March 30, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Barbara A. Beno, Executive Director  
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

FROM: Mark Silliman, Ed.D., Chancellor

SUBJECT: Progress Report from Leeward Community College

Enclosed are three (3) paper copies of the Progress Report (including the Attachments) from Leeward Community College, University of Hawai‘i, due to the Commission by April 1, 2005, as directed by the Commission’s corrected “action letter” to the College dated January 31, 2005.

As required by the ACCJC guidelines on the “Preparation of a Progress Report with a Visit,” an electronic copy of the Progress Report and Attachments has also been transmitted to the Commission office by e-mail (accjc@accjc.org).

The ACCJC guidelines on the preparation of a Progress Report require the Report to be reviewed by the Governing Board prior to its submission. Please be informed that, as of this writing, the Board of Regents (BOR) of the University of Hawai‘i is anticipated to review Leeward CC’s Progress Report, together with the Progress Reports to ACCJC of the six other University of Hawaiʻi Community Colleges, at its meeting on May 19-20, 2005.

However, in order to meet the Commission deadline of 4/1/05 and following appropriate consultation between the UH System’s Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (Community Colleges) and ACCJC, Leeward CC’s Progress Report is being submitted to ACCJC prior to BOR review with the understanding that ACCJC will be informed about the official action taken on the Progress Report by the Board of Regents at its May 2005 meeting, and that a revised Progress Report will be submitted to ACCJC should the BOR require any changes to the report.
As indicated below, a copy of Leeward CC’s Progress Report (including Attachments)—together with a copy of this memorandum—is also being mailed this date to each of the following two other team members (in addition to Dr. Barbara Beno) who comprise the three-member visiting team who will be conducting a special “group-colleges” visit, on Thursday, 4/7/05, in Honolulu, Hawai‘i at the UH Community Colleges System Office, with representatives from Hawai‘i Community College, Leeward Community College, and Maui Community College: Mr. Joseph Richey, ACCJC Commission Chair, and Dr. Marie Smith.

If there are any questions, please contact the LCC Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Peter Quigley, at 808/455-0440 or quigleyp@hawaii.edu.

Enclosures (3)

CC (with a copy of the LCC Progress Report):

- Mr. Joseph Richey
- Dr. Marie Smith
- Dr. Peter Quigley, Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, LCC
- Dr. Robert Asato, Accreditation Liaison Officer, LCC
- Ms. Lani Uyeno, Co-Coordinator, Institutional Self Study, LCC
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SECTION I

Background

At its meeting in January 2005, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges reviewed Leeward Community College’s Progress Report (dated September 9, 2004) and the report of the evaluation team that visited the College on October 25, 2004. As indicated in its action letter dated January 31, 2005, the Commission accepted the College’s Progress Report, continued the College’s Warning status, and required a Progress Report by April 1, 2005 to be followed by a visit by Commission representatives. (See Attachment A or the website, http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/ter/ACCJC_letter_050131.pdf)

The action letter contained five “University of Hawai‘i System Recommendations” to be addressed in the next Progress Report. These recommendations are enumerated below.

In a separate action letter, also dated January 31, 2005, to University of Hawai‘i (UH) Interim President David McClain, the Commission notified the President that it had placed six of the seven UH Community Colleges (including Leeward Community College) on Warning. Although Hawai‘i Community College was the only college not placed on Warning status, it was nonetheless required to submit a report on its own progress in developing and implementing “an integrated program review system that leads to institutional improvement.”

The action letter to the UH Interim President contained the five UH System recommendations repeated in the respective action letters to the seven UH Community Colleges (UHCCs). The Commission action to place the majority of the UHCCs on Warning was taken after the Commission had reviewed the UH System’s October 2004 “Progress Report on the Substantive Change Request Related to the System Reorganization and Other Commission Recommendations” and the report of the ACCJC team that had visited the UH System in November 2004. The findings, conclusions, concerns, and issues that gave rise to the five UH System recommendations are articulated in the visiting team report.

As indicated in the Commission’s action letter to Interim President McClain, the Commission accredits colleges, not systems. Quoting the ACCJC “Policy and Procedures
for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems,” the Commission informed the President as follows:

“When a team identifies serious inadequacies in the performance of district/system functions, such a deficiency could jeopardize the accreditation of one, some or all of the district/system’s colleges. Responsibility for correcting this deficiency will be placed on the district/system offices as well as on the college(s) in question.”

By consensus of the UH Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (Community Colleges) and the Chancellors of the seven UHCCs, the seven colleges, in their respective Progress Reports, would address any campus-specific recommendations contained in their respective action letters and also incorporate the UH System’s response to the five UH System recommendations.

Leeward Community College, which did not have campus-specific recommendations, is providing an update on additional progress to date in the area of program review, as well as responses to the UH System’s recommendations.

The five UH System recommendations addressed in the Progress Report are the following:

**Recommendation 2:** The team recommends that the UH Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:

- That the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including programs review;
- That the community college system as well as each college set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based on analysis of research data;
- That the colleges and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
- That the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and
- That the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress. Standards I.B, II.A.1 and 2, II.B.3.a, II.B.4, II.C.1.e, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.1 and 2, III.D.1.a, IV.B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards)
Recommendation 4: The team report of April 2003 required the University of Hawai’i Community Colleges to submit a report on how the University of Hawai’i system structure has been finally staffed and funded.

Recommendation 5: The Team recommends that the University of Hawai’i review its salary placement policies and practices, assures that those policies are available for information and review by institutional employees, and assures that they are equitably administered to all employees, including all administrative staff. (Standards III.A.3 and 4)

Recommendation 6: The UH Community Colleges and the University of Hawai’i system should identify more clearly the community college system functions and authority assigned to the two Associate Vice President offices and staff, and communicate those to the colleges and the University System-wide Support. Both organizations must then design workflow and decision-making processes that allow the Community College System-wide support staff to provide support and delegated authority in areas of academic planning, administrative (including personnel) and fiscal operations. (Standards IV.A.5, IIIA.3, 1B)

Recommendation 7: The UH Community Colleges should identify and implement the means to ensure that the Community College governance system at the system head and board levels meets accreditation standards by developing and implementing policies and processes that ensure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services. (Standards IVB, all)

Statement on Report Preparation

Background
Upon receipt of the Commission’s January action letter, Chancellor Mark Silliman informed the campus community about the Commission’s decision to continue the College on Warning status. He articulated the need to fully address and resolve the recommendations and related concerns contained in the action letter.

The ACCJC action letter dated January 31, 2005 and the evaluation report of the ACCJC visiting team were distributed in pdf format via e-mail to the campus community on February 4, 2005. In that e-mail, Chancellor Silliman explained and summarized the action letter (Attachment B) and provided a link to the College’s accreditation webpage.
In mid February, the Council of Chancellors met to decide on future actions. This meeting was followed by a conference call with Executive Director Barbara Beno.

**Process of Report Preparation**
The System response to Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 was prepared by the UHCC’s Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs.

The preparation of the Progress Report relied on input from the College’s administrative team, the Assessment Analysis Team, the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee (FSPRC) Chair, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Strategic Plan Coordinator, and faculty and staff involved in program and area assessments. Their collective work played a pivotal role in providing the necessary information and documents required for the preparation and writing of these sections of the report.

**Report Writing**
The System response to Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were received from the Office of the UHCC Associate Vice President and are included verbatim.

The principal writers of the LCC Responses were Bob Asato, ALO; Lani Uyeno, Strategic Planner; Kathy Hill, Assessment Coordinator; with supervision by Peter Quigley, Chief Academic Officer.

**Review and Approval of Report**
In March 2005, the campus constituencies were notified of the March 30 deadline for a review of the Progress Report. Both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council were advised of the short timeline and the need to expedite the approval process due to the internal deadline for Board of Regent’s approval.

The Chief Academic Officer distributed a draft of the report for review via email and feedback from the College governance groups.

The Campus Council reviewed and approved the report with modifications on March 17, 2005, and the Faculty Senate reviewed the report on March 30 2005. Revisions were made in response to the feedback from the governance groups.

Chancellor Mark Silliman certifies this Statement on Report Preparation through his signature on the Cover Sheet of this Report.
SECTION II

Responses to Commission Recommendations

SECTION II A: Responses to Recommendation 2

**Recommendation 2:** The team recommends that the UH Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:

- That the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including programs review;
- That the community college system as well as each college set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based on analysis of research data;
- That the colleges and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
- That the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and
- That the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress. Standards I.B, II.A.1 and 2, II.B.3.a, II.B.4, II.C.1.e, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.1 and 2, III.D.1.a, IV.B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards)

**System response**

Recognizing that the Commission is concerned that the UH Community Colleges need to develop an integrated system-wide program review, institutional assessment and improvement process, the Chancellors met in February to get a briefing from each campus as to their current policies, practices, and timetable; and to seek agreement on a number of principles that will guide all campuses in the development and modification of their program review processes. Following extensive discussion, eight principles were adopted to address ACCJC concerns, meet UH BOR and Executive Policy requirements on program review (*Attachment 1*); and to provide system consistency but also enough local control to make reviews meaningful at the campus level:

- Each instructional and non-instructional program should undergo a comprehensive review at least once every five years.
- Program reviews shall result in improvement plans that are linked to each college’s Strategic Plan.
- There shall be an annual report of program data which is analyzed, reviewed, and, where appropriate, reflected in updated action plans.
- There shall be an overarching commitment to continuous quality improvement.
• The program review process shall be collegial.
• Program review information shall be publicly available.
• Comparable measures shall be consistent across campuses.
• Program reviews and resulting plans for improvement shall be used in decisions regarding resource allocation.

The community college chancellors made a presentation (Attachment 2) to the Board of Regents at its March meeting that examined the issues detailed in the January 2005 letter from the Commission. The presentation included the magnitude of the required program review task within the community colleges, the planned review schedule for each campus, and the principles the chancellors articulated to guide the campus processes to comply with both University policies and ACCJC standards.

**Campus Response**
The program review process at LCC continues to evolve. It began with a very narrow focus and has slowly expanded as a result of dialogue and more inclusive participation. Change was based on new information gained on an almost weekly basis and was instigated by a need to address emerging issues:

• how will we do program review?
• what do we assess?
• who will do the review and assessments?
• by when?

**Initial Efforts: January to August 2004**
Leeward Community College’s initial approach to Program Review focused on the assessment of instructional programs, individual courses, and support areas. At the time of the ACCJC site team’s visit in October, 2004, initial assessments of student learning outcomes (slo) in all instructional programs had been completed. Areas and units such as the Chancellor’s Office, Administrative Services, Student Services, and Academic Services (formerly Academic Support) had also completed reviews of their respective areas.

As established in the Unit/Area Program Review Policy (May 2003), the Faculty Senate Program Review Committee (FSPRC) implemented the review process for program slo assessments. Program assessment activities were organized within the Associate in Arts (AA), Associate in Science (AS), and Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degrees and certificates constituent to them.
A Program Assessment Reporting Form template was used to provide consistency in collection of data. To ensure the accuracy of describing outcome measures, selection of the data/sample population, and method of assessment, all Assessment Forms submitted were discussed and voted upon by the FSPRC before the collection of data. Those that were not approved were sent back for revision.

By the end of Spring 2004 the initial phase of assessments was completed in all six of the General Education Outcomes of the AA degree and in selected outcomes in the AS, AAS degrees and certificates. The Assessment Form for all of these areas were uploaded onto the Assessment Website (http://campus.leeward.hawaii.edu/group.asp?itemid=1000243).

Implementation of the Support Area assessments began with each area
- Developing a mission statement for its operational areas;
- Establishing goals and objectives;
- Selecting outcome measures;
- Analyzing and reporting on the results;
- Developing action plans for the upcoming year.
Reviews were also completed by the end of 2004 Spring semester.

During the summer, the Institutional Researcher compiled the FSPRC assessment results into a Program Review Fact Book. See (www.lcc.hawaii.edu/docs).

**August 2004 to Present**
In August 2004, the College engaged Julie Slark, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Educational Services, Rancho Santiago Community College District, as a consultant to examine our progress. After consulting with Ms. Slark, College leaders began to re-think assessment efforts to include instruction, academic support, student needs and achievement, and most importantly, to create a culture of evidence to produce data from which we could take appropriate actions. Several individuals who were already engaged in research and planning activities participated in the AAHE Assessment Conference in Glendale, where they began to formulate the College’s program review model. The four participants became the core of LCC’s Assessment Team, a group that has worked extensively with program and area assessment leaders on the design and implementation of assessment projects. The rich dialogues that occurred have spurred a re-thinking of what we do in our classrooms to support student learning and have provided a basis for future actions that must be taken. (The revised Program Review Model is shown in Attachment C)
The following is a chronology of major events in the development of our Program Review.

- The revised model was shared with the campus community via numerous dialog sessions during September and October. The intent of these sessions was to build a common understanding of the terms, processes, and reasons for re-conceptualizing our existing model, and to illustrate that the support area reviews would be driven by the findings of College’s assessment of degree programs.

- This dialog was continued by an Assessment Analysis Team under the leadership of the CAO in October, 2004. This team met with all groups who had completed assessments of student learning outcomes in the AA, AAS, and AS degrees and with unit heads from Administrative, Academic, and Student Services who had assessed the achievement of specific objectives for their respective areas. The purposes of these meetings were to identify slo or outcome measure assessed; to determine the validity of the assessment tool and the information gained by the assessment; and most importantly, to identify changes that could be made to improve student learning.

- In January 2005, the CAO formalized LCC’s Assessment Program through the naming of an Assessment Coordinator and Associate Coordinator. The announcement was part of a Faculty Senate update and included information on the Assessment Team’s work with program, course, and area assessments.

- An *Assessment Analysis Report* summarizing the Team’s findings was prepared and distributed to the entire campus in February, 2005 (See *Attachment D*.) The campus community was encouraged to use the Report as a basis for action plans that would be incorporated in the revisit of the College’s Strategic Plan (SP) during March, 2005. For the first time in the College’s history, student learning assessment results will be the basis for the development of action plans in the annual revisit of the SP. (See email message to faculty in *Attachment E.*) After faculty, staff, and administrators have submitted action plans, representatives of the campus governance organizations will collect priorities from their constituencies and will work with administrators to create the budget.

- Another element of the process is that program and support areas will work collaboratively in the design of action plans. For example, in the AA general education assessment of written communication, faculty have pointed out the need
for a method to collect and access student writing samples, preferably in a paperless form. In collaboration with the campus’ Educational Media Center, faculty members have designed an action plan that calls for assigned time for both faculty and support area personnel to facilitate the design of such a website, as well as to carry on the initial implementation of the project in its new form. The Assessment Team anticipates that other general education core areas would be able to use the website for similar assessments of student learning.

- The Assessment Coordinator and Institutional Researcher are revising the campus’ Program Review Policy.

- LCC’s mission statement has been revised to emphasize student learning as central to the College’s mission. (See Attachment F.)

- The College will administer the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) in March, 2005. (See Attachment G.) This is student survey that assesses the quality of educational programs, practices, and services.

The building of a culture of evidence has begun with the creation and approval of a new position, Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment (DPPA) that has been approved by the campus governance bodies. The director and his staff will be responsible for ensuring that the results of assessment are integrated into the College’s Strategic Plan and its budget priorities. The College has also planned for instituting an enrollment management system so that LCC can more fully understand what incoming students want as they enter, what they need while here, and where they go after LCC. We have also moved a job placement position from extramural to general funds so we can place and track students as they become employed. Finally, the analysis of the degree program assessments strongly indicated a need for assigned time for instructors involved in these efforts, which resulted in an action plan that the college reallocate a percentage of its yearly budget to ensure the measurable improvement in student learning.

Leeward Community College’s Program Review process is the vehicle by which the campus engages in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness. Through systematic collection and review of student learning assessment and effectiveness measures, faculty, staff, and administrators identify and address concerns and make improvements to ensure that programs meet their goals and address the College’s mission.
Currently, Strategic planners work with project directors in the carry-through and assessment of their actions plans. Because these plans are developed to support the goals and objectives of the College, assessments reflect the College’s improvement. Results of the action plan assessments are published annually and shared via email with the campus community, as well as with the larger community. (See http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/sp/03-04SPAssess%20Report.pdf for a sample copy of the last SP Assessment Report.) A more comprehensive assessment of institutional effectiveness is scheduled for Spring 2006, when LCC will engage in its first complete Program Review. At that point, common data elements on student learning achievement, faculty and staff, curriculum, support, and external input will be included. Results of the Program Review will be communicated with the College, the UHCC System, and the Board of Regents.

Additional Action to Be Taken by the College
Approval of the revised Program Review Policy by campus governance.
Continue implementation of Program Review

SECTION II B: Responses to Recommendation 4

Recommendation 4: The team report of April 2003 required the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges to submit a report on how the University of Hawai‘i system structure has been finally staffed and funded.

System response
The December 2002 University system reorganization resulted in the creation of a Council of Chancellors reporting directly to the President. Represented in this council are chancellors of each individual campus throughout the UH system, including a chancellor for each community college. The reorganization also eliminated the Office of the Senior Vice President and Chancellor for Community Colleges and reassigned the support functions of system community college staff to various system-level vice presidential offices; established the office of the Vice President for International Education; established the office of the Chief of Staff; and transferred the Office of Research Services from the UH Mānoa campus to the office of the Vice President for Research.

The 2002 system reorganization was premised in part on an assumption of a major infusion of funding, which was requested from the Legislature, but not provided. In November 2004, as requested by Interim President David McClain, the Board of Regents approved a system
reorganization that realigned the organizational structure to more closely fit the University’s operating and administrative needs given the available resources. The reorganization was based on models from other similarly sized multi-campus public university systems.

The purpose of the reorganization was to streamline the University’s system level organizational structure while continuing to provide academic and administrative coordination to the autonomous campuses. The number of Vice Presidents (plus the Chief of Staff position) was reduced from eight to five through function consolidation and relocation. The new organization preserved previous Board action designed to promote and facilitate campus autonomy as represented by the Council of Chancellors in balance with system wide academic and administrative coordination provided by system office executives.

The reorganization reduced the number of direct reports to the President from 18 executives to 15 executives as listed:

- Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy (retitled from Vice President for Academic Affairs)
- Vice President for Research
- Vice President for Student Affairs
- Vice President for Administration
- Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer
- Chancellor, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
- Chancellor, University of Hawai‘i at Hilo
- Chancellor, University of Hawai‘i at West O‘ahu
- Chancellor, Hawai‘i Community College
- Chancellor, Honolulu Community College
- Chancellor, Kapi‘olani Community College
- Chancellor, Kaua‘i Community College
- Chancellor, Leeward Community College
- Chancellor, Maui Community College
- Chancellor, Windward Community College

The community college campuses and system support offices comprise a single state appropriation, and therefore are managed as a separately fiscal entity. In FY 2002, prior to the system reorganization, the Community Colleges system had 1,602.25 total positions and total annual expenditures of $116,121,050. Table 1 details the distribution of positions by campus and Systemwide support.
Following the system reorganizations in 2002 and 2004, and additional legislative appropriations to campuses in FY 2003, the Community Colleges system had 1,610.25 total positions and total annual expenditures of $120,510,565 (Table 2). In the process of making those changes, the number of positions in the “Community College Systemwide Support” category was reduced from 41.25 to 32.25 as positions were reallocated to either community college campuses (7.0 positions), or University system functions (2.0 positions). The FY 2003 legislative appropriations included 8.0 positions and $611,121 for operational improvements (Windward CC, Maui CC, and Kauai CC), and 2.0 positions and $144,644 for workforce development programs (Honolulu CC). The need for additional resources was identified as part of the community college assessment and budget request prioritization process.

The current Board of Regents’ approved University system tables of organization and community colleges campus’ tables of organization are located in Attachment 3.
At the same November meeting, the Board approved the establishment of a new Executive Class, Vice Chancellor, Community Colleges (CC), to which the following community college managerial positions were allocated:

**Dean of Instruction to Vice Chancellor (Academic)**
- Hawai‘i Community College
- Honolulu Community College
- Kapi‘olani Community College
- Leeward Community College
- Maui Community College

**Dean of Student Services to Vice Chancellor (Students)**
- Maui Community College

**Director of Administrative Services to Vice Chancellor (Administrative)**
- Hawai‘i Community College
- Honolulu Community College
- Kapi‘olani Community College
- Maui Community College

There were no additional costs associated with the retitling of these managerial positions as the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) indexing remains the same.

**Campus Response**
The College has been engaged in a review of its organizational structure. From August, 2004 through February, 2005, the Reorganization Committee, with broad-based, campus-wide membership, met and discussed the administrative levels of the College. In February 2005, the College governance groups, the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate, approved the Reorganization Resolution, which included the conversion of our Director of Administrative Services to a Vice Chancellor (Administrative) position.
SECTION II C: Responses to Recommendation 5

Recommendation 5: The Team recommends that the University of Hawai‘i review its salary placement policies and practices, assures that those policies are available for information and review by institutional employees, and assures that they are equitably administered to all employees, including all administrative staff. (Standards III.A.3 and 4)

System response
In fall 2001, the University Board of Regents adopted a revised Executive/Managerial Compensation Policy that called for salaries to be indexed to College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) national salary benchmarks. The policy calls for new Executive and Managerial employees to be normally hired at least at the median but no higher than the 80th percentile salary of the applicable College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) comparable class. The policy calls for interim appointees’ salaries to be set at no less than the 20th percentile and no more than the median of the respective class. This policy is in Board of Regents Policy, Chapter Nine - Personnel, and is available to all on the Board Web site.

In addition, Transition Guidelines were also presented that called for salary adjustments to be made for continuing Executive/Managerial personnel, subject to availability of funds, who were performing above the fully satisfactory level. This salary adjustment was planned to allow the University to hire and retain administrative personnel. The reorganization plan called for salaries to be adjusted in 2003.

The Board of Regents adopted salary adjustment schedules for Executive and Managerial position adjustments laddered over time and budget cycles. The first executive adjustments were to be effective 7/1/02 (20th percentile), 7/1/03 (20th percentile), 7/1/04 (40th percentile), 7/1/05 (40th percentile), and 7/1/06 (median percentile). The first managerial adjustments were to be effective on July 1, 2002 bringing all managers up to the 20th percentile, the second adjustment to be effective July 1, 2003, to the 40th percentile, and the final adjustment to be effective July 1, 2004 bringing all managers to the median CUPA-HR comparable level. Implementation of the salary adjustment schedule for incumbents was delayed. The first level adjustment was effective July 1, 2004.

Acknowledging that the high cost of living in Hawai‘i was a detriment to attracting new staff from outside the state, the University hired new administrators from outside the system at the target 50th percentile, and then decided in fairness it should hire current employees who were
going to new jobs within the system at the 50th percentile. In addition, as part of the first reorganization (December 2002) there was a plan to adjust Community College Chancellors salaries in the 2003-4 fiscal year.

In fall 2004, the Board of Regents’ delegated to the President authority to approve personnel actions related to managerial positions and incumbents in those positions, provided that managerial appointments above the median and salary adjustments for incumbents above the 60th percentile of the applicable CUPA-HR comparable class or appropriate equivalent salary survey will require Board approval.

In December 2004, following consultations with the Chancellors, the President approved using the funding available for executive and managerial salary increases to bring all incumbents up to the 20th percentile of the CUPA-HR for their comparable class. In addition, the Chancellors were asked to recommend to the President for his approval, salary adjustments for managerial incumbents to bring them into alignment with their newly appointed peers. In November 2004, the Board of Regents approved salary adjustments for executive positions, including Chancellors and Associate Vice Presidents to bring their salaries at a minimum to the 20th percentile of the CUPA-HR for their classification.

The community colleges and the University system offices supporting the community colleges have a total of sixty-four management level positions, twenty-one classified as Executive positions that require Board of Regents’ approval for any salary adjustment, and forty-three classified as Managerial positions requiring the President’s approval for salary adjustments up to the sixtieth percentile of the CUPA-HR schedule.

An examination of Executive salaries on March 14, 2005 indicates that there were four recent new hires, three appointees were placed at or above the CUPA-HR 40th percentile for the position and one was placed between the 20th percentile and the 40th percentile. In the case of incumbents, seven (50%) currently have an annual salary at or above the CUPA-HR 40th percentile for the position, while seven (50%) have a salary that is between the 20th percentile and the 40th percentile.

An examination of Managerial salaries on March 14, 2005 indicates that there were six recent new hires, of which four appointees were placed at or above the CUPA-HR median for the position and two were placed below the median. In the case of twenty incumbents who were in their positions at the time the policy was adopted, eleven (53%) currently have an annual salary at or above the CUPA-HR median for the position while ten (47%) have a salary below the CUPA-HR median.
There are fifteen Executive and Managerial positions filled on an acting or interim basis; all the individuals filling these positions have a salary that is at or above the CUPA-HR 20th percentile for the position they hold.

A table of the current community college managerial and executive personnel salaries relative to the CUPA-HR median is located in Attachment 4.

**Campus Response**

No campus specific response required.

**SECTION II D: Responses to Recommendation 6**

**Recommendation 6:** The UH Community Colleges and the University of Hawai‘i system should identify more clearly the community college system functions and authority assigned to the two Associate Vice President offices and staff, and communicate those to the colleges and the University System-wide Support. Both organizations must then design workflow and decision-making processes that allow the Community College System-wide support staff to provide support and delegated authority in areas of academic planning, administrative (including personnel) and fiscal operations. (Standards IV.A.5, IIIA.3, 1B)

**System response**

**UHCC Organizational Issues**

Following receipt of the draft Visiting Team Report to the Commission, the community college chancellors and the two Associate Vice Presidents organized a series of meetings and discussions on organizational issues. In mid-December, a meeting was then held with President McClain to discuss the following criteria and organizational alternatives. Further meetings were held with the President in January and in February, after the receipt of the ACCJC Action Letter.

**Critical Questions for Consideration:**

In considering organization models, below are questions that can lead to criteria that we might use in evaluating those models. These questions are, in some cases, contradictory and no structure would likely optimize all criteria. The questions all assume that it is in our best interest to be some kind of “system” of community colleges.
• How do we maximize the collective impact of community colleges on resource allocation decisions and policy formation within the hierarchical UH system?
• If the President creates a UH Cabinet that includes campus CEOs, how will the CCs be represented in that cabinet?
• How do we optimize our collective relationship with our baccalaureate peers, especially around areas of curriculum, articulation, student flow, enrollment management, etc.?
• How do we develop and communicate a consistent community college message with external publics?
• How do we mobilize to achieve collective goals?
• How do we provide administrative support to small and large campuses?
• How do we resolve conflicts around policies or decisions that need to be consistent, especially in areas where by law or Board policy or accreditation standards we are still considered a system?
• How do we ensure campuses the freedom and flexibility to act when there doesn’t need to be common or consistent direction?
• How do we gain economies of scale across campuses?
• How do we gain consistency of practice or adoption of best practices across campuses?
• How do we manage the Board of Regents if ACCJC is requiring them to interact with us much more intensely as if they were a local board?
• How do we become more than just the sum of our seven campuses?

Prospective Organizational Models:
Below are several organizational models, with variants, that were considered during the discussions:

The CC Separate System (Kentucky 1997- Present) Model
Separate Governing Board
CEO for the CC system with campus CEOs reporting to the CC System CEO, who reports to the Separate Governing Board
System administrative and academic policy/support reports to CC System CEO
Relationship with other UH campuses negotiated politically

Variant A – Same model except the CC System CEO reports to the UH Board of Regents, which serves as the Separate Governing Board, and not to the UH President, similar to the role the BOR plays for Career and Technical Education.
The CC System CEO (Tsunoda 1983-2002) Model
CC System CEO reports to the UH President who reports to the Board of Regents
Campus CEOs report to the System CEO
System administrative and academic policy/support reports to CC System CEO
CC System CEO sits on UH President’s Cabinet and represents CC interests within UH

Variant A – Same model except the role of the system office focuses primarily on policy, coordination, external relations, etc. and less on operations.

The CC System Coordinator (Melendy – 1965-72) Model
Vice-President or similar high level position created for CC Coordination.
Campus CEOs report to the UH President
CC System administrative and academic policy/support reports to the Coordinating VP
Coordinating VP sits on UH President’s Cabinet and represents CC interests within UH

Variant A – Same model except VP has more direct control over those functions such as system planning and system budgeting where policy, law, or accreditation dictates that we be a system. Only coordinating responsibility for plan implementation, campus initiatives, campus operations.

Variant B – Assoc VP for Academic Affairs assumes the VP role; Assoc VP for Administration and CC Operations reports to VP

The Present Model (Since 2003)
No CC System CEO
Campus CEOs report to the UH President
CC System administrative support reports to VP Admin and VP Finance
CC System academic support reports to VP Academic Policy and Planning
CC System decisions negotiated through Council of Community College Chancellors
Associate VP for Administration (Community Colleges) and Associate VP for Academic Affairs (Community Colleges) sit on UH President’s Senior Management Group

Variant A – Council of Community College Chancellors negotiates but UH President makes final decision on CC System decisions
The CC Collective Leadership Model

- No CC System CEO
- Campus CEOs report to the UH President
- CC System decisions decided by Council of Community College Chancellors
- Council names a permanent or rotating chair
- Chair sits on UH President’s cabinet
- CC System administrative and academic policy/support reports to the Chair

Since the issue is our ability to meet the ACCJC Standard for a multi-campus district, a generic, the President requested that a draft functional statement for the CEO of the UH Community Colleges as a system be created to clarify the roles of the CC system CEO compared with that of the campus CEO. This draft functional statement for an “Executive Chancellor” of the community colleges (Attachment 5) was used by the Chancellors during their December, January and February discussions among themselves and with the President. Similar discussions have been held involving the President and community college faculty leadership.

A number of issues were considered during these discussions over the past several months concerning each of these approaches. Chancellors and faculty generally agreed that there were a number of positive attributes of the Present System. At the same time, they recognized that more “coherence” among community college operations is needed in order to satisfy current ACCJC standards. Of particular note was the desire of some chancellors, and their faculties, to maintain a direct reporting relationship to the President. Other chancellors and their faculties were more accepting of a reporting relationship through a CC System CEO to the UH President.

We expect to reach closure on these discussions during the first half of the month of April. If there is an organizational change to be made, it will be recommended to the Board of Regents for adoption by the end of this Academic Year.

Also worthy of note is a new “cabinet”-style group convened biweekly by President McClain since mid-January 2005. Attending are five chancellors: one from each of the three baccalaureate campuses; one from an O’ahu community college; and one from a Neighbor Island community college. Also attending are all System level vice-presidents. The intent of these meetings is to create a biweekly meeting at which System-level leaders can discuss operational and strategic issues with their campus counterparts. The meeting is limited to approximately 10 participants to encourage dialogue; it was felt that including all 10 chancellors along with all System-level VPs would create a meeting that would be too large and unwieldy. Community college representation is determined by the constituent chancellors themselves;
O‘ahu chancellors have tended to identify Kap‘iolani CC chancellor John Morton as their representative, while Neighbor Island chancellors have rotated representation among themselves.

President McClain intends to review the efficacy of this arrangement at the end of the spring semester, 2005. Should this “cabinet”–style group be continued, it will reflect any organizational changes made in the structure of the community college system and its leadership.

**Campus Response**
The College has experienced confusion in the handling of curricular actions because the lines of communication and authority are not clearly established between the individual campuses and the Associate Vice-Presidents. It is hoped that when the organizational model is agreed upon, the roles and lines of authority are clearly defined and, most importantly, communicated to all faculty and staff.

### SECTION II E: Responses to Recommendation 7

**Recommendation 7:** The UH Community Colleges should identify and implement the means to ensure that the Community College governance system at the system head and board levels meets accreditation standards by developing and implementing policies and processes that ensure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services.

(Standards IVB, all)

**System response**
Over the past month there have been a number of informal discussions involving the University administration and the leadership and staff of the Board of Regents as to the most appropriate way to organize the community college governance at the system level (see the response to # 6 above) and the best way for the Board to meet the ACCJC governance standards.

At the conclusion of the community college presentation to the Board of Regents at its March meeting on program review and other measures needed to address the issues identified in the January 2005 ACCJC Action Letter, President McClain suggested that changes would need to occur at the campus, system and Board of Regents levels to address ACCJC concerns.

At the Board level, several issues were brought forward by the President and the Board for future consideration, including: increasing the size of the Board’s Community College Committee from three members to five members, developing a meeting schedule for the Community College Committee that is different from that of the regular Board meetings, and
making modifications as necessary to current Board and Executive Policies. It is anticipated that a number of these changes will be implemented by the end of this Academic Year.

At the campus level, the community college chancellors’ eight principles, articulated under #2 above, are intended to address ACCJC concerns.

At the UH System level, it may be necessary to redesign the System using some variant of the organizational ideas contained under #6 above.

**Campus Response**

Having gone through a full cycle of program assessment, the College sees the importance and value of research on student learning and its effect on program and fiscal decision-making. However, time and resources are necessary to engage in the following, including:

- continuous assessment as the basis of evaluation, planning, and improvement of programs and services
- on-going professional development and training of faculty, staff, and administrators
- growing need for learning resources and technology to support student learning.

The UH System needs to set up a method to honor these priorities.
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January 31, 2005

Dr. Mark Silliman
Chancellor
Leeward Community College
96-045 Ala Ike
Pearl City, HI 96782

Dear Chancellor Silliman:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 12-14, 2005, reviewed the Progress Report submitted by Leeward Community College and the report of the evaluation team which visited on Monday, October 25, 2004. The purpose of this review is to assure that the recommendations made by the evaluation team were addressed by the institution.

The Commission moved to accept the report, continue the College on Warning, and to ask that Leeward Community College correct the deficiencies noted. The college is required to complete a Progress Report by March 15, 2005. The report will be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.

A warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course of action which deviates from the Commission’s eligibility criteria, standards of accreditation, or policy to an extent that raises a concern regarding the ability of the institution to meet accreditation standards. The accredited status of the institution continues during the warning period.

The Progress Report of March 15, 2005 should focus on the recommendations below:

University of Hawaii System Recommendations:

Recommendation #2. The team recommends that the University of Hawaii Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:

- That the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;
- That the community college system as well as each college set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;
- That the colleges and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
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- That the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and
- That the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress. (Standards I.B, II.A.1 and 2, II.B.3.a, II.B.4, II.C.1.e, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.1 and 2, III.D.1.a, IV.B.2.b and the Preamble to the Standards)

**Recommendation #4.** The team report of April 2003 required the University of Hawaii Community Colleges to submit a report on how the University of Hawaii system structure has been finally staffed and funded.

**Recommendation #5.** The Team recommends that the University of Hawaii review its salary placement policies and practices, assures that those policies are available for information and review by institutional employees, and assures that they are equitably administered to all employees, including all administrative staff. (Standards III.A.3 and 4)

**Recommendation #6.** The UH Community Colleges and the University of Hawaii System identify more clearly the community college system functions and authority assigned to the two Associate Vice President offices and staff, and communicate those to the colleges and the University System-wide Support. Both organizations must then design workflow and decision-making processes that allow the Community College System-wide Support staff to provide support and delegated authority in areas of academic planning, administrative (including personnel) and fiscal operations. (Standards IV.A.5, III.A.3, IB)

**Recommendation #7.** The UH Community Colleges identify and implement the means to ensure that the Community College governance system at the system head and board levels meet accreditation standards by developing and implementing policies and processes that ensure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services. (Standard IV.B all)

I also wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation.

I have previously sent you a copy of the evaluation team report. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the College Progress Report, the team report and this letter appropriate dissemination to your college staff. The Commission also requires that the reports and the Action Letter be made available to the public. Placing copies in the college library can accomplish this. Should you want the report electronically to place on your web site or for some other purpose, please contact Commission staff.
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Please note that the next comprehensive evaluation of Leeward Community College will occur in fall 2006.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno  
Executive Director

BAB/tl

cc: President David McClain  
Associate Vice President Mike Rota  
Dr. Robert Asato, Accreditation Liaison Officer  
Dr. Patricia Lee, Chair, Board of Regents, University of Hawaii  
Ms. Linda Henderson, US DOE
Aloha all Faculty and Staff,

This is in follow-up to my related e-mail dated 2/2/05.

Attached is a (pdf) copy each of (1) the action letter to Leeward Community College, dated 1/31/05, from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges, received on 2/4/05, and (2) the evaluation report of the ACCJC visiting team which visited the College on October 22 and 25, 2004 in follow-up to the College’s last Progress Report to ACCJC dated 9/9/04.  These two documents will also be posted soon on the LCC accreditation webpage at http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/ . The Progress Report has already been so posted.

As you will note from the attached action letter, ACCJC, at its January 2005 meeting, accepted our Progress Report but continued us on Warning status and asks that the College submit a Progress Report by April 1, 2005 (the correct date; not 3/15/05) to be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.

The next Progress Report is to address the five recommendations enumerated in the letter. Please note that the five recommendations are “University of Hawaii System Recommendations,” not recommendations addressed specifically or solely to Leeward CC. Please read carefully the evaluation report of the 10/04 visiting team.

Because that team’s evaluation report was generally positive in its review or assessment of the actions taken by and the progress made by the College to date in addressing the three recommendations*, on which we were required to report in our last Progress Report, the visiting team, as you will note, made no new or follow-up recommendations in its report to the Commission. As a result, the Commission made no campus-specific recommendations to the College in its action letter dated 1/31/05. (*Of the three recommendations, two related to program review, and one related to the need to formalize our planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources.)

In the context of the generally positive visiting team’s evaluation report and the absence of new or follow-up campus-specific recommendations, I commend the entire campus community for the enormous amount of time, effort, dedication, and resources you have given in addressing and continuing to address these accreditation recommendations and concerns and the related ACCJC accreditation standards. I thank you for your efforts and hard work. I especially wish to acknowledge and thank the faculty, staff, and administrators who were involved in compiling, writing, revising, and editing our last Progress Report. I also thank those who have participated and assisted in the various program review and assessment initiatives. Thank you also to the Faculty Senate and Campus Council which reviewed our last Progress Report on an expedited basis.

But why has the College still been continued on warning status? By now, you may have read the official University of Hawai‘i press release reporting that six of the seven UH Community Colleges have been placed on warning status by ACCJC, and that the seventh College (Hawai‘i CC) is also required to submit a Progress Report by 4/1/05. The press release is posted on the UH News website at:  http://www.hawaii.edu/news/

All seven of the UHCCs are being required by ACCJC in their respective action letters to report on the same five “University of Hawaii System Recommendations” enumerated in the 1/31/05 action letter to Leeward CC. A few of the campuses must also address campus-specific recommendations. All seven action letters have been posted on the website of the UH Vice President for Academic Affairs at: http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/ Scroll down to “UH Community Colleges.”
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On that same website, please review especially carefully the two documents listed below. They are essential in understanding why Leeward CC and the other UHCC campuses have been placed on Warning status.

1. ACCJC action letter, dated 1/31/05, to UH Interim President David McClain. Please note that ACCJC is requiring the UH System to respond to the same five recommendations, which are repeated in the respective action letters to each UHCC campus, through a Progress Report also due 4/1/05. Note especially the last two paragraphs on page 3 of the letter which read as follows:

“Under the Commission’s Policy and Procedure for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems,

“When a team identifies serious inadequacies in the performance of district/system functions, such a deficiency could jeopardize the accreditation of one, some or all of the district/system’s colleges. Responsibility for correcting this deficiency will be placed on the district/system offices as well as on the college(s) in question.”

“The Commission accredits colleges not systems. Nevertheless, the four remaining recommendations to the University of Hawai‘i system noted above have contributed to the inability of the Hawai‘i Community Colleges to meet important accreditation requirements. In separate actions, the Commission acted to place six of the seven Hawai‘i Community Colleges on Warning and ask that they resolve these same recommendations..., as well as, address recommendations contained in the reports of the visiting teams. The Commission also acted to require Hawai‘i Community College [although not placed on Warning] to submit a report on its own progress in developing a practice of program review that is used to inform institutional decision making and resource distribution, and that leads to institutional improvement, as well as participate in the resolution of community college system-wide issues.”

2. ACCJC 11/04 “Visiting Team Report on the Reorganization of the University of Hawaii Community Colleges”. This report is critical reading. All of the five recommendations, on which the seven UHCCs and the UH System must report to ACCJC by 4/1/05 through Progress Reports, are based on and made in this visiting team report. More importantly, the findings, conclusions, concerns, and issues which gave rise to the five recommendations are articulated in this report.

Responding to ACCJC by 4/1/05

The UHCC Chancellors and applicable UH System administrators/staff will be meeting next week (and possibly in subsequent meetings) to discuss the accreditation recommendations, the relevant issues and timelines, and the procedures and process to best and efficiently address and respond to the five “University of Hawai‘i System Recommendations.”

The last four of the five recommendations may require uniform System-wide responses. The first recommendation--relating in essence to program reviews and regular assessment of institutional effectiveness--may require both a System response and individual campus updates.

I (or a designee) will communicate again on this matter with the campus community.

However, in the meantime and because of the tight timeline for the LCC Progress Report--assuming that the President’s Office and/or the BOR will need to review the various campus Progress Reports in advance of the 4/1/05 submission deadline and also assuming a review on campus by the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council--I am asking Chief Academic Officer/Vice Chancellor Dr. Peter Quigley to confer with the applicable faculty and staff involved with program review and assessment of institutional effectiveness (the first of the five recommendations enumerated in our action letter), including with our Accreditation Liaison Officers. The purpose is to determine and quickly initiate the best process for the College to expeditiously compile and draft an update on the College’s progress, since our 9/9/04 Progress Report, in the areas of program review, institutional assessment, and planning/improvement processes.
Through this e-mail, I am also alerting the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council of the possible need for a special meeting in the next few weeks to review a draft of LCC’s Progress Report prior to its submission to the UH President’s Office for any required BOR review at its March 17-18, 2005 meeting. As you may know, agenda items for BOR action are usually required to be submitted to the President’s Office about a month prior to the actual BOR meeting date.

Please stay tuned for further developments, and thank you in advance for your assistance. As I have said before, accreditation and institutional improvement and quality are college-wide responsibilities. We must all share in this responsibility for the good of our students and the communities we serve.

Mark Silliman
Chancellor
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BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY  
CHAPTER 5  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Section 5-1 Instructional and Research Programs

b. Review of Established Programs.

(1) All established programs at UH-Mānoa, UH-Hilo, and UH-West Oahu shall receive an in-depth review every seventh year unless otherwise stipulated by the Board. Established programs at the Community Colleges shall be reviewed on a five-year cycle unless otherwise stipulated by the Board. Should it be determined, in consultation with the Board, that a program had undergone significant changes since its establishment, a shorter review cycle may be invoked. In such cases, the program shall be subject to an in-depth review. Each campus shall develop its own five or seven-year program review schedule and submit an updated version annually to the Office of the President.

The reviews required by these schedules shall be submitted annually to the Office of the President as they are completed, but in no case later than December 31 in the year following the academic year in which they are scheduled. The in-depth program reviews shall be submitted in the prescribed program evaluation format.

(2) Reviews of particular programs may be undertaken at any time as deemed necessary by the faculty, administration, or Board. The President may authorize Chancellors to approve a program stop-out (a halt to new admissions to the program) for not more than two years in conjunction with a special study. An admission stop-out in excess of two years requires the President’s approval. The Board shall be provided a report on all programs stopped-out.

(3) Provisional and established programs deemed out-of-date or non-productive may be terminated by the President in consultation with the Board, following a stop-out of the program by the administration. Commitments to students already officially enrolled in such programs shall be met but no new program admissions shall take place. (Feb. 8, 1973; March 18, 1983; Nov. 22, 1991; am: Oct. 18, 2002)
I. INTRODUCTION

This Executive Policy directs implementation of Sections 5-1a(3) and 5-2a of the Board of Regents Bylaws and Policies. The following objectives, policies, and guidelines provide for the systematic monitoring, review, and evaluation of established academic programs at the University of Hawai‘i. The Vice President for Academic Affairs at Manna and Chancellors are called upon to develop implementing procedures and schedules as appropriate for their campuses.

II. OBJECTIVES

The Objectives of this executive policy are:

1. To provide for a periodic examination by faculty and administration of the extent to which established academic programs are meeting their stated objectives and the extent to which these program Objectives are still appropriate to the campus, Unit and University missions.

2. To specify the unit of analysis for the review of established programs.

3. To establish guidelines and procedures for the preparation and processing of reviews of established programs.

4. To assure the administration and Board of Regents that appropriate follow-up activities are undertaken in response to concerns addressed by the review.

III. POLICIES

1. Definition of established program. For the purposes of program review, an established program is any one or set of degree/certification programs and/or areas of instruction that are judged by the campus to be sufficiently interrelated in objectives, clients served, resources used, or other components to justify a common identification for purposes of evaluation. (Appendix A suggests guidelines for identifying appropriate groupings for review.)
2. Review requirement and schedules. All degree/certificate programs that have been approved by the Board of Regents as Continuing programs and all instructional areas that utilize substantial University resources are subject to review at least once every five years on a schedule to be developed by the campus and submitted by either the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or Chancellors to the Office of the President. Completed reviews will be kept on file in the offices of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or Chancellors, and shall be available upon request by the President or other universitywide offices.

3. Content and method of review. The review of established programs begins with a self-study. A quantitative profile of program activity and resource indicators is prepared centrally and transmitted to the responsible program personnel for analysis and inclusion in the review document (see Appendix B). The program submits a review document including at least the following information. Appendix C details specific guidelines to consider in the program evaluation.

a. A statement of the program objectives. Where appropriate this should be taken from the program proposal on which establishment of the program was based.

b. An assessment of whether or not the program is meeting its objectives and a summary of the evidence used to reach this conclusion. Where appropriate, this should include evidence related to continuing need for the program and, in the case of graduate programs, should specifically address the criteria for evaluation of graduate programs provided in Board policy. (Appendix C includes these criteria.)

c. A discussion of unusual features or trends in the quantitative program profile, if any.

d. An identification of any present or potential problems that the program personnel believe warrant attention and a plan for addressing those problems that falls within the program's jurisdiction.

Each Unit establishes its own internal procedures for carrying out the self-study (method, participants, etc.) and for any review requirements beyond those specified above. Appropriate faculty and student input must be assured.

In reviewing established programs, maximum use is made of self-study materials prepared in conjunction with accreditation requirements. Review schedules are prepared accordingly. A self-study completed as part of an accreditation review or external program approval process may be submitted in lieu of the
report required above (e.g., professional school accreditation self-studies or self-studies completed by the College of Education, UHM, in conjunction with state approval of teacher education programs). Such reports should be supplemented by the information specified above (a-d) where this is not included in the self-study.

4. **Review follow-up.** If the basic review required above indicates a need for a more thorough examination of specific issues or problems, the appropriate administrative office, as identified in the Unit procedures, directs follow-up activities or further study as necessary. When completes this follow-up includes recommendations for addressing the problems identified in the program review process and is shared as appropriate with affected parties.

5. **Processing of reviews.** Each Unit establishes its own internal procedures for conducting, processing and transmitting reviews of established programs to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or Chancellors' offices. Completed program reviews, including quantitative program profiles as outlined in Appendix B, are retained by Chancellors and the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa. These offices are responsible for providing feedback to the programs under review on key issues raised during the review process. By July 30 of each year the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa and Chancellors report to the President on program reviews completed during the previous year (7/1-6/30). This report includes a summary list of the reviews completed and attaches a brief (one page) report on each review (see Appendix D). This report summarizes the major conclusions and recommendations of the program review and indicates the actions taken or planned to address significant problems, if any.

6. **Special reviews.** A special review of a program may be undertaken at any time as deemed necessary by the faculty or administration. The Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or a Chancellor may, if he determines it appropriate, stop-out the admission of new students to a program undergoing a special review for a period of not more than two years. A stop-out in excess of two years requires the recommendation of the President for Board approval. Such a program shall be identified as "stopped-out" with an appropriate explanation in reports, publications, and the like. Students already admitted to a program at the time of the stop-out shall be permitted to complete their studies.

Prior to the effective date of a program stop-out, the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or the Chancellor provides an information item to the President including:
EXECUTIVE MEMORANDUM NO. 99-02

TO:       Senior Vice President and Executive Vice Chancellor
          Senior Vice Presidents and Chancellors
          Senior Vice Presidents
          Vice Presidents
          Chancellor
          Secretary of the Board of Regents
          State Director for Vocational Education

SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE POLICY E5.210, INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE

The University has completed a review and update of Executive Policy E5.210. This review was undertaken to ensure that this policy is current with the accountability and benchmarks requirements of the UH Strategic Plan and Acts 161 and 115. Revisions include the following:

a. Retitling E5.210 from Educational Assessment to Institutional Accountability and Performance. This clarifies that the overall commitment is to institutional accountability consistent with established mission, goals, and objectives. While always intended by the policy, the updated language emphasizes performance and outcomes across the full spectrum of University activities;

b. Adding language that clarifies that performance assessments and reporting are incorporated across a wide spectrum of activities, including academic strategic planning, program review/evaluation, accreditation, and tuition setting;

c. Adding language that incorporates the statutory benchmarks/performance indicators requirement; and

d. Making a variety of technical, consolidation, and editorial updates.

I am hereby officially promulgating Executive Policy E5.210. Please distribute this policy to appropriate offices and organizations and take actions required to carry out its intent and purpose.

Kenneth P. Mortimer
President, University of Hawai‘i, and
Chancellor, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

Enclosure
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E5.210 Institutional Accountability and Performance

I. INTRODUCTION

Assessment and accountability are central to the University of Hawai‘i’s agenda and shared responsibilities of system/campus administrators and the faculty. The University seeks to gather and produce evidence, from a variety of sources, about the University’s effectiveness in meeting its mission and Strategic Plan goals and objectives. Benchmarks and performance indicators and a variety of assessment activities are vehicles for quality improvement and accountability. They can serve as catalysts for change and as instruments for institutional self-reflection and planning. These activities are not ends but rather means to achieving learning outcomes, discovering new knowledge, and to serving the community.

This policy provides for the regular and systematic assessment of programs, campuses, and the University of Hawai‘i System as a whole. The University has purposely decentralized assessment activities, while maintaining an overall policy framework appropriate for a heterogeneous statewide public higher education system. The fact that different University campuses, colleges, departments, and programs pursue separate assessment agendas is consistent with this policy.

II. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this executive policy are:

A. To implement section 4-5 (Institutional Accountability and Performance) of the Board of Regents’ Bylaws and Policies.

B. To provide for the ongoing assessment by faculty, staff, and administrators of the degree to which mission and strategic plan goals and objectives are accomplished, and to review and clarify goals and objectives as appropriate.
C. To demonstrate how assessment outcomes are used to:
   1. Take regular readings on how well the University is doing;
   2. Guide educational decision-making, improve programs/services, further accountability, and demonstrate institutional quality and responsiveness;
   3. Justify policy, procedural, and organizational changes;
   4. Influence the delivery of student services; and
   5. Establish the information base needed to respond to accountability concerns.

D. To establish policy statements and guidelines for implementing assessment activities and integrating them into existing program review, accreditation, planning, budgeting, and tuition-setting processes.

E. To demonstrate the University’s continued commitment to public accountability and satisfy mandatory federal, state, and University reporting requirements.

III. POLICY STATEMENTS
A. The University of Hawai‘i will:
   1. Gather evidence about the degree to which the University of Hawai‘i is effectively accomplishing its mission and Strategic Plan goals/objectives, and use this information to guide decision-making and improve University programs and services.

   2. Integrate assessment activities into the institution’s ongoing planning, program review, accreditation, student services, administration, budgeting, tuition-setting, and other processes.

   3. Systematically aggregate information from a variety of sources into comprehensive and meaningful information about patterns of achievement.

   4. Give priority to the assessment of undergraduate education.

   5. Address public accountability concerns and strengthen the
interrelationships between K-12 and postsecondary education in the State.

B. The University of Hawai‘i’s assessment and accountability activities will:
   1. Focus on overall program and institutional effectiveness and not individual achievement.
   2. Span instructional, research, and service missions.
   3. Vary across program/units with differing missions, goals, and objectives.
   4. Be collaborative and involve appropriate faculty and staff input.
   5. Draw on existing data when possible.

IV. GUIDELINES
Assessment and accountability programs/activities are designed in accordance with the following guidelines

A. Assessment requires and takes place in the context of the mission, goal, and objective statements that established the program or activity. In the case of undergraduate instruction, student learning objectives describe the general skills and abilities students are expected to acquire. Assessment focuses on those outcomes deemed to be the most important.

B. Undergraduate education is a major element of the University’s mission and a shared responsibility among all campuses. Each campus gives high priority to the collection of information that includes:
   1. Descriptive profiles of entering students, including demographic data, prior academic achievement, results of placement testing in key basic skills, and student educational expectations.
   2. Student achievement in general education, including acquired proficiency in key competencies such as writing and computation skills.
   3. Student accomplishment in the major field of study.
4. Student satisfaction with educational programs and services.

5. Alumni demographic and employment data, including long-term satisfaction with educational programs and services.

C. The scholarly reputations of the UH-Manoa and UH-Hilo campuses are greatly enhanced by the accomplishments of their graduate and post-baccalaureate professional students. Therefore, the assessment of graduate and professional programs includes student profiles that address admission patterns, student achievement and satisfaction, and alumni accomplishments.

D. The University’s research function is strengthened by a clear understanding of its goals and accomplishments. Each campus, but especially UH M–noa, collects information relating to:

1. The effectiveness of organized research units in meeting their goals and objectives.
2. The role and accomplishments of instructional and service units in furthering the University’s overall research mission.

E. Public confidence and internal morale are enhanced by assessment of the University’s internal organization and administrative functions along the following lines:
1. Collective efforts that assess the effectiveness of academic program articulation and collect data on the long-term performance of students who transfer among campuses of the University system.
2. Campus assessment of the effectiveness of student service programs in supporting student educational goals.
3. Campus assessment of instructional support units.
4. Assessment of faculty and staff morale.
5. Assessment of the effectiveness of organizational structures and administrative procedures in supporting clear and timely decisionmaking.

F. Ongoing University assessment activities address the University’s
effectiveness in meeting state objectives and satisfying state needs. Examples include:

1. The University periodically ensures that campus role and mission responsibilities reflect state needs.

2. The Office of the Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate Division tracks, assesses, and reports on the level of research and training activity focused on state needs.

3. Each campus assesses the level of community service activity focused on state and local needs.

4. The Office of the Vice President for Planning and Policy coordinates the preparation of system-wide benchmark/performance indicators responsive to higher education needs of the state.

5. The Office of the Senior Vice President for Administration assesses the University’s stewardship of its resources, including real property, equipment, and personnel.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Leadership and Coordination

1. Overall policy direction is provided by the Board of Regents and the Office of the President.

2. System-wide coordination and reporting are the responsibility of the System Academic Affairs Council and the Office of the Vice President for Planning and Policy.

3. Campus/unit assessment implementation and reporting are the responsibility of the senior vice president/chancellors.

B. Reporting Accountability and Performance Information

1. The Senior Vice President/Executive Vice Chancellor for Ma‘noa, the Senior Vice Presidents/Chancellors for Hilo and the Community Colleges, and the Chancellor for West O‘ahu describe and update their Units’ assessment activities and outcomes as part of their Unit
Academic Plans (commonly referred to as strategic plans and required by Executive Policy E4.201). Campuses are encouraged to seek or reallocate appropriate resources in order to implement planned assessment activities in a timely fashion. The Senior Vice Presidents and Chancellors designate campus administrators who have responsibility for coordinating campus assessment activities. Additionally, they actively encourage professional development activities designed to acquaint faculty and staff with assessment approaches and increase their effectiveness in setting appropriate objectives, administering assessment activities, and analyzing and interpreting assessment information.

2. Each campus reports assessment information in accordance with the following guidelines:

   a. All reports give special attention to the difference that assessment activities make by describing impacts on: student learning, curriculum/program change, delivery of student services, research, service, policy, procedural and organizational change, planning and budgeting, accountability, information exchange, resource acquisition, and others.

   b. Assessment information collected by instructional departments and programs is reported as part of the program review process mandated by Executive Policy E5.202 (Review of Established Programs). Program and departmental information may also be reported for use in planning and budgeting. Programs and departments seeking specialized accreditation report assessment information as required by the accrediting body.

   c. Assessment/performance information is reported in accordance with the accreditation requirements of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Additionally, each campus incorporates applicable assessment information as a part of University planning and Level IV budgeting.

   d. Baccalaureate campuses are encouraged to report to the Office of the Senior Vice President/Chancellor for Community Colleges information on performance in upper
division course work of UH Community College transfer students.

e. Each University campus provides the Department of Education with data on the initial placement and first-year academic performance of recent public high school graduates in Hawai‘i.

f. Units prepare special reports on assessment and accountability as required.

g. Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS) 304.4-5 (Act 161) required the Board of Regents to adopt benchmarks tied to Master Plan goals (BOR action taken 09/13/96), to use these benchmarks in the development of budget and tuition schedules for the periodic review of programs, and to submit a report to the Legislature in the second year of each fiscal biennium. This reporting requirement is also cited in the preamble to Act 115 as an accountability measure important to greater University autonomy.

Therefore, the Office of the Vice President for Planning and Policy, with guidance from the System Academic Affairs Council, coordinates, consolidates, and prepares a system-wide benchmarks/performance indicators report in the second year of each fiscal biennium. The University reports on assessment results that demonstrate performance relative to strategic plan goals and provide evidence of the institution’s commitment to public accountability.
Presentation to the
Board of Regents

Program Review
March 17, 2005
UHCC System Program Review

- Letter from ACCJC January 31, 2005
  - The Commission is concerned that the UII Community Colleges continue to lack an integrated system-wide program review, assessment and improvement process that sets the expectation that campuses develop a culture and practice of assessment and that supports improvement in campus practice at the system decision-making level.
  
  - Furthermore, confusion continues about the respective roles of campus and system administrators in determining campus priorities, and this lack of distinction continues to challenge the ability of each college to meet accreditation standards.

- ACCJC found
  - Uneven progress in developing program review policies and practices among the campuses
  - Inconsistent use of data across campuses
  - Uneven support among campus constituencies for program review
  - Unclear links between program reviews and budget requests and allocation decisions at the campus and system level
UHCC System Program Review

- Fundamental system question from ACCJC is
  
  "How can the system make rational planning and allocation decisions if the assessment information coming from the colleges is so inconsistent?"

- It is important to note that the question is a system question. Even campuses with acceptable program reviews in place were put on warning.

---

UHCC System Program Review

- CC Chancellors met to develop and agree on common principles that, when fully implemented,
  
  - Meet UH BOR and Executive Policy requirements on program review
  - Address ACCJC concerns
  - Provide system consistency but also enough local control to make reviews meaningful at the campus level
UHCC System Program Review

Principle 1

Each instructional and non-instructional program should undergo a comprehensive review at least once every five years.

A Major Effort at Each Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Program Classification</th>
<th>Number of Reviews by Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes ETC
## Planned Review Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Academic Year</th>
<th>HAW</th>
<th>HON</th>
<th>KAP</th>
<th>KAU</th>
<th>LEE</th>
<th>MAU</th>
<th>WIN*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## UHCC System Program Review

### Principle 2

Program reviews shall result in improvement plans that are linked to the campus strategic plan.
UHCC System Program Review

- Program review analysis should lead to action plans
- Where appropriate, strategic plan goals should be reflected in program plans and program review
- Progress toward achieving planned results should be part of program review

UHCC System Program Review

**Principle 3**

There shall be an annual report of program data which is analyzed, reviewed, and, where appropriate, reflected in updated action plans.
UHCC System Program Review

- Annual analysis is required by Perkins for technical programs; also good business practice
- Annual review should focus on progress toward planned improvements
- Annual review should consider unexpected changes in the program measures or in events external to the program
- Annual review should focus on updates or modifications of the agreed upon plans

UHCC System Program Review

Principle 4

There shall be an overarching commitment to continuous quality improvement.
UHCC System Program Review

- Program review should be evidence driven
- Evidence is benchmarked against
  - Best practice
  - Desired goals and/or
  - Incremental change
- Achieving standards “raises the bar”

UHCC System Program Review

**Principle 5**

The program review process shall be collegial.
UHCC System Program Review

- Program faculty and staff are involved in establishing the measures, analyzing the evidence, and developing the improvement plans.
- The broader college community acts as quality control to ensure analysis and plans are well done, to ensure alignment with college-wide strategic goals and directions and to examine areas of overlap or consequence for other programs.
- Exact process and structure will vary by local college governance.
- Faculty must provide leadership and commitment to a culture of evidence.

UHCC System Program Review

**Principle 6**

Program review information shall be publicly available.
UHCC System Program Review

- Program reviews and related action plans should be published through the campus intra-net
- BOR should be informed of significant actions taken as a result of program reviews

UHCC System Program Review

Principle 7

Comparable measures shall be used consistently across campuses.
UHCC System Program Review

- Common system definition and language
- Creation of additional measures to complement “standard” measures
- Selected system-based benchmarks
- Creation of “tools” that reflect the measures and make data retrieval easy
- Continuous quality improvement applied to measures and outcomes

UHCC System Program Review

**Principle 8**

Program reviews and resulting plans for improvement shall be used in decisions regarding resource allocation at the campus and system level
UHCC System Program Review

- College budget requests should be based on program review and plans
- Internal college reallocations should be based on program review and plans
- Internal program budget expenditures should reflect program review and plans

UHCC System Program Review

- The same consideration applies to other decisions such as the development of policies, curriculum actions, and changes in practice.
- The same consideration applies to other resources in addition to money - time, attention, communication
UHCC System Program Review

Possible BOR/UH System Related Actions

- Review of BOR policy, E5.202, and E5.210 to bring into alignment with ACCJC standards
- Discussion of how colleges and BOR engages in a discussion of program review related actions
Leeward CC Revised Program Review Model

Leeward Community College has as its motto “to help people learn.” In that spirit the College takes action to become a meaningful learning community that honors an open exchange and energetic, unhampered pursuit of ideas, collaboration and discovery, diversity, and student success. This vision will be insured through quality programs and excellent teaching. Our programs and teaching must also be shaped by a commitment to enhancing the greater good and, as a result, community and service are also highly valued. Through assessment and continuous improvement, the program review process is designed to inspire a culture of evidence to ensure excellent educational programs that address student and community needs.

Defining Programs
The first challenge for the Leeward team was to define “program.” Initially we knew we wanted to bring assessment together with IR data sets in order to have a campus report. At this time we, however, called assessment “program review.” Since then we have realized that our assessment process is just one part of a larger program review activity.

We were most interested in how our efforts culminated and influenced the whole student. Therefore, we have spent most of our initial energy on defining programs as instructional degrees and certificates. These degrees are our primary reason for being and the largest kind of activity we have on campus. In total, we identified these major program areas:

Associate in Arts Degree (A.A.)

Associate in Science Degree (A.S.)
  Accounting
  Business Technology
  Digital Media
  Information and Computer Science
  Television Production

Associate in Applied Science Degree (A.A.S.)
  Automotive Technology
  Food Service
  Management/Supervisory Management

When focusing on our degree programs we wanted to answer the question “Is Leeward preparing students for academic success, for community involvement, and for workplace preparation?” We wanted to know what kind of student we were graduating and how successful and prepared she was going to be in the transfer market, the workplace and the community. Instead of a series of silo accounts and reviews, we were determined to see the total impact of our academic mission on the student.
**AA Degree Program**
To accomplish this, we mapped out the following scheme for academic measurement. We launched a set of activities that measure selected AA Degree General Education SLOs for Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, Abstract Thinking and Written Communication across a range of disciplines. Therefore, the College assesses the academic terrain in depth and in breadth:

![Diagram of Individual Course Assessments](image)

Although assessment of Oral Communication and Information Retrieval focused on one course each in the initial assessment cycle, plans include expansion over the disciplines in the future.

**AS and AAS Degrees**
AS and AAS Degree Programs have measured outcomes in areas of competency. As assessment continues, we will look at ways to evaluate these program SLOs in a similar method as those of the AA Gen Ed outcomes.

**AA, AS, and AAS Degrees**
The approach to program assessment for the AA, AS and AAS degrees includes an incremental, rotating cycle of SLO assessment, as indicated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO #1</td>
<td>SLO #1</td>
<td>SLO #3</td>
<td>SLO #5</td>
<td>SLO #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #2</td>
<td>SLO #2</td>
<td>SLO #4</td>
<td>SLO #6</td>
<td>SLO #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #3</td>
<td>SLO #3</td>
<td>SLO #5</td>
<td>SLO #7</td>
<td>SLO #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #4</td>
<td>SLO #4</td>
<td>SLO #6</td>
<td>SLO #8</td>
<td>SLO #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #5</td>
<td>SLO #5</td>
<td>SLO #7</td>
<td>SLO #1</td>
<td>SLO #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #6</td>
<td>SLO #6</td>
<td>SLO #8</td>
<td>SLO #2</td>
<td>SLO #7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Incremental Assessments of instructional program SLOs (note: number of SLOs vary by degree program or AA Gen Ed Outcome)*
Course Assessment
In addition to program SLO assessment, we are also measuring outcomes for specific courses on a rotating cycle. Instructional divisions have planned to measure approximately 17% of the courses in their area per year; therefore, in 6 years all courses will have been assessed.

Continuing Education and Workforce Development
Following our definition of “program,” the activities in the Continuing Education and Workforce Development area will also be considered a program. Assessment and review will follow the same report structure and timelines of the revised Program Review, but will have a different set of outcome measures.

PROGRAM REVIEW
In addition to assessing academic performance, our review of the degree programs includes an assessment of trends in academic fields, facilities adequacies, community issues, transfer rates of our students, student needs assessment, staffing levels, grants, professional development and other indicators that help give us the complete picture of the performance and the needs of our degree programs.

The areas of review are as follows:

- Program Overview: General Description and Mission
- Student Learning and Achievement: Program & Course SLOs Assessment; Demographics; Student Needs; Enrollment Data; Transfer Numbers and Efficiency; GPA, Course & Program Completion; Retention & Persistence Rates
- Faculty and Staff: Response to Mission, Professional Development
- Curriculum: Innovations, Challenges, Issues, Trends
- Support: Technology, Library & Learning Resources, Facilities, Marketing, Equipment, Other Resources (Academic Support, Administrative Services, Student Services, Chancellor’s Office)
- External: Advisory Boards, Community Input, Job Outlooks, National Standards, Specialized Accreditation
- Summary
- Action Plan

It is important to note that the Program Review process forces the integration of instructional issues with the other planning areas as well as the budget. The Program Review of the degree/certificate programs drives all of the other reviews, studies and action plans on campus so it is launched first in the cycle.
**PROGRAM REVIEW**

**AA, AS, AAS Degrees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Overview and Achievement</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Response to Mission</td>
<td>Innovations</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Advisory Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Library &amp; Learning Resources</td>
<td>Community Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Job Outlooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Needs</td>
<td>Trends</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>National Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Specialized Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Numbers &amp; Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA, Course &amp; Program Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Persistence Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support Area Reviews

- Student Services Area Review
- Academic Support Area Review
- Admin Services Area Review
- Chancellor's Office Area Review
- Technology & Info & Learning Resources Committee

**ANALYSIS**

Annual Review of Strategic Plan

**ACTION PLANS**

Prioritization and Budget Implications

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

---

**Schedule**

The timeline for Program Reviews are as follows:

- Program SLOs for all degrees will occur every year in an incremental manner
- Course assessments will occur on a rotating basis involving 17% of the curriculum per year
- Support Area Reviews will occur annually
- Comprehensive Program Reviews will occur every 4 years to match up with budget cycles (every other biennium)

**Teams**

The team effort to produce Program Review is as follows:

- Course Assessments: Division Chairs (to DPPA/IR)
- General Education SLOs: Faculty Senate Program Review Committee Chairs (to DPPA/IR)
- Program Review: Division Chairs, IR/DPPA, CAO, Chancellor

**Revised Program Review Model insures:**

- linkages between reports, budgets and planning
- smooth and clear pathways for data collection
- dynamic triangulation between assessment data and other contextual data
- democratic integrity for interpretation and authoring
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Assessment Analysis Report: Introduction

Because **student learning** is central to our purpose at Leeward Community College, our focus on institutional improvement must include dialogue and activities about learning theory, assessment, evaluation, and planning, as well as their integration with resource distribution. LCC’s **Program Review** brings together all of these elements and is based on information about who our students are, their goals and needs, and how our programs fulfill these needs.

As a College, we have determined that Program Review, set on a 5-year cycle, will focus on AA, AS, and AAS degree competencies, with initial measures focusing on the General Education Core student learning outcomes (slo’s). Simultaneously, support areas like Administration, Administrative Services, Academic Services, and Student Services have completed internal assessments of their units in an effort to determine changes needed to support student learning.

The assessment report that follows presents the initial findings in the AA General Education Core areas of Information Retrieval and Technology, Abstract Reasoning, Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, Written Communication, and Quantitative Reasoning. Also included are assessments of the AS and AAS degrees in Accounting, Automotive Technology, Business Technology, and Digital Media. Some of the assessments, like those in Quantitative Reasoning and Oral Communication, focus on courses within a discipline or division; others have a broader, across-the-curriculum span. Some rely on a single test, while
others consider essays or research projects in their assessments. Whatever their form, these assessments have helped us see what our students have learned and what changes are needed.

The assessment efforts up to this point are far from perfect, but they are a first step. We now need to take our efforts across the curriculum, assessing student learning outcomes across divisions and disciplines rather than just within them. Membership of the assessment groups must also be expanded to include a wider cross-section of disciplines that contribute to these learning outcomes, a task that is facilitated by curriculum grids like the one introduced at convocation.

Our assessment of student learning should be a continuous, cyclical process of finding out what our students are learning, what changes can be made to improve that learning, and what the effects of these changes are on their learning. The extent to which we engage in these efforts speaks to our integrity and our commitment to our mission.

The Program Review process is the vehicle by which we hope to make improvements in student learning. Our assessment results will lead to the creation of actions that feed into the Strategic Plan and will provide the basis for our budget. The process will translate intention into action. When all of the pieces come together, we will have completed a full cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement, and the College will have evidence of organizing its processes and structures and directing its resources toward the achievement of student learning.
We hope that this document will initiate a campus-wide dialog concerning our progress in assessing the impact of our efforts toward producing learning and in designing steps that can be taken to improve that learning. A number of actions have been proposed and will form the basis of action plans that will be incorporated within the Strategic Plan when it is revisited and revised during February and March. Your input is needed to prioritize these actions and to direct the allocation of funds for the next year.
Assessment Activities: Associate in Arts (AA) Degree

The Information Retrieval and Technology (IRT) Assessment Group focused on two student learning outcomes in their initial assessment: 1) demonstrate knowledge of vocabulary, concepts, and operations of information retrieval and technology, and 2) access and retrieve information through print and electronic media, evaluating the accuracy and authenticity of that information. The Library Skills Modules, including Basic Library Skills, Searching for Books, Searching for Periodicals, and Searching the Internet, were the basis for the assessment of these student learning outcomes. The focus group, English 100 students, produced good results; however, the IRT Assessment Group has determined that English 100 students are an inappropriate test group because these students are not near the conclusion of their LCC experience. The IRT Group also believes that the student learning outcomes and title of this core requirement need to be changed to reflect competence in information literacy and technology.

The action plans for the group are as follows: a) broaden participation in the IRT Group to include faculty and staff across the curriculum whose students must retrieve, assess, and use information through technology; b) revise the title and student learning outcomes to reflect the broadened scope; and c) develop an appropriate assessment by May 15, 2005.
The Abstract Reasoning (AR) Group assessed two student learning outcomes (slo’s) in their initial study: 1) recognize the possibility of more than one solution to a problem with no single “right” answer, and 2) demonstrate the ability to evaluate and engage in interpretation. A group of faculty from Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences, including those from sociology, psychology, philosophy, and literature devised an assessment tool, a 10-item multiple-choice test administered to Philosophy 100 and English Literature 200-level students. The test was not part of the course requirement. Test results included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 students</td>
<td>Philosophy 100</td>
<td>Median score of 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 students</td>
<td>English Literature 200-level</td>
<td>Median score of 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AR Group pointed out that the median score of the 200-level students was 20% higher than for the 100-level students. However, no attempt was made to seriously analyze the data, and the validity of the assessment tool has not been determined. The Group offers the following observations: 1) the AR student learning outcomes can only be meaningfully measured within courses, not as a program; 2) entry and exit tests would be one way to assess effectiveness at the program level, but are not economically feasible; 3) as slo’s for Critical Thinking are similar to Abstract Reasoning, perhaps a single assessment vehicle could be used for both. No specific action plans were submitted by the AR Group.
The Critical Thinking (CT) Assessment Group studied the following three student learning outcomes: 1) identify and state problems, issues, arguments, and questions contained in a body of information; 2) identify and analyze assumptions and underlying points of view relating to an issue or problem; and 3) recognize and understand multiple modes of inquiry, including investigative methods based on observation and analysis. Faculty members in History 152 and English 250 collected student writings that received a grade of C or better and addressed the three slo's. A total of 26 classes, each with approximately 25 students per class, was assessed by the faculty member who taught the course. The results are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome assessed</th>
<th>Level of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identify and state problems, issues, arguments, and questions contained in a body of information</td>
<td>80% of the papers assessed were judged as acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify and analyze assumptions and underlying points of view relating to an issue or problem</td>
<td>70% of the papers assessed were judged as acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize and understand multiple modes of inquiry, including investigative methods based on observation and analysis</td>
<td>65% of the papers assessed were judged as acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CT Group will share their rubric with the Assessment Team and are encouraged to establish inter-reader reliability before the next set of assessments is done. In addition, faculty members involved in the study would benefit by having at least one other instructor (besides the teacher of the class)
assess their papers for the student learning outcomes listed above. The plan of action for the Group has not yet been established.

The **Oral Communication Assessment** Group focused on two student learning outcomes for their initial assessment: 1) identify and analyze the audience and purpose of any intended communication; and 2) gather, evaluate, select, and organize information for the communication. Assessments focused on informative and persuasive speech outlines collected from Speech 251 students.

For slo 1, the results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student has identified the purpose of the intended communication</th>
<th>88%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student has identified the audience of the intended communication</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For slo 2, the assessment results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student has gathered, evaluated, and selected appropriate information for the communication</th>
<th>96%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student has appropriately organized the information for the communication</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Oral Communication Committee will take the following actions:

- Develop a common audience analysis form for public speaking assignments to ensure identification and analysis of intended listening audience
- Require identification of speech’s purpose for all public speaking outlines
To expand assessment of oral communication across the curriculum, the group will also engage in the following:

- Identify 1 or 2 courses that have an oral communication component and work with the instructors to determine if field-testing the rubric is appropriate and/or feasible.
- Create rubrics for the remaining slo's.
- Evaluate the oral communication general education student learning outcomes to determine if revisions are needed.
- Once LCC curriculum grid is constructed, designed rubrics can be used across the curriculum in courses that require an oral communication component. Assigned time may be needed for this effort.

The **Written Communication Assessment Group** studied the following three student learning outcomes in their initial assessment: 1) express a main idea as a thesis, hypothesis, or other appropriate statement; 2) develop a main idea clearly and concisely with appropriate content; 3) demonstrate mastery of conventions of writing, including grammar, spelling, and mechanics. A total of 119 papers from 12 different WI and non-WI classes, representing 5 divisions, were assessed by 24 faculty members working in pairs. Each paper was evaluated with a rubric adapted from two previous assessment projects and produced the following results:

Overall 65% of all papers (based on averages from specific courses/disciplines) were deemed acceptable compared to an expectation of 70%. More specifically,

- Express a thesis, hypothesis, or main idea – actual level of performance was 70%
- Develop a main idea clearly and concisely with appropriate content - actual level of performance was 64%
- Demonstrate mastery of conventions of writing, including grammar, spelling and mechanics – actual level of performance was 71%
• Overall – 65% of all samples were rated as acceptable compared to the expectation of 70%

The sample of papers was mixed, ranging from papers required in WI courses, to optional assignments in non-WI courses. Some of the papers were from courses having no English writing requirement as a prerequisite.

The WI Assessment Group plans to refine the sample selection by standardizing the types of papers to be collected, as well as categorizing “capstone” and “non-capstone” classes. To improve the method of collection of papers, the group will institute submission of papers as a requirement for WI courses, as well as provide incentives for submissions from non-WI courses. Because of the amount of work required, the group believes that it is imperative that the following resources be provided for this project: compensation for the coordinator of the assessment project; clerical help for the reporting of findings; and duplication costs for the writing samples and reports.

Assessment of **Quantitative Reasoning** was initially limited to courses in the Math and Sciences (MS) Division, including science lab courses, since at least one lab course is required to earn an AA degree. The remainder of MS courses studied were selected from those most frequently taken by AA degree graduates. Once LCC has created its curriculum grid, courses across the curriculum that emphasize quantitative reasoning can use the rubrics designed for the MS assessments. The student learning outcomes assessed were as follows:

1. Apply numeric, graphic, and symbolic skills and other forms of quantitative reasoning accurately and appropriately (Neupane, Stanton, Reese/Matsuoka, Lane, Thompson, Connell)
2. Demonstrate mastery of mathematical concepts, skills, and applications, using technology when appropriate (Reese/Matsuoka, Lane, Thompson, Connell)

3. Communicate clearly and concisely the methods and results of quantitative problem solving (Stanton, Millen, Thompson, Connell)

4. Formulate and test hypotheses using numerical experimentation (Neupane, Stanton, Millen)

5. Define quantitative issues and problems, gather relevant information, analyze that information, and present results (Stanton, Millen)

6. Assess the validity of statistical conclusions (Reese/Matsuoka)

Assessments included eight different projects that focused on students’ research papers, science and lab reports, and completion of selected exercises and problems. The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bio 101 (Neupane)</td>
<td>Research Paper: 30 of 36 students submitted research paper; 70% received “C” or better (counts for 5% of grade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio 200 (Stanton)</td>
<td>Science Report: unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 161B (Reese/Matsumoto)</td>
<td>Lab Reports: 83% of lab reports demonstrated mastery of all identified outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG 101L (Lane)</td>
<td>Selected Exercises: 6 out of 10 students scored 75% or better on rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hort 198 (Millen)</td>
<td>58% of students scored 70% or better on report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 103 (Thompson)</td>
<td>Selected Problems: 75% of students performed at 70% accuracy or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zool 200 (Stanton)</td>
<td>82% exceeded 70% level of competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zool 241 (Connell)</td>
<td>Science Report: 96% (25 of 26 students) responded correctly to at least 70% of the problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro 140 (Ito)</td>
<td>Research Project: 93% of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
demonstrated understanding of research projects presented; Culture Identification: 100% of students correctly identified the culture after 1-2 attempts

Action plans resulting from the assessments include the following:

- Increasing the weight of the research paper in the overall course grade to encourage their completion
- Increasing frequency of testing to ensure student mastery of course content
- Clarifying questions/directions in lab reports
- Adding a writing pre-requisite to course
- Requiring completion of rough drafts to be shared with instructor (to ensure revision)
- Individualizing instruction
- Offering more computer hardware (only one computer is set up in the classroom) to facilitate graphing
- Simplifying format for assessment of oral report and offering students points for completion of assessments

Assessment Activities: Associate in Science (AS) and Associate in Applied Science (AAS) Degrees

The Accounting Group focused on four student learning outcomes in their assessment of the Accounting AAS (slo’s 1, 2) and Accounting Certificate of Achievement (slo’s 3, 4): 1) analyze and compare financial statements, 2) solve accounting problems using an electronic spreadsheet, 3) demonstrate understanding of accounting terminology, and 4) complete payroll accounting process and prepare Hawaii General Excise tax returns. Assessments for the Accounting Program included rubric scoring of ACC 155 (capstone course) students’ financial statement analysis project for slo 1 and 2 above. Assessment of slo 3 was through specific questions in the final exams of ACC 124 and ACC
201 (including DE sections), and slo 4 was assessed through rubric scoring of ACC 132 students’ Hawaii General Excise Tax project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO/Course</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO #1/ACC 155</td>
<td>Rubric scoring of financial statement project</td>
<td>Average score 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #2/ACC 155</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Average score 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #3/ACC 124 and 201</td>
<td>Questions on final exam</td>
<td>Each question answered correctly by 72% of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO #5/ACC 132</td>
<td>Hawaii General Excise Tax project</td>
<td>Average score 81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following actions will be taken as a result of the assessments:

- After consulting with advisory board and systemwide accounting discipline, faculty members felt expectations for financial statement analysis project were too high. Faculty will refocus on calculating ratios and interpreting trends for the next few years.
- Additional time will be spent on ACC 155 reinforcing financial statement analysis concepts.
- Rubric for slo 2, ACC 155, may need a narrower focus.
- Assessment for slo 3 will be changed to include broader questions for assessing ACC 125 and ACC 202.
- Increase faculty awareness (especially lecturers) on important accounting concepts
- Request accounting tutors; continue or increase supplementary instruction leaders
- For ACC 132, change outcome measure to payroll project; create a rubric for assessment.

The **Automotive Technology** (AT) Group has been focusing on NATEF re-certification, and the results can be used for student learning outcomes assessment. The group will be working on the design of student learning outcomes to address item 8 of the AAS competencies (demonstrate competence in selected program/plan of study to achieve entry-level employment).
Current AT assessments focus on the eight ASE certification tests taken by students. The ASE test is given twice a year, and students are encouraged to take them immediately after specific modules are completed. However, because they do not have the money or are unsure of their goals, students often postponed test taking until completion of the Automotive Program. Despite this fact, LCC students met the national standard of 50% passing the ASE tests; however, this is an unusually high number.

AT faculty believe that better writing, math, and study skills will improve student success in the program. Therefore, the action plans designed by the AT Group include the following:

- Establish math and English as pre-requisites to be completed before entrance into the AT program
- Develop slo’s to address AAS competency #8 and design assessments to measure them.

The Business Technology (BT) Assessment Group focused on four student learning outcomes in their initial study: 1) BUS 127: Students will key at 30 words per minute on a five-minute timing with no more than five errors or with no more than three errors, 2) BUS 155: Students will input numbers from a 10-key pad at a speed of 100 depressions per minute on a five-minute addition timing with no more than one error, 3) BUS 136: Students will create a spreadsheet containing formulas and answer a written question regarding the spreadsheet, and 4) BUS 259W: Students will write a paper and make an oral presentation of findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assessed</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business 127</td>
<td>Three best 5-minute timed writings: 30 wpm</td>
<td>100% reached criteria (7 out of 7 students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business 155</td>
<td>5-minute timed activity: 100 dpm</td>
<td>71% reached criteria (10 out of 14 students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business 136</td>
<td>Production test: creation of spreadsheet</td>
<td>70% reached criteria (7 out of 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business 259W</td>
<td>Paper and Oral Presentation</td>
<td>100% scored 70% or higher on evaluation rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these results, the Business Technology Program has come up with the following action plans:

- Offer more computer lab time and support staff at the LCC Waianae campus
- Faculty members will provide instruction in basic essay structure and grammar, sentence structure, and mechanics as needed.

The **Digital Media** Assessment Group assessed seven student learning outcomes in its initial effort: the student should be able to 1) work well with others as part of a team, 2) be receptive to suggestions from peers, 3) produce professional quality Digital Media Production projects, 4) produce professional, print-quality projects, 5) produce professional motion graphics quality projects, 6) produce professional quality digital video projects, and 7) produce professional web page design quality projects. To assess slo’s 1 and 2 above, DMED 293 (Practicum in Digital Media) students completed an internship, and as part of their evaluation, their direct supervisors ranked them from 1 to 4 on two questions: Does the student work well with others as part of a team? Is the student receptive to suggestions to peers? To assess slo’s 3 to 7, DMED 113 (Desktop Publishing), DMED 121 (NetPrep Web Site Design), DMED 131
(Introduction to Digital Video), DMED 200 (Electronic Portfolio), and DMED 240 (Advance Motion Graphics) students submitted projects to the Digital Art Showcase event during Spring semester for evaluation by the local industry Digital Media leaders. The following results were reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO/Course</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3-7/DMED 113</td>
<td>Desktop publishing rubric</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3-7/DMED 121</td>
<td>NetPrep Web Site Design rubric</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3-7/DMED 131</td>
<td>Digital video rubric</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3-7/DMED 200</td>
<td>Electronic portfolio rubric</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3-7/DMED 240</td>
<td>Advanced motion graphics rubric</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SLO 1, 3/DMED 293      | Supervisor evaluation                       | 93% got 3-4 on 4-point scale for slo #1  
96% got 3-4 on a 4-pt scale for slo #2 |

The action plans needed are as follows:

- Continue DMED 293 assessments by internship supervisors to obtain appropriate measures of student ability to work on a team and their receptiveness to peer suggestions. All of the slo’s for the A.S. degree will be added to the supervisor evaluation tool.
- In March 2005, the Advisory Board Committee will review the slo’s for the A.S. degree in Digital Media.
- The Digital Art Showcase event held each Spring semester is a huge undertaking, requiring coordination and communication with DM industry leaders. Assigned time is needed for a faculty member to coordinate the planning and production of the event.
- The collection of forms from industry digital media leaders must be facilitated.
The LCC Administration’s first attempt at a “support area review” for AY 2003-2004 consisted of the elements listed below. Each element was required by the Chancellor of each of the seven Deans and Directors, as well as of himself.

1. Each Dean and Director completed a mission statement for his/her position or office, except for Arts and Sciences and Career and Technical Education, which underwent changes/resignations and vacancies in their administrative heads. A mission statement will also be developed by our new Chief Academic Officer/Vice Chancellor. An overall mission statement was completed by the Chancellor for the Administrative team as a whole.

2. Each Dean, Director, and the Chancellor established goals, during Summer 2003, for AY 2003-2004. For each goal, the format required a “measurement method” and “sequential activities” to achieve the goal.

3. Each Dean, Director, and the Chancellor completed an annual Performance Self Evaluation by Summer 2004. As prescribed by the Chancellor, the Self Evaluation required responses to the following items:
   - Evaluation of program operations for 2003-2004, including identification and summary discussion of high success areas and areas needing further improvement.
   - Delineation of strengths and areas needing improvement, with plans to address those challenges.

4. All LCC administrators, during Spring 2004, participated in the UH System’s 360° Performance Assessment of Executive/Managerial Personnel.

Although BOR policy (Chapter 9-14) requires Executive/Managerial (E/M) personnel to be evaluated annually between March and June, the 360° Performance Assessment, administered by the UH System Human Resources Office, is optional for those offices/campuses that choose to utilize this evaluation. The most recent memo from the UH President on this matter, dated 1/14/05, states that the 360° assessment “provides an opportunity to comment and provide input on the performance of E/M employees. …The 360° process provides for multiple perspectives, rather than the traditional supervisor only evaluation, utilizing a confidential electronic format. The intent of the
360° Performance Assessment is to provide a positive basis by which the E/M employee can strive to improve his/her performance and to identify individual strengths and weaknesses. This assessment serves to supplement, rather than to replace, supervisory review.”

The 360° assessment allows for the evaluation of E/M employees in designated areas based on a 7-point Likert scale in which scores at 3.9 or lower represent areas that are less than satisfactory. Scores at the lower end indicate “Below Expectations;” scores in middle range indicate “Meet Expectations;” and scores at the higher end indicate “Exceeds Expectations.” The designated areas evaluated are leadership, relations with others, planning, decisiveness, problem solving, organizational abilities, EEO/AA, safety, and overall rating. Three separate average evaluation ratings are compiled for each of the designated areas representing the evaluations made by the following three groups: Peer—college and system administrators; Subordinate—those who report directly to the administrator; and Constituent—all others.

Once the 360° assessment results have been compiled by UH Human Resources Office, the results are disseminated to the President/Vice President/Chancellor for appropriate dissemination to the applicable E/M employees. The "Quantitative Summary of 360 Executive and Managerial Evaluations" for the entire LCC administrative team as a whole (for Spring 2004) showed an overall average range of 4.31 to 5.62 (reflecting the average ratings by peer, constituent, and subordinate input).

5. An annual performance evaluation meeting was held in Summer 2004, for each LCC Dean and Director with the Chancellor. Under any future LCC administrative reorganization and any changes in administrative reporting lines, such annual evaluation meetings might not all be with the Chancellor. The Chancellor, in turn, has such an annual evaluation meeting with the UH President.

Accomplishment of Goals

Most of the goals established by the respective LCC administrators were accomplished or met, although not always by the projected or desired completion date. Additionally, some goals, although achieved in 2003-2004, will require
continuing or additional monitoring and follow-up. The goals not met, unless rendered moot or no longer important or pressing, are being addressed in AY 2004-2005.

As examples only, the following goals were among those accomplished during AY 2003-2004 by the various LCC administrators, collectively and/or individually with the support of the campus community:

Various accreditation concerns and recommendations addressed; accreditation Midterm and first of two Progress Reports completed and submitted to ACCJC; policies on Program Review and Curriculum Revision and Review formulated, approved, and initially implemented; assessment initiatives started; various grants successfully administered; Spring 2004 course offerings successfully implemented without material reductions, despite the challenge of budget reductions and teaching assignment/load reductions; LCC Strategic Plan and revised Mission Statement approved by the Board of Regents in March 2004; campus as a whole, and especially Student Services, adjusts well in implementing and adjusting to the demands imposed by the new Banner Student Information and Registration System; Title III grant renewed for 2003-2004; improved organization and administration of the units under Academic Services, together with the development of 3-year plans and planning and assessment cycles and processes for those units to address ACCJC accreditation standards and concerns and to improve their effectiveness; extension of HUD grant for 2003-2004; significant
repair and maintenance projects initiated; significant positions in various administrative units successfully filled (e.g., Personnel Officer, Auxiliary Services Officer, and Chief Academic Officer/Vice Chancellor designate); significant improvements implemented by the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development in its financial, registration-enrollment, and related recordkeeping and information processes and systems to enable more informed and effective decision-making; initiation, completion, and continuation by the Chancellor of numerous outreach activities, meetings, and initiatives in order to develop and sustain external community relationships so that the College has the support of the community in order to be responsive to the needs of the community and our various constituencies and to help ensure program relevancy.

*Action Plans*

In order to determine administrative action plans requiring future attention or implementation, the major goals for AY 2003-2004 not yet completed by the various administrators--including goals which will require additional monitoring or follow-up--and the outcomes for AY 2004-2005 deemed important by the various administrators were reviewed by the Chancellor. Based on that review, the actions or goals listed below (although in no particular order or priority) are deemed suitable as action plans for the annual updating of the LCC Strategic Plan and/or follow through by the Administration with the support of the campus community.
1. Complete the campus review of the LCC administrative reorganization proposal. Forward the proposal for additional review to the appropriate UH offices and then to the applicable employee unions, the UH President, and for final approval to the Board of Regents.

2. In advance of the completion of our accreditation Institutional Self Study, re-examine the College’s Mission Statement to ensure that, in accordance with the applicable ACCJC standard, the Mission Statement makes clear or emphasizes the College’s commitment to the achievement of student learning.

3. Continue to refine and strengthen the campus’ assessment and program review processes and policies, including those relating to course review.

4. Support and facilitate the accreditation self-study process and institutional self-improvements in order to maintain our accreditation in good standing.

5. Complete the review of the LCC Associate in Arts degree.

6. Finalize the proposal for an Associate in Arts in Teaching degree for review by the LCC Faculty Senate and approval by the BOR.

7. Complete and submit a Title III grant application.

8. Continue to adjust, fine-tune, or improve campus procedures and processes required by or to accommodate the Banner student information and registration system.

9. Continue to facilitate and improve communication with the various units reporting to the various administrators, including with the faculty and staff of those units, and to promote the professional and staff development of the personnel in those units.

10. In order to meet funding limitations and shortfalls, continue to be proactive in seeking external sources of funding and support, e.g., through federal and foundation grants; private and public partnerships; and fund development and fundraising.

11. Strengthen activities and strategies to improve student retention and success.

12. Fill as soon as feasible the two vacant administrative/Dean positions, which report to the Chief Academic Officer/Vice Chancellor and which became vacant due to resignations. With the loss of these two Deans, the accreditation-related issue of administrative instability and turnover is again becoming an issue.
Special Note: Although the Marketing Office or function, under the current LCC organizational structure, reports to the Office of the Chancellor, the Administration Support Area Review above was limited, in essence, to a review involving the offices or positions of the LCC Administration headed by Dean or Director. The Marketing Office, however, has completed its own "support area review" which is included in the September 2004 report, compiled by Institutional Analyst/Researcher Andy Rossi, entitled “Report on Program Reviews & Support Area Reviews,” pages 73-75. That Report is also available on the LCC website at:


Administrative Services Area Review

The Administrative Services (AS) Assessment group efforts concentrated in three units: Business Office, Operations and Maintenance, and Human Resources. The Business Office survey focused on the accessibility and usefulness of financial information currently being disseminated. Assessment of Operations and Maintenance focused on documenting the number of leaking roofs, drainpipes, and lanais and on completing 85% of all Institutional Repairs (work orders) within 3 working days. The Human Resources Office is currently studying existing policies (UH, BOR, DHRD directives) to evaluate their currency and to look for gaps or overlaps.

The Business Office survey findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial information provided by Business Office</td>
<td>17 of 18 respondents: helpful and useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly reports</td>
<td>15 of 18 respondents: somewhat or very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Purchasing system</td>
<td>6 of 18 respondents: familiar with system and find it useful; 9 of 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line financial reports</td>
<td>responses: not familiar with system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 of 18 respondents: prefer on-line; 6 of 18 respondents: prefer both hard copies and on-line; 3 of 18 respondents: prefer hard copies only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Operations and Maintenance group reported that as of December 1, 2004, 35 leaks were documented. By September 2004, 82% of Institutional Repair work orders were completed within 3 days.

The Human Resources Office (HRO) reported many gaps and overlaps in State, UH, and LCC policies and procedures that must be addressed. These gaps and overlaps tend to cause confusion and uncertainty about proper procedure and require time-consuming research to determine proper guidelines for decision-making.

Actions Needed:

1) For HRO, hire an APT to support the Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment. This position will ensure that policies and procedures are clear, current, and available on the WEB.

2) For the Business Office, hire an APT to support Contracts and Grants Management. With increased emphasis on obtaining extramural contracts and grants, the Business Office needs additional staffing to meet the fiscal and administrative needs in this area. Currently, there is only one individual who is provides fiscal support for these grants.

3) In the area of Operations and Maintenance, the College needs to be proactive in addressing roof leak problems. The roofs need to be on a preventive maintenance schedule to avoid disruption to educational services.
Academic Services Area Review

In the area of Academic Services, over the past five years, the number of services provided to the campus has increased while the AS budget has remained static. Each AS unit has assessed their services and found them valued by the campus; however, services are insufficiently funded and staffed, including Supplementary Instruction (LRC), Technology Mentoring (EMC), Information Literacy (Library), and the Help Desk (ITG). This list is not comprehensive, and the area’s first action plan calls for all AS units to prioritize services, both new and established, reference them to the budget, and using program assessment data, collaboratively prioritize what services to augment, to continue without change, to decrease, and to eliminate.

LCC’s distance education (DE) program is mandated by ACCJC to provide equivalent services to DE students. Many of these services are provided by the AS units, so the plan of action is to assess whether equivalent services are available, to address weaknesses found, or to discontinue the College’s emphasis on distance learning.

Student computer access is the responsibility of AS and is currently provided through the CCL, LRC, and Library. Current funding for the CCL is provided through the Technology Fund, while computers in the Library and LRC were funded externally and are not part of the campus budget. The action plans to be taken include the following: 1) determine the level of access required for general and program-based student use; 2) determine the quality level of computer resources required; 3) develop a budget based on the above. These
actions will insure that student access to appropriate computer resources for college priorities will be maintained.

**Student Services Area Review**

The **Student Services** area is comprised of six general-funded units and two federally-funded TRIO projects. The six units include Admissions and Records, Counseling and Advising, Financial Aid, Job Prep Services, Health Center, and Student Activities. The assessments of the six units are listed below; the TRIO Upward Bound projects have separate, grant-required reports that were not included in this process.

A major impact on the Student Services units of Admissions & Records and Financial Aid, and to a lesser degree, Counseling and Advising, is the continuing evolution of the Banner student information system. The increasing impact of this system will be discussed within each unit report.

**Admissions and Records** studied the application process, transcript process and information delivery process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was assessed?</th>
<th>Assessment tool</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application input and notification</td>
<td>Decision letter</td>
<td>96% of applicants received letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript production process</td>
<td>Transcript requests</td>
<td>100% met processing guidelines and deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information availability</td>
<td>Satisfaction survey</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While performance on these assessment measures met expectations, what is not reflected in these findings is the “Banner” effect. The Banner system operates extremely slowly at various times during the year, especially when all ten
Campuses are inputting applications, registering students, processing financial aid applications, entering grades, and performing end-of-term functions. Inputting applications requires entering information on 16 – 20 different screens, with decision-making required at various points.

As the College responds to community and DOE requests and seeks more revenue generation and funding streams, the increase in special programs has brought about an increased need to monitor student application, registration, and completion. If the College intends to continue with the creation of special programs, more staff will be needed.

Action Plans

- Request positions and budget for a new APT and a new clerk to support Banner application input and special program development activities.
- Develop outcome measures to determine the length of time required to input applications.

Counseling and Advising’s assessment activity occurred during the Spring 2004 semester. During this period, a total of 802 surveys were administered and collected from students who came into the Counseling Center for individual appointments. According to the surveys, most students who came in for individualized appointments received the information that they needed, and nearly 100% of the students expressed satisfaction with their interaction with the counselor. In the five areas measured with the instrument, the results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was assessed</th>
<th>Assessment tool</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying to LCC</td>
<td>Post-appointment survey</td>
<td>96% satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for Financial Aid</td>
<td>Post-appointment survey</td>
<td>80% satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>Post-appointment survey</td>
<td>99.8% satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>Post-appointment survey</td>
<td>97% satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the above results, intervention strategies to enhance effectiveness in the area of financial aid counseling were added. In addition, surveys indicated that interaction with a counselor helped students feel more connected to the College and more confident in their ability to succeed, so to further strengthen this aspect of counseling services, more classes taught by counselors are being offered. In addition, more Success Quotient workshops that relate to student retention and encourage student success will be offered.

**Action Plans**
- Encourage counselors currently teaching classes to mentor their peers.
- Develop workshops targeting student retention and student success.

Financial Aid’s (FA) assessed the awareness and knowledge of its services according to the number of applications submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was assessed</th>
<th>Assessment tool</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of students receiving awards</td>
<td>Number of students receiving awards through FAFSA – Free Application for Federal Student Aid</td>
<td>Met the 5 – 10% expected level of performance: actual was 7% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the total amount of funds awarded</td>
<td>Banner awarding process</td>
<td>Exceeded 5 – 10% expected level of performance: actual was 14% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Financial Aid Office is faced with similar “Banner” effects alluded to earlier in the section dealing with Admissions & Records. Analysis and awarding of financial aid has become more complex with the advent of the Banner system and its financial aid protocols. There has also been an increase in the number of
applications as the cost of higher education continues to rise. The current staff has increasing difficulty in processing and awarding financial aid in a timely manner.

**Action Plans**

- Request positions and budget for a new APT and a new clerk to support financial aid awarding processes and informational program development activities.
- Develop annual evaluation measures of FA processes and procedures to make awarding more efficient and timely.

The job placement office, **Job Prep Services (JPS)**, has been funded through the Carl Perkins grant. It assists career and technical education students in researching employment opportunities and preparing for the job hunt.

The assessment activities involved the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was assessed?</th>
<th>Assessment tool</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students using the services</td>
<td>Sign-in sheet</td>
<td>Exceeded expectations. (30% of 774 declared CTE majors utilized the JPS Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students creating a resume</td>
<td>Resumes left with the JPS Office for evaluation</td>
<td>Expectation not met. (46%--175 of 378 students v. 50% expected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students finding employment through JPS Office</td>
<td>Student sign-in sheet for employment seeking</td>
<td>Expectation not met. (15%--27 of 175 students v. 20% expected)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the Perkins grant, JPS is mandated to focus its job placement activities and efforts on Career and Technical Education (CTE) students. However, JPS has been able to serve Liberal Arts and undeclared students whenever possible. The demand from Liberal Arts majors comprises approximately 60% of all students JPS served in AY 2003-2004.
**Action Plans**

- Request positions and general fund budget support for a Job Developer and Education Specialist for Job Prep Services. Currently, one faculty member is on loan from Business Technology and an APT position is funded through a Perkins grant. General funding would allow for the expansion of JPS to all students, rather than limited to CTE majors.
- Develop methods to encourage more students to utilize JPS.
- Develop better tracking and follow-up methods for student employment.

**The Health Center** assessment focused on patient knowledge of services available, satisfaction level of the health care services received, and student willingness to support an increase in the Student Health fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was assessed</th>
<th>Assessment tool</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients/visitors will learn about services</td>
<td>Survey of all patients who signed in over a 2 week period</td>
<td>Expectations exceeded. 100% of respondents concurred that they learned about services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student satisfaction with services received</td>
<td>Post-visit survey</td>
<td>Expectations exceeded. 100% of respondents reported being satisfied with the quality of services received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students find service affordable, recommend service to others; willing to pay a higher fee</td>
<td>Post-visit survey</td>
<td>Expectations exceeded. 100% of respondents indicated “Yes” to affordability, recommend, and willingness to pay a higher fee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Plans**

- Investigate additional means to advertise Health Center services.
- Begin the process of recommending that the Health Service fee be increased by $3.00 to fund clerical support.

**Student Activities’** assessment focused on the qualitative experience for students involved with co-curricular activities: relevance of co-curricular
involvement to professional/personal growth; appreciation of diverse backgrounds, values, and perspectives within groups; and strengthening participation in group meetings and activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was assessed?</th>
<th>Assessment tool</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identify benefits of co-curricular involvement</td>
<td>Focus group discussion Essay</td>
<td>Expectations not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase appreciation of diverse backgrounds, values and perspectives</td>
<td>Focus group discussion Essay</td>
<td>Expectations exceeded. 100% of respondents indicated either “Strongly Agree” or “Agree”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve ability to participate in group meetings or activities</td>
<td>Focus group discussion Essay</td>
<td>Expectations exceeded. 100% of respondents indicated either “Strongly Agree” or “Agree”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Plans**

- Develop more clearly delineated program elements that enhance personal and professional opportunities.
- Develop methods to increase the number of participants in focus group discussion.
February 22, 2005

Dear Campus Community Members:

We are asking for your input in designing new action plans for the 2005-2006 academic year. The goals and objectives in our 2002-2010 Strategic Plan will continue to be our framework, and you may want to consider the following process in designing your new action plans:

- Read through the Assessment Analysis Report that was sent to you as an email attachment on February 9, 2005.
- Review the 2002-2010 Strategic Plan goals and objectives that are attached to this email.
- Consider how improvements can be made to student learning as a result of the assessments.
- Design new action plans to improve student learning at our College.

Note that new action plans should include in their rationale a brief explanation of the assessment results that are the basis for the action. Referencing the Assessment Analysis Report would be a good first step in designing new actions. In addition, proposers are asked to collaborate with support areas (Administration, Administrative Services, Academic Services, Student Services) to develop group proposals. For example, in the area of writing assessment, if an action plan includes the development of a website to allow direct student input of writing samples to be assessed, the proposer should collaborate with an Academic Services (Educational Media Center) person to design an action plan that involves both instructional and support areas.

Please use the attached form, Revisit_Grid2_Fill_in.xls, to provide complete information about your action plan and e-mail it to either of us at robertas@hawaii.edu or luyeno@hawaii.edu  Action plans must be received by Wednesday, March 16 noon, to be considered for prioritization. All submissions will be posted on the LCC web site for review by the entire campus.

An open forum will be held to discuss new actions on Monday, March 28. All proposers are invited to discuss details about their action plans at that forum.

We hope to hear from you.

Bob Asato and Lani Uyeno
Aloha all Faculty and Staff,

I am pleased to inform the campus community that, following the respective approvals by the Campus Council on 2/28/05 and the Faculty Senate on 3/9/05, I approved on 3/10/05 the attached, amended version of the Leeward Community College Mission Statement. As shown in the attached Word document, the Mission Statement has been amended by adding the following sentence to the appropriate section:

“The College is committed to the achievement of student learning.”

The College’s motto is “To help people learn,” and the addition to the Mission Statement lends much greater meaning and support to that motto.

The amendment was recommended by the Co-Coordinators for the College’s Accreditation Institutional Self Study, Robert Asato and Lani Uyeno. Bob Asato also serves as the campus’ Accreditation Liaison Officer. The purpose of the recommended amendment was to have our Mission Statement comply with the requirements of Standard I, relating to institutional mission, of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

ACCJC Standard I states in relevant parts as follows:

“The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning....”

“The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

For additional background and details, see my earlier mass e-mail to the campus community, dated 2/17/05, Subject: Mission Statement Amendment to Comply with ACCJC Standard I, and the memorandum attached to that e-mail.

ACCJC Standard I also requires that the mission statement be approved by the governing board and published. Early next week I will be forwarding the campus-approved, amended LCC Mission Statement to the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents (BOR) for its review and approval at its meeting on April 21-22, 2005. Agenda items for the Board’s April meeting are due to the UH President’s Office by March 18. After approval by the BOR, the amended Mission Statement will be published in the LCC Catalog for 2005-2006.

Thank you to the members of the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate for your prompt approval of the amended Mission Statement, the members of the campus community who saw the value of and need for, and who therefore supported, the proposed addition to our Mission Statement, and of course to Robert Asato and Lani Uyeno for taking the initiative to propose this important amendment to the College’s Mission Statement.

Mark Silliman
Chancellor

Attachment: Amended Leeward CC Mission Statement (approved March 2005)
Leeward Community College
University of Hawai‘i

Mission of the College
As one of the seven community colleges of the University of Hawai‘i, the overall mission of Leeward Community College is contained in the following principles.

• **Access:** To broaden access to postsecondary education in Hawai‘i, regionally, and internationally by providing open-door opportunities for students to enter quality educational programs within their own communities.

• **Learning and Teaching:** To specialize in the effective teaching of remedial/developmental education, general education, and other introductory liberal arts, pre-professional, and selected baccalaureate courses and programs, with the goal of seamless system articulation and transfer, where appropriate. To structure our programs in such a way that they reflect not only academic rigor but also student development, learning outcomes and student goals. The College is committed to the achievement of student learning.

• **Work Force Development:** To provide the trained workforce needed in the State, the Asia-Pacific region, and internationally by offering occupational, technical, and professional courses and programs, which prepare students for immediate and future employment and career advancement.

• **Personal Development:** To provide opportunities for personal enrichment, occupational upgrading, and career mobility through credit and non-credit courses and activities.

• **Community Development:** To contribute to and stimulate the cultural and intellectual life of the community by providing a forum for the discussion of ideas; by providing leadership, knowledge, problem-solving skills, and general informational services; and by providing opportunities for community members to develop their creativity and an appreciation for the creative endeavors of others.

• **Diversity:** To prepare students for the global workplace, with particular emphasis on Asia and the Pacific Rim, by building upon Hawai‘i’s unique multi-cultural environment and geographic location, through efforts in curriculum development and productive relationships with international counterparts.

Within this context, the special mission of Leeward Community College is to provide teacher training and serve the residents of our diverse communities, with particular attention to the Hawaiian population; communities actively transitioning from an agricultural base to a more diversified economic base; and communities making up the fastest growing middle-income suburban population on O‘ahu.

March 2005
February 16, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty, Staff, and Administrators

FROM: Peter Quigley, Vice Chancellor & Chief Academic Officer

SUBJECT: Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)

This spring, our College has the opportunity to participate in a national survey focusing on teaching, learning, and retention in community colleges. The project is administrated by the Community College Leadership Program, at The University of Texas at Austin.

The student survey will be administered in classes randomly selected by CCSSE to ensure a representative sample, and to preserve the integrity of the survey results. Instructors whose classes are selected for this student survey will receive specific information once the classes are identified.

Research shows that students who read and write more, and who interact in positive ways with their teachers and peers, gain more in terms of essential skills and competencies. Identifying what our students do in and out of the classroom, knowing their goals, and understanding their external responsibilities can help us create an educational environment that can enhance student learning, development, and retention.

This survey is very important to us and can assist us in identifying where we are and what further actions may be helpful in our continuing work to support and strengthen teaching and learning. Your cooperation and participation in this exciting national survey are sure to enhance our educational programs and services to students.

While not everyone will be directly involved in this project, if you are asked to help, please do so. Andy Rossi will oversee the administration of the survey at our campus. If you have any questions about the survey itself, or the project in general, please contact him directly at ext 663.
PLANNING, ASSESSMENT AND POLICY ANALYSIS

Institutional Research and Analysis
- Program Officer: 89340
- Secretary II: SR-14 47760 (.50) (.50N)
- Institutional Analyst: PBB 80217 (.75) (25N)
- Institutional Analyst: PBB 80019

NOTE: All positions in Community Colleges Academic Affairs to be redescribed, also Pos. No. 89051.

* Proposed position classification
^ Excluded from position count, this chart

STATE OF HAWAI'I
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I
SYSTEMWIDE ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
COMMUNITY COLLEGES ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

CHART (B)

CHART UPDATED JUL 01 2004

General Fund 8.25
Federal Funds 1.75
**BUDGET AND PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>77148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Budget Officer</td>
<td>SR-14</td>
<td>41599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Specialist</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>71577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Specialist</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>71577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Officer</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>71577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HUMAN RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Officer</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>77194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>77194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINANCIAL SERVICES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered Architect</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>85992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>ST-1C</td>
<td>98916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>85992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>98916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Field Spec.</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>98922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Control</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>98922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Officer</td>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>82711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>ST-1A</td>
<td>33573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>ST-1D</td>
<td>25391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHART UPDATED**

Date: JUL 01 2004

**NOTE:** All positions in Community Colleges Administrative Affairs to be reclassified

*Excluded from position count, see chart*
STATE OF HAWAII
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
MAUI COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Organization Chart

Chart I

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII SYSTEM
Office of the President

Office of the Chancellor
Chart II

Instruction
Chart III

Student Services
Chart IV

Administrative Services
Chart V

Continuing Education and Training
Chart VI

University of Hawaii Center, Maui
Chart VII

CHART UPDATED
DATE JUL 01 2004

General Fund
168.00
(B) Special Funds
7.50
(W) Revolving Funds
3.00
### Community Colleges - Comparison of E/M Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Salary Annual</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Salary Annual</th>
<th>CUR/HR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>126,360</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>122,543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>109,362</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>116,464</td>
<td>126,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>127,608</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>137,688</td>
<td>126,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>101,220</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>112,992</td>
<td>109,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>104,800</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>118,664</td>
<td>126,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR (Academic)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>105,240</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>120,360</td>
<td>122,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR (Academic)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>104,800</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>112,992</td>
<td>109,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VPC/CHANCELLOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Academic)</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>90,120</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>93,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Academic)</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>84,584</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>93,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Academic)</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>92,592</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>90,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Academic)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>87,480</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>94,944</td>
<td>93,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Academic)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>60,330</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>83,184</td>
<td>90,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Admin)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>73,632</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>72,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Admin)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>77,764</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>79,344</td>
<td>84,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Admin)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>77,160</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>84,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Admin)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>58,176</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>73,652</td>
<td>84,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR (Student)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>68,568</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>85,206</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>120,144</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>140,166</td>
<td>169,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>111,528</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>131,544</td>
<td>129,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VC STDTN AND CMFTY AFF (CC)</strong></td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>107,230</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>107,230</td>
<td>91,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial Positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF CONTINUING ED &amp; TRNG</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>71,020</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>71,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>75,552</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>75,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>76,224</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>75,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM DIRECTOR (CC)</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>100,344</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>78,808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR (CC)</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>96,072</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR (CC)</td>
<td>NEW HIRE</td>
<td>88,200</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF STDTN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>68,568</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>65,506</td>
<td>73,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF STDTN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>81,240</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>81,240</td>
<td>83,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF STDTN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>75,406</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>83,897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>68,184</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>73,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>66,804</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>68,840</td>
<td>75,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR FAC CTR FOR ADV TECH TRNG</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>86,248</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>88,248</td>
<td>78,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR (CC)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>75,364</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>75,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>58,100</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>58,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF STDTN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>82,224</td>
<td>83,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>71,916</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>73,056</td>
<td>78,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>68,752</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>69,720</td>
<td>78,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>65,568</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>69,240</td>
<td>78,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST TO SENIOR EXECUTIVE</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>75,906</td>
<td>78,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF INSTRUCTION (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>81,508</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>63,130</td>
<td>83,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF ADMIN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>71,100</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>77,160</td>
<td>88,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF ADMIN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>67,824</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>76,092</td>
<td>75,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF STDTN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>73,968</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>73,960</td>
<td>89,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF CONTINUING ED &amp; TRNG</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>61,536</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>59,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF UNIV OF HH CTR (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>55,512</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>56,540</td>
<td>53,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF STDTN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>85,080</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>83,307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>78,808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF CONTINUING ED &amp; TRNG</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>62,104</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>62,104</td>
<td>78,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF CONTINUING ED &amp; TRNG</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>68,304</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>69,480</td>
<td>75,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF CONTINUING ED &amp; TRNG</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>71,604</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>71,495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF UNIV OF HH CTR (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>65,568</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>65,568</td>
<td>53,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>71,368</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>70,368</td>
<td>58,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF INSTRUCTION (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>82,652</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>83,506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF ADMIN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>64,624</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>75,690</td>
<td>75,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF STDTN SVCS (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>63,926</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>63,101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR VOCATIONAL &amp; COMMUNITY AFF</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>54,040</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>60,468</td>
<td>82,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF CONTINUING ED &amp; TRNG</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>48,545</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>49,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>80,260</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>67,924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DEAN (CC)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>74,976</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>89,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN ASST (CC)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>85,193</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>85,193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST RES &amp; ANALYS PGRM OFFCR (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>66,744</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>71,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD AFFRS PGRM OFFCR (CC)</td>
<td>INTERIM</td>
<td>68,576</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR OF ECO- AA (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>59,550</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>64,513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR MARKETING &amp; FUNDS DEV (CC)</td>
<td>INCIDENT</td>
<td>59,668</td>
<td>INCUMBENT</td>
<td>60,688</td>
<td>92,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Executive Chancellor provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the community college system and assure support for the effective operation of the community colleges.

The Executive Chancellor

a. Effectively represents the interests and needs of the community college system within the University system and with the external community and agencies, e.g., Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

b. Acts as liaison between the community colleges and the Board of Regents.

c. Ensures that the community college system provides effective services that support the community colleges in their missions and functions.

d. Establishes a clear delineation between the operational responsibilities and functions of the community college system office and those of the community colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

e. Provides a fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the community colleges.

f. Ensures that the community college system effectively controls its expenditures.

g. Ensures that the community college chancellors have full responsibility and authority to implement and administer delegated system policies without interference and holds the chancellors accountable for the operation of the colleges.

h. Establishes effective means of communication between the Board of Regents, the University system administration, and the community colleges and assures that information is exchanged in a timely manner.

i. Evaluates community college CEOs.
Draft Functional Statement
Chancellor
XXX Community College

As Chief Executive Officer of the College, the Chancellor has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

The Chancellor

a. Plans, executes, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to meet the College’s purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.
   1. Approves all appointments, all personnel classifications, all tenure and promotion applications, and manage all grievances within the framework of the collective bargaining agreements and University and community college system policies.
   2. Authorizes all internal budget allocations and controls, position approval, and authority for expenditures.
   3. Design or develop organizational structures and processes for effective operations within their colleges.
   4. Makes decisions and recommendations for their college, in alignment with community college system plans and directions.
   5. Prepares and presents college specific matters for consideration by the Board of Regents.

b. Guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by:
   - Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities
   - Ensuring that planning and evaluation rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal conditions
   - Ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes
   - Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts

c. Assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, Board of Regents policies, and community college system policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

d. Effectively controls budget and expenditures.

e. Works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.