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SECTION I

BACKGROUND: Campus Response

In an action letter dated June 28, 2005, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accepted Leeward Community College’s Progress Report and removed the College from “Warning” with the requirement that the College complete a Progress Report by October 15, 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_050628.pdf).

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

By consensus of the UH Vice President for 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 three 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 three 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 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 Systemwide 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 IV.B, all)
BACKGROUND: System Response

As part of a university system administrative reorganization, the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents (BOR) received a proposal in November 2002 that included the elimination of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges. This reorganization proposal was approved by the BOR in December 2002 and approved by the ACCJC through its Substantive Change approval process in April 2003.

As part of the action approving the reorganization, the ACCJC requested a series of reports (August 1, 2003; November 1, 2003; April 1, 2004; November 1, 2004; and April 1, 2005) detailing various aspects of the implementation of the reorganization. In January 2005, the Commission placed six of the seven colleges on warning because of concerns expressed over system level governance issues and inconsistent development of program review and assessment policies and practices. In June 2005, the Commission removed four colleges from warning status. Those colleges remaining on warning were asked to submit progress reports on campus specific concerns and all campuses were asked to submit a report by October 15, 2005 that describes system progress on recommendations related to program review and assessment, system organization, and Board governance.

As detailed below, in June 2005 the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents approved a reorganization of the community colleges, including the creation of a Vice-President of Community Colleges and the re-consolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the community colleges.
STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

Background

Upon receipt of the Commission’s June action letter, Interim Chancellor Peter Quigley informed the campus community about the Commission's decision to remove the College from Warning status. He articulated the need for a Progress Report in October 2005 to fully address and resolve the recommendations and related concerns contained in the action letter.

The ACCJC action letter dated June 28, 2005 and the evaluation report of the ACCJC visiting team were distributed in pdf format via e-mail to the campus community (Attachment B). In July, the Council of Chancellors met to decide on future actions.

Process of Report Preparation

The System response to Recommendations 2, 6, and 7 was prepared by Vice President of Community Colleges John Morton. The preparation of the Progress Report relied on input from the College’s administrative team, the Assessment Coordinator, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), 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, 6, and 7 were received from the Office of the UHCC Vice President and are included verbatim.

The principal writers of the LCC Response were Bob Asato, ALO; Lani Uyeno, Strategic Planner; Kathy Hill, Assessment Coordinator; with supervision by Peter Quigley, Interim Chancellor.

Review and Approval of Report

In August 2005, the campus constituencies were notified of the September 21 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 process due to the internal deadline for Board of Regent’s approval. The Acting Chancellor distributed a draft of the report for review via email and feedback from the College governance groups. The Campus Council reviewed the report on September 12, 2005 and the Faculty Senate reviewed the report on September 14, 2005. Revisions were made in response to the feedback from the governance groups.

Interim Chancellor Peter Quigley 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**

In addition to continued improvements on each campus, the following system-wide actions have taken place to ensure an integrated approach to regular assessment, including program review, and subsequent use of this assessment information in planning and resource distribution:

a. On August 4, 2005, the Chancellors of all seven colleges adopted a recommendation from the chief academic officers that established common measures for academic program review. While colleges can expand on these measures for planning and resource allocation questions at the college level, the common information, including common data definition and source, will provide a comparative baseline of data for system-level decisions. On September 8, 2005, the Chancellors adopted common measures for all administrative and student services programs. Following the process used for the self-study demographic information and achievement data (DIAD) template, the IR Cadre can identify, define, and tailor data requirements from system IRO products which meet standards of good evidence.

b. The previously agreed upon principles related to program review (see the April 1, 2005, progress report) and the common measures identified above were promulgated as community college system policy and procedures on September 15, 2005. A copy of the policy and procedures, including the common measures, is included in Attachment C.

c. A high priority item was included in the community colleges supplemental budget request for consideration by the Board of Regents and subsequently the State Legislature. The budget request, if approved, would strengthen the staff supporting program review and assessment at the colleges and also create a program improvement fund that could facilitate continuous quality improvement as identified in program review and planning. A copy of the budget request is included as Attachment D.

d. Work continues on creating a web-based access system for the program review and planning information so that all interested parties may review the assessment results of each program.
e. Work continues with the University system Institutional Research Office to create a more responsive environment for consistent, regular, and timely reports as well as ad hoc data query and for better business intelligence using data warehouses for student, faculty, and financial information.

f. Through the Board’s newly expanded Community College Committee, the Board of Regents will receive a regular briefing on program review and assessment, as well as on related program improvement plans and budget requests. More details are provided below in the response to Recommendation 7.

CAMPUS RESPONSE

Leeward Community College’s Program Review process continues to be the vehicle by which the campus assesses institutional effectiveness. During the past six months, members of the campus community have been actively involved with initiatives that have focused on the College’s efforts to produce student learning. Program Review at LCC continues to evolve through the implementation of program, course, and support area assessments conducted by faculty, staff, and administrators. The following is a chronology of events and accomplishments since April, 2005.

- Modification of the LCC Policy on Program Reviews to formalize the College’s Assessment Team. The modified policy includes standardized assessment templates that were used to summarize and report findings, specific timelines, as well as a description of how assessment results are translated into budget allocations. The modified Policy was approved by the Faculty Senate at their May 11, 2005 meeting. (Attachment E)

- Modification of Curriculum Central to serve as a repository for information obtained via assessment of all courses, including distance education (DE) courses, according to current accreditation standards. (See Attachment F)

- Presentation of six workshops for faculty to learn how to navigate the new modules in Curriculum Central and to have opportunities to dialogue about the steps of the course assessment process.

- Provision of guidance and information on assessment tasks and timelines to division, program, and support areas through information sessions and small group meetings conducted by the Assessment Team.

- Distribution in April 2005 to all faculty of a “Handbook on Outcomes Assessment for Two-Year Colleges,” by Edward A. Morante to provide tools for developing program and course assessment plans.

- Ongoing assessments (course, program, and support area) of student learning, as originally scheduled.

- Collaboration between Assessment Coordinators from Leeward CC, Windward CC, Honolulu CC and Kapi‘olani CC to discuss and identify common data issues from the UHCC System.

- Development of a system for integrating assessment information from programs, support areas, and courses, in the planning and budgeting process, described in detail on the following pages.
Planning and Budgeting Process:
For 2005–06, budget decisions were based on an action item process. Most of these actions items were generated through data driven evidences and connections to the Strategic Plan goals. Because the process was found to be faulty, it will not be used in future budgeting.

The challenge was to replace our action plan method with a process based in academic divisions and relying upon evidence and assessment-driven discussions. At this juncture, the campus team saw the opportunity to refine our planning and budgeting cycle to clarify the role of assessment and analysis in program review. The addition of “annual reviews” provided a set of interactive engagements that more accurately linked assessment with allocation, as well as planning exercises. The modifications are illustrated in diagrams I and II below.

To get a full accounting from divisions and other areas subsumed within the overall Program Review document, a planning tool was developed that is now in place in the academic units and will soon be expanded to the support areas, as well. During August, the Acting Chancellor presented this process to the Administrative Staff and the Assessment Team, to the participants in the College’s Leadership Retreat, and to the campus as a whole at Convocation.

The Administrative Staff is particularly excited about this template since it pulls vital information from the divisions and support areas into the larger program review. Additionally, it serves three important functions:

1) a planning and budgeting tool,
2) a program review tool, and
3) an accreditation tool.
As the Annual Division Review Template (diagram III) below shows, the divisions will use the tool as a planning document to have engaged and focused discussions. These planning discussions will 1) occur in the same categories as the overall Program Review model (see diagram IV); 2) have guiding questions that are derived from the ACCJC Standards; 3) be filtered through a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) lens; 4) insist on the usage of SLO data and assessments, and 5) result in budgetary lists as a result of discussions.

**Annual Division Review Template**

Institutional Research Data
Executive Summary
SWOT Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PLANNING LISTS**

- **Personnel**
  1. XXX
  2. XXX
  3. XXXX
  4. XXXX

- **Equipment**
  1. XXX
  2. XXX
  3. XXXX

- **Info Tech & LR**
  1. XXX
  2. XXX
  3. XXXX

- **Supplies**
  1. XXX
  2. XXX
  3. XXXX

- **Training**
  1. XXX
  2. XXX
  3. XXXX

- **Facilities/CIP**
  1. XXX
  2. XXX
  3. XXXX

**SWOT Analysis Narrative incorporates:**
- IR Data
- Course Assessment data
- Answers to suggested questions based on and tied to accreditation standards.
This Annual Review process will integrate all of the College's activities and provide incentive and meaning to the assessment process. The template is part of a larger process that, in the case of the Academic units, will yield an Academic Plan, which will then be aligned with other area summative reports, yielding a College Plan, as illustrated in diagram V below.

Needs

- To proceed with planning, the College will need to receive from the System appropriate and regularly published data, including Banner (Student Information System) data that speaks to accreditation needs.

- Formulas for campus staffing per student FTE would be helpful for planning purposes.

- The System and the College might be conceived as participating in budget allocations as a result of Program Review; distinctions could be drawn regarding the kinds of funding allocated by the System versus kinds allocated at the Campus level.
**SECTION II B: Response 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**

In the April 1, 2005, progress report, several alternative organizational models were under consideration. After further discussion and consultation, the Board of Regents on June 21, 2005 approved a reorganization of the community colleges. Key elements of the reorganization include:

a. The creation of a new position of Vice-President for Community Colleges within the University of Hawai‘i system organization. The Vice-President is responsible for system governance and advocacy for the community colleges. The Community College Chancellors will report to the Vice President for Community Colleges, but will also have a dual reporting relationship to the President. The Community College Chancellors will report to the Vice President for Community Colleges for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges and to the President for system wide policy development, on par with the chancellors of the four-year campuses.

b. Realignment of the system community college support functions so that they now report to the new Vice-President for Community Colleges. Michael Rota, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and Michael Unebasami, Associate Vice-President for Administrative Affairs, and their respective staff report to the Vice-President for Community Colleges and are totally committed to community college support.

c. The retention by the college Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) of the title and authority of Chancellors with respect to college based operations. The Chancellors continue to meet and participate in the University-wide Council of Chancellors as well as the Council of Community College Chancellors and have a dual reporting relationship to the Vice-President for Community Colleges for community college matters and to the President of the University for matters of University wide concern. The structure is designed to ensure that the Chancellors have the appropriate authority as CEOs of accredited colleges while maintaining the system governance structure to assure policy and planning coherence and equitable resource allocation within the system of community colleges.

The reorganization proposal, as approved by the Board of Regents, is included as Attachment G.

On July 23, 2005 the Board of Regents appointed John Morton, formerly Chancellor of Kapi‘olani Community College, as interim Vice-President for Community Colleges. Vice-President Morton and his staff are working with both colleges and University system personnel to establish clear reporting lines and levels of authority and responsibility for both the system staff and the colleges.
SECTION II C: Response 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**

The standards established by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) require a degree of engagement and familiarity by the BOR with the issues and operations of the community colleges that were not adequately met through the current BOR structure. At its September 16, 2005 meeting, the BOR enlarged the Community College Committee and clarified its duties to allow the BOR to address these standards without impacting the other business of the BOR in its governance of the University system and the baccalaureate campuses. The new committee has the following characteristics:

**Membership**

The committee consists of six members, including each of the four neighbor island BOR members and two members appointed from O’ahu. This membership ensures that all community colleges are represented by Regents from their respective islands on the committee.

**Frequency of meetings**

The committee will have quarterly meetings independent of the regular BOR meetings, although the community college meeting might precede the regular BOR meeting. The meetings will be of sufficient length in a workshop format to allow an in-depth exploration of the issues.

**Meeting Agenda**

**Meeting 1,** to be held in September or October of each year, will focus on the broad community college mission and the degree to which the community colleges are meeting that mission. The focus topics will include access, workforce development, baccalaureate transfer, and engagement with the local communities. To the degree that new BOR members are appointed to the community college committee, this first meeting each year will also serve as an orientation for those members.

**Meeting 2,** to be held in November or December, will focus on the financial health of the community colleges including, all sources of funds and financial aid for students.

**Meeting 3,** to be held in February, will focus on program review and assessment results. Given the large number of programs across the seven campuses, the program review discussion will focus on those programs that were most successful and those programs that were most likely to be stopped out, terminated, or significantly modified.

**Meeting 4,** to be held in April or May, will focus on planning issues for the upcoming year. The discussion will also focus on major initiatives and budget-related proposals.
Meeting Location
The meetings will rotate among the campuses so that in a two-year period, all campuses, including both the East and West Hawai‘i sites, will host the meeting. Time will be devoted to acquainting the committee members with local campus facilities and/or program issues.

Relationship to Regular Monthly Board Meetings
The committee meetings are intended to provide in-depth understanding and discussion with BOR members about the issues and directions of the community colleges. The intention is not to create an additional layer of approval authority for transactions. Regular transactional items would not come to the committee but rather would be processed through normal BOR monthly meetings.

The Vice-President for Community Colleges will serve as liaison to the BOR Community College Committee to communicate significant issues that emerge between the regularly scheduled meetings, to inform the BOR of significant accomplishments of community college faculty and/or students, and to respond to any inquiries from the BOR related to community college matters.

The first meeting of the new community college committee is scheduled to take place within the next fifty days.
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June 28, 2005

Dr. Peter Quigley  
Interim Chancellor  
Leeward Community College  
96-045 Ala Ike  
Pearl City, HI 96782

Dear Chancellor Quigley:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on June 8-10, 2005, reviewed the Progress Report submitted by the college and the report of the evaluation team which visited on Thursday, April 7, 2005. I am pleased to inform you that the report was accepted and Warning removed, with the requirement that the college complete a Progress Report by October 15, 2005. That report will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

The Progress Report of October 15, 2005 should focus on the University of Hawaii System recommendations 2, 6, and 7 as noted below:

**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 UH CC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
- That the colleges and the UH CC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvement; and
- That the colleges and the UH CC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress (Standards I.B, II.A.1 and 2, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.1.e, II.C.2.2, III.A.6, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.1.a, IV.B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards).

**Recommendation 6.** The team recommends that U.H. 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 (Standard IV A.5, Standard III A.3, Standard I B).
Recommendation 7. The team recommends that 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, particularly policies and processes that ensure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services. (Standard IV B, all).

I have previously sent you a copy of the evaluation team report. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires that you give the report and this letter appropriate dissemination to your college staff and to those who were signatories of your college report. This group should include campus and system leadership and the Board of Trustees. The Commission also requires that all reports be made available to the public. Placing copies in the college library can accomplish this. Should you want the team report electronically to place on your web site or for some other purpose, please contact Commission staff.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution’s educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno
Executive Director

BAB/tl

cc: Dr. David McLain, Interim President, University of Hawaii
Dr. Robert Asato, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Mr. Michael Rota, Associate Vice President, University of Hawaii
Dr. Patricia Lee, Chair, Board of Regents, University of Hawaii
Dr. Barbara A. Beno, Executive Director, Team Chair
Evaluation Team Members
Good morning LCC Faculty & Staff...

It is with great pleasure that I announce that Leeward Community College has been removed from Warning. Our accreditation status has been returned to normal. Moving the Campus off Warning status reflects a concerted effort by many folks. Staying off Warning will require a change in campus culture. It will require continued effort on all of our parts and renewed dedication to the principles that are the heart of the new accreditation standards: planning based on open, honest, inclusive and civil dialogue; decision making based on assessment, evidence, and planning; and a deep commitment to institutional improvement.

While we certainly should take time for positive reflection on our good news and to thank all of those who worked so hard, we need to remember the work has just begun. In front of us remains an ACCJC visit and another Progress Report due in October. Looming behind this is our accreditation reaffirmation in fall 2006, one short year away.

As we take on these challenges, I invite the college to explore an era of renewal. What does it take to renew a College? As we enjoy removal from Warning status, this provides us all the opportunity to reflect on what kind of contribution it takes to make good things happen. With few resources, we must be able to rely on each others’ good will, good ideas, good graces, good energies and good offices. We must listen, carefully, to one another; we must be willing to change our minds; we must hope for the best and assume the best in one another; we must be willing to accept common goals that advance the institution; we must allow and assist those with the energy and innovation to lead in areas such as assessment and Program Review.

For now, enjoy the attached letter from ACCJC.
SUBJECT: Review of Established Programs

1. Purpose

Program reviews are intended to provide a regular assessment of the effectiveness of degree programs, of significant non-credit programs, of areas of major curricular emphasis, and of major educational and administrative support functions. Program reviews are conducted by the faculty and staff in the program, based on agreed upon measures and program plans. Program reviews provide for assessment of student learning, program demand and efficiency, analysis of external factors impacting a program, and assessment of planned program improvements. Program review results shall be used for decisions relating to program improvement, program modification, and/or program termination.

2. Related University Policies

   a. Board of Regents Policy, Section 5-1.b Review of Established Programs
      www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/policy/borpch5.pdf

   b. University of Hawai‘i Systemwide Executive Policy, E5.202 Review of Established Programs
      www.hawaii.edu/apis/ep/e5/e5202.pdf

3. Policy Objective

This policy establishes a coordinated program review process within each College and across the Community College System that meets the requirements of the University Board of Regents and Executive policies, external mandates such as those required by the Federal Carl Perkins Act of 1998, and the standards of good practice established by program and regional accrediting bodies.

4. Required Elements of the Program Review

All Colleges shall develop program review policies and processes that comply with the following principles:

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

   b. Program reviews shall result in improvement plans that are linked to the College strategic plan.
c. There shall be an annual report of program data which is analyzed, reviewed, and, where appropriate, reflected in updated action plans.

d. There shall be an overarching commitment to continuous quality improvement.

e. The program review process shall be collegial.

f. Program review information shall be publicly available.

g. Comparable measures shall be used consistently across Colleges.

h. Program reviews and resulting plans for improvement shall be used in decisions regarding resource allocation at the College and System level.

4. Programs Subject to Review

The following programs are subject to the program review policy:

a) All Board of Regents approved credit degree and certificate granting programs. Program reviews for degree granting programs should incorporate reviews of all related certificates and non-credit programs, and student service support.

b) All non-credit programs where the scope of the program is comparable to a credit degree or certificate granting program and where the program is not otherwise incorporated in the review of a degree granting program.

d) All educational and administrative support programs.

c) Any cross-curricular emphases or special programs that have been designated by the College as a significant component of the general education or strategic direction of the College.

5. Frequency of Program Reviews

All programs shall prepare annual reports documenting performance on agreed upon outcomes, key benchmarks, critical external factors, and planning improvements. All programs shall complete a comprehensive assessment at least once each five years in accordance with the schedule established by the College. If a program has completed a comprehensive self-assessment for the purposes of program accreditation within two years of the program review cycle, the results of the accreditation self-study may substitute for the comprehensive program review.

6. Content of Program Review

Program reviews shall include the following components:

a. Statement on the mission or purpose of the program, including the target student population.
b. Information on external factors affecting the program

c. Historical trend data on key measures

d. Program health indicators with benchmarks to provide a quick view on the overall condition of the program

e. Required external measures

f. Analysis of the outcomes over the period of the review, including an assessment related to progress in achieving planned improvements

g. Recommendations for improvement or action to be incorporated into the unit plan or the College’s next strategic plan.

7. Dissemination of Program Reviews

The Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs shall compile an annual report of program reviews summarizing the reports completed and significant actions or issues identified in the reports. The Vice President for Community Colleges will report the results of the program reviews to the Community College Committee of the Board of Regents.

The program reviews and the annual summary shall be made available to the Community Colleges’ community and the general public through a public web site.

8. Assessment of the Program Review Process

Under the management of the Community Colleges' Director of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, the established Community College System deans and/or directors groups are responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the system Program Review Process and to recommend changes to improve the outcomes of the process.

At the conclusion of each year, each established system vice chancellors/deans and/or directors group will review the measures and content of the program review in their respective area to ensure that the review provides the information necessary for program assessment and improvement.

At the conclusion of each program review cycle, each established system vice chancellors/deans and/or directors group will conduct an assessment of the overall program review policy and procedures to determine if improvements are necessary.

9. Annual Program Review Procedures

Within the principles outlined in Section 3, each College shall establish and operate its own program review process, each College is free to supplement the Community Colleges System agreed upon common set of program review data elements, and each College shall make available to the Community College System, summary data and analysis on a timely manner to facilitate the annual report to the Board of Regents.
Details regarding the common data elements, summary reporting formats, and timetables will be established separately for instructional programs, academic support programs, student services programs, and institutional support programs. The procedures and common measures for each may be found at the following Web sites:

- **Instructional Programs** (Attachments 1-A & 1-B) [(www.hawaii.edu/???)](www.hawaii.edu/???)
- **Academic Support Programs** (Attachment 2) [(www.hawaii.edu/???)](www.hawaii.edu/???)
- **Student Services Programs** (Attachment 3) [(www.hawaii.edu/???)](www.hawaii.edu/???)
- **Administrative Services Programs** (Attachment 4) [(www.hawaii.edu/???)](www.hawaii.edu/???)
HAWAI’I COMMUNITY COLLEGES

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES AND MEASURES

Associate in XXXX Degree

Assessment Period: (e.g. 2002-2005)

College Mission Statement

Program Mission Statement

Part I. Executive Summary of Program Status
Response to previous program review recommendations

Part II. Program Description
History
Program goals/Occupations for which this program prepares students
Program SLOs
Admission requirements
Credentials, licensures offered
Faculty and staff
Resources
Articulation agreements
Community connections, advisory committees, Internships, Coops, DOE connections
Distance delivered/off campus programs, if applicable

Part III. Quantitative Indicators for Program Review

Demand/Efficiency

1. Current and projected positions in the occupation (for CTE programs)
2. Annual new positions in the State (for CTE programs)
3. Number of applicants
4. Number of majors
5. Student semester hours for program majors in all program classes
6. Student Semester Hours for all program classes.
7. FTE program enrollment
8. Number of classes taught
9. Average class size
10. Class fill rate
11. FTE of BOR appointed program faculty
12. Semester credits taught by lecturers
13. Percent of classes taught by lecturers
14. FTE workload (Credits taught / full teaching load.)
   Note: Full teaching load is generally defined as 27 or 21 credits depending on program
15. Major per FTE faculty
16. Number of degree/certificates awarded in previous year by major
17. Cost of program per student major
18. Cost per SSH
19. Determination of program’s health based on demand and efficiency (Healthy, Cautionary, Unhealthy)

Outcomes
1. Attainment of student educational goals
2. Persistence of majors fall to spring
3. Graduation rate
4. Transfer rates
5. Success at another UH campus (based on GPA)
6. Licensure information where applicable
7. Perkins core indicators for CTE programs
8. Determination of program’s health based on outcomes (Healthy, Cautionary, Unhealthy)

Part IV. Assessment Results Chart for Program SLOs (3-5 year trend)
Changes made as a result of findings

Part V. Curriculum Revision and Review
(Minimum of 20% of existing courses are to be reviewed each year.)

Part VI. Survey results
1. Student satisfaction
2. Occupational placement in jobs (for CTE programs)
3. Employer satisfaction (for CTE programs)
4. Graduate/Leaver (for CTE programs)

Part VII. Analysis of Program
Alignment with mission
Strengths and weaknesses based on analysis of data
Evidence of quality
Evidence of student learning
Resource sufficiency
Recommendations for improving outcomes

Part VIII. Action Plan

Part IX. Budget implications
HAWAI‘I COMMUNITY COLLEGES

ANNUAL INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES AND MEASURES

Associate in XXXX Degree

College Mission Statement:

Program Mission Statement:

Part I. Quantitative Indicators for Program Review

Demand/Efficiency

1. Current and projected positions in the occupation (for CTE programs)
2. Annual new positions in the State (for CTE programs)
3. Number of applicants
4. Number of majors
5. Student semester hours for program majors in all program classes
6. Student Semester Hours for all program classes.
7. FTE program enrollment
8. Number of classes taught
9. Average class size
10. Class fill rate
11. FTE of BOR appointed program faculty
12. Semester credits taught by lecturers
13. Percent of classes taught by lecturers
14. FTE workload (Credits taught / full teaching load.)
   Note: Full teaching load is generally defined as 27 or 21 credits depending on program
15. Major per FTE faculty
16. Number of degree/certificates awarded in previous year by major
17. Cost of program per student major
18. Cost per SSH
19. Determination of program’s health based on demand and efficiency (Healthy, Cautionary, Unhealthy)

Outcomes
1. Attainment of student educational goals
2. Persistence of majors fall to spring
3. Graduation rate
4. Transfer rates
5. Success at another UH campus (based on GPA)
6. Licensure information where applicable
7. Perkins core indicators for CTE programs
8. Determination of program's health based on outcomes (Healthy, Cautionary, Unhealthy)

Part II. Assessment Results for Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)

Part III. Curriculum Revision
   Courses reviewed/revised for currency, accuracy, integrity

Part III. Analysis of data
   Alignment with mission
   Strengths and weaknesses based on analysis of data
   Evidence of quality
   Evidence of student learning
   Resource sufficiency
   Recommendations for improving outcomes

Part IV. Action plan

Part V. Budget implications
HAWAI‘I COMMUNITY COLLEGES

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES
PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES AND MEASURES

College Mission Statement

Program Mission Statement

Part I. Summary of Student Services with emphasis on particular program being reviewed

Part II. Mission, Purpose and Goals of the Sub-Programs
- Admissions and Orientation
- Registration and Records
- Counseling and Academic Advising
- Financial Aid
- Student Life
- Student Health Services
- Job Preparation Services

Part III. Quantitative Indicators for Program Review
Goal: Matriculation Services/Student Access
Measures:
1. Percentage of gender/ethnicity distribution compared to the population of the State
2. Number and percent of degree/certificate seekers based on intent
3. Percent of resident/non-resident breakdown
4. Percent of students receiving financial aid
5. Annual headcount trends
6. Percent of Applicants who enroll within one year

Goal: Retention Services/Student Progress
Measures:
1. Number and percent of students who report that Counselors helped them achieve or make progress toward their goal (CCSSE)
2. Average time for a student to complete degree
3. The percentage of first time students receiving orientation services (content to be defined)

Goal: Transition Services/Student Success
Measures:
1. The number and percentage of students who transfer to a four year institution having earned a degree
2. The number and percentage of students who transfer to a four year institution without a degree
3. The number and percentage of students who receive a degree or certificate

Goal: Quality Resources and Services/Student Experience
Measures:
1. Number of counselors per FTE student by demand/need
2. Number of enrollment services staff per FTE student
3. Average processing time per student request for service transactions
4. Number and percentage of students who are active in Registered Independent Organizations (RIOs) and Chartered Student Organizations (CSOs)

Part IV. Assessment Results – establish benchmarks
1. COMPASS placement scores distribution
2. Quantitative indicators
3. Qualitative indicators
4. Survey and other data sources
5. Student Satisfaction Surveys (use national survey and compare average rates)

Part V. Analysis of Program

Part VI. Plan for Improvement

Part VII. Budget Implications
I. Administrative Services Mission Statement

Administrative support services at each campus provide campus-wide executive leadership, budgetary and financial management, personnel administration, procurement and property management, facilities and grounds maintenance, security, physical facilities planning of both repairs and maintenance and capital improvement projects, and auxiliary services. Under the direction of the Vice President for Community Colleges, the University of Hawai‘i Community College systemwide administrative affairs unit directly coordinates, supports, and assists the community college campuses in policy formulation; budgeting, planning and coordination; budget execution and the effective use of available resources; organizational management and position control; human resources; facilities planning; and other administrative, logistical and technical services.

The campus and systemwide administrative services units support the primary program objectives of the Community Colleges, which are to develop eligible individuals to higher levels of intellectual, personal, social, and vocational competency by providing formal vocational and technical training and general academic instruction for certificates or degrees, or in preparation for the baccalaureate; and by offering adult continuing education for both personal and vocational purposes. The administrative services units directly support the academic mission of providing quality educational and related services to the students and the communities.

II. Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives & Campus Program Review Relationships

III. Program Review of Individual Administrative Services Units

- Description
- Analysis:
  - Measurements/Outcomes/Surveys
  - Workload/Efficiency
- Future Direction - Plan of Action

A. Budget & Planning measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses – CCBPO collection and distribution of data):

1. Fall and Spring Credit Headcount Enrollment
2. Fall and Spring Credit FTE Enrollment
3. General Fund + Tuition and Fee Special Fund (TFSF) Expenditure & Encumbrances (E&E)
4. Ratio of General Fund + TFSF E&E (fiscal year) per Credit Headcount Enrollment (Fall)
5. Ratio of General Fund + TFSF E&E (fiscal year) per Credit FTE Enrollment (Fall)
6. Ratio of General Fund Appropriation + collective bargaining (fiscal year) per Credit Headcount Enrollment (Fall)
7. Ratio of General Fund Appropriation + collective bargaining (fiscal year) per Credit FTE enrollment (Fall)
8. Expenditure & Encumbrances (E&E) (fiscal year) for all Appropriated funds (General, Federal, Special, Revolving)
9. Legislative Appropriations (fiscal year) for all Appropriated funds (General, Federal, Special, Revolving)
10. Tuition and Fee Special Fund (TFSF) Revenue (fiscal year)
11. Ratio of Tuition and Fee Special Fund (TFSF) Revenue (fiscal year) per Credit FTE Enrollment (Fall)
12. Ratio of Tuition and Fee Special Fund (TFSF) Revenue (fiscal year) per Student Semester Hours (fiscal year)
13. Quarterly BLS Reports
14. BLS Reports – 3 year Comparisons
15. BLS Reserve Status Report

B. Business Office measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses):

1. Number of UH Purchase Orders issued (fiscal year)
2. Average number of work days required to issue UH Purchase Order
3. Average number of work days required to submit PO payment documents to UH Disbursing Office
4. Number of RCUH Purchase Orders issued (fiscal year)
5. Number of UH P-Card transactions processed (fiscal year)
6. Number of UH FMIS AFP documents issued (fiscal year)
7. Number of RCUH Direct Payment documents issued (fiscal year)
8. Number of UH Departmental Checks issued (fiscal year)
9. Average number of work days required to issue UH Dept Checks
10. Number of UH Payroll Journal Vouchers processed (fiscal year)
11. Number of RCUH Payroll Journal Vouchers (fiscal year)
12. Number of UH Non-Payroll Journal Vouchers processed (fiscal year)
13. Number of RCUH Non-Payroll Journal Vouchers processed (fiscal year)
14. Number of UH Inter-Island Travel Completion Reports processed (fiscal year)
15. Number of RCUH Inter-Island Travel Completion Reports processed (fiscal year)
16. Number of UH Out-of-State Travel Completion Reports processed (fiscal year)
17. Number of RCUH Out-of-State Travel Completion Reports processed (fiscal year)
18. Number of UH invoices outstanding and total dollar value of UH Accounts Receivables at fiscal year end
19. Business Office staff FTE (Civil Service, APT)

C. Operations and Maintenance measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses):
   1. Number of work orders completed (fiscal year)
   2. Janitor FTE
   3. Ratio of Building gross square feet per Janitor FTE
   4. Groundskeeper/Laborer FTE
   5. Ratio of Campus acres of land per Groundskeeper/Laborer FTE
   6. Building Maintenance FTE
   7. Security FTE

D. Human Resources measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses):
   1. Number of PNF Transactions processed (fiscal year)
   2. Number of New Appointments processed (fiscal year)
   3. Number of Lecturer PNF documents processed (fiscal year)
   4. Number of Form 6 Transactions processed (fiscal year)
   5. Number of Leave Cards processed (calendar year)
   6. Average number of work days required to establish APT positions
   7. Average number of work days to fill faculty/APT positions
   8. Number of Grievances/Investigations filed (fiscal year)
   9. Human Resources FTE
   10. Faculty/Staff Headcount

E. EEO/AA measurements (Standard, comparable measures across campuses):
   1. Number of Training and workshops presented on campus (fiscal year)
   2. Number of EEO related Training and workshop sessions attended (fiscal year)
   3. Utilization analysis and numeric hiring goals
   4. Number of EEO complaints formally filed (fiscal year)
   5. Number of campus EEO investigations, including campus initiated investigations (fiscal year)

F. Surveys – Campus determined structure and content

IV. Summary of Issues and Direction for Administrative Services
FY 2007 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET
BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

DEPARTMENT: University of Hawai'i
Program ID/Org. Code: Community Colleges - UOH 800/DD
Program Title: Community Colleges - UOH 800/DD

Department Contact: Michael Unebasami, Associate VP for Administration and CC Operations
Phone: 956-6230
Date Prepared: August 9, 2005

I. TITLE OF REQUEST:

Program Review / Program Improvement Fund

Description of Request:

Funding to directly support accreditation related program review processes at the campuses and to provide a Program Improvement Fund with flexible resources to allocate to the campuses based on the outcomes of the program review processes to ultimately improve student learning.

II. OPERATING COST SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FTE (P)</th>
<th>FTE (T)</th>
<th>Supplemental FY 07 Request ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Services</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,123,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Other Current Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Current Lease Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Motor Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUEST</strong></td>
<td>(9.25)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>1,683,243</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By MOF:

A (9.25) 0.00 1,683,243
## III. OPERATING COST DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>FTE (P)</th>
<th>FTE (T)</th>
<th>Supplemental FY 07 Request ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>54,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Personal Services
- Prog Improvement Fund - Payroll A 500,000
- Lecturer Replacement - 130 Credits @ 1,405 A 182,850

### Fringe Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Personal Service Costs</th>
<th>9.25 0.00</th>
<th>1,123,243</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td>A 9.25 0.00</td>
<td>1,123,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Other Current Expenses (List by line item)
- Prog Improvement Fund - Others A 500,000
- 3400 Supplies & Non-inventory Equipment A 60,000

### Subtotal Other Current Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Other Current Expenses</th>
<th>550,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td>A 550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Equipment (List by line item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Equipment</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td>A 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### L. Current Lease Payments (Ncts each lease)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Current Lease Payments</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td>A 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M. Motor Vehicles (List Vehicles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal Motor Vehicles</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By MOF</td>
<td>A 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL REQUEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL REQUEST</th>
<th>9.25 0.00</th>
<th>1,683,243</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 9.25 0.00</td>
<td>1,683,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. JUSTIFICATION OF REQUEST

The community colleges are each accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). In June 2004, the ACCJC adopted new standards for accreditation that have placed additional emphasis on the processes linked to the improvement of student learning. This has heightened the expectation that each college will have a program review process in place that looks at the performance of every program and service. This requires that each college have the capacity to collect data, analyze performance, and use the results from these processes to determine resource requirements and allocate available resources to improve student learning. In addition, the ACCJC standards call for the system level administration in multi-campus districts (the Vice President for Community Colleges within the University of Hawai'i system) to make system-wide resource allocations on the basis of the outcomes of the campus program review processes.

Following the December 2002 reorganization of the University, the ACCJC has evaluated the ability of the UH system organization to meet its standards for a multi-campus district. In 2004, six of the seven campuses were on Warning by the ACCJC for our inability to implement a program review process at the campus and system according to their expectations. While four campuses have successfully dealt with the on-campus component of the program review and resource allocation process and thus had the Warning status removed, three campuses are under Warning over this same issue. Part of the problem continues to be our inability to develop an internal resource allocation process across the campuses that is tied to the outcomes of program review.

In the current budget appropriation process, all Legislative appropriations are earmarked for specific program activities within each of the campuses, thus restricting the ability of the system to develop a resource allocation plan based upon the outcomes of the program review process. In addition, our capacity to collect data, analyze the outcomes of programs and services, and make resource allocation decisions is not capable of meeting the requirements of the New ACCJC standards.

The purpose for this request is to develop a system set of resources that can provide the infrastructure needed to meet the new assessment processes, and the flexible resources to differentially allocate resources across the colleges according to the needs identified in the program review process.

Campus Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapi'olani CC</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>105,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>177,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai'i CC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>40,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui CC</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>204,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Systemwide /1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,054,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>1,683,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/1 Includes $1,000,000 Program Review / Program Improvement Fund

V. RELATIONSHIP OF THE REQUEST TO STATE PLAN OR FUNCTIONAL PLAN

This request meets Goal A of the Community College Strategic Plan (Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success) and Goal 1 of the UH System Strategic Plan and Goal 1 (Educational Effective and Student Success). This request is necessary to meet the fundamental goal of integrating measurable student learning outcomes and a cycle of assessment and improvement in all college functioning.
I. Introduction

1. The purpose of this policy is to provide Leeward Community College (LCC) with a formal and systematic method for conducting program reviews. Program reviews provide valuable feedback to the College and are instrumental to the decision-making process for all academic programs, and all support areas. Essentially, the program review process is an on-going evaluation of the school and an integral part of the Institution’s integrated planning, implementation, and budgeting process.

2. The overall focus of the program review process is the collection of evidence to ensure a high quality education is being provided to students and that students are learning. The on-going program review process collects data from which the College can assess student learning and make improvements in relation to student learning, resource allocation, and mission accomplishment. Through assessment and continuous improvement, the program review process is designed to accomplish the following:
   • Ensure educational programs are continually improved
   • Address student and community needs
   • Inspire dialogue throughout the campus
   • Establish a culture of evidence that provides data for decision-making

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

4. For the purposes of this review process, a program is defined as any degree. The programs (agreed upon by the Faculty Senate, Campus Council, and Administration) are as follows: (See Appendix A for an itemized listing of each degree program.)
   • Associate in Arts Degree (AA)
   • Associate in Science Degree (AS)
   • Associate in Applied Science Degree (AAS)
   • Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD)

5. A support area is defined as an administrative or support activity that is deemed by the Campus to be sufficiently related in terms of objectives, clients served, resources used, or other common identification for the purposes of evaluating performance, determining accountability, and improving quality. The support areas (modeled after the College organizational structure) are as follows: (See Appendix A for an itemized listing of each support area.)
   • Office of the Chancellor
   • Academic Services
• Student Services
• Administrative Services

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

II. **Policy Objectives**

The objectives of this policy are as follows:

1. To provide the College with important data that can be used for the evaluation and assessment of the academic programs, and support areas.

2. To promote campus dialog necessary for the continued exchange of ideas and identification of improvements.

3. To assure that each area of the College is providing quality support of student learning and related student outcomes.

4. To create an avenue for changes and improvements that leads to budget and allocation decisions.

5. To establish a model or method for conducting program reviews that facilitates the efficient evaluation of all academic programs, and support areas.

6. To prescribe an administrative reporting format that is directive, yet generic enough, to accommodate the different programs and areas under review and the variety of data that will be collected.

7. To identify key positions and specific responsibilities that are essential for the oversight and improvement of the review process.

8. To identify the specific academic programs and support areas to be assessed and a time frame for conducting the reviews.
III. Program Review Process

1. The program review process is on-going, year-round assessment of the various academic programs and support activities of the College. Program Coordinators* and Support Area Supervisors should be continually engaged in some aspect of the program review process and not wait for direction or oversight from Administration.

*Due to the complexity of the AA Degree, a Program Coordinator will be assigned for each of the general education outcome areas. The AS and AAS Degree programs have assigned coordinators.

2. The program review process supports the integration of instructional issues with the support areas that results in action plan submission and budget prioritization. The program reviews of the academic degree/certificate programs drive all of the other reviews, studies, and action plans on campus so that academic program reviews are launched first in the cycle. Support area reviews are based on results of instructional assessments conducted within the framework of the academic program reviews, as well as reviews that are conducted within the support areas, on issues raised within their professional areas. Ultimately, the goal is to improve student learning.
3. An Assessment Team comprised of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer (VC/CAO), the Director of Policy Planning and Assessment, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Institutional Researcher, a representative from the Faculty Senate, and others as selected by the VC/CAO will oversee the review process for the College. Oversight entails the following:

- Assisting Program Coordinators and Support Area Supervisors with the development of student learning outcomes and the identification of appropriate data collection methods
- Monitoring the timeliness of review completions
- Assisting with the analysis of data and the identification of action plans for improvement
- Assembling, publishing, and distributing an Annual Assessment Progress Report each August.
- Supporting the design of action plans for the budget and allocation process

IV. Reporting Requirements and Scheduled Timelines:

1. All approved degree programs and support areas are subject to a comprehensive review at least once every four years on a schedule to be developed by the campus and submitted by the VC/CAO to the Office of the Chancellor. Completed reports will be kept on file in the Office of the VC/CAO. After completion of the first LCC comprehensive program reviews in April 2006, individual academic programs and support areas reviews will be scheduled according to a program review timeline (Appendix B).

2. Program Coordinators and Support Area Supervisors will submit Program/Support Area Assessment Templates (Appendix C) to the Assessment Team annually by May 1.

3. Program Coordinators (in conjunction with Discipline Coordinators) and Support Area Supervisors will be responsible for the comprehensive program review reports. These reports will include the following information:

   - **Program Overview**: General Description of Program and College Mission (Do the Program objectives align or support the College Mission?)
   - **Student Learning Outcomes**: Program (Program/Support Area Assessment Template, Appendix C) & Course Assessment (SLO module in Curriculum Central)
   - **Student Achievement Data**: (Demographics; Student Needs; Enrollment Data; Transfer Numbers and Efficiency; GPA; Course & Program Completion; Retention & Persistence Rates, etc.) Common data elements will be collected annually by the institutional researcher.
   - **Faculty and Staff**: Response to Mission, Professional Development (Faculty/Student ratios, levels of degrees, number of tenured vs. untenured and classifications)
   - **Curriculum**: Innovations, Challenges, Issues, Trends
• **Support:** (Changes in technology, Library & Learning Resources, Facilities, Marketing, Equipment, and other resources such as Academic Support, Administrative Services, Student Services, and Chancellor’s Office, that are needed to improve student learning)

• **External:** Advisory Boards, Community Input, Job Outlooks, National Standards, Specialized Accreditation

V. **Integration of Program Review and Strategic Planning:** For a visual flowchart of the program review process see Appendix D.

VI. **Policy Change:** In the event that an academic program or support area desires a change or adjustment to this review policy, the request should be sent to the Assessment Team for their review. The Assessment Team will evaluate the merits of the proposed change, and if required, seek coordination/approval from the Faculty Senate and Campus Council.
Detailed Listing of Academic Programs and Support Areas

**Programs** (agreed upon by the Faculty Senate, Campus Council, and Administration) are as follows:

- **Associate in Arts Degree** (Academic Subject Certificates* will be reviewed with the AA Degree)
  
  Abstract Thinking  
  Critical Thinking  
  Information Retrieval & Technology  
  Oral Communication  
  Quantitative Reasoning  
  Written communication

- **Associate in Science Degree** (Human Services/Substance Abuse Counseling Certificate will be reviewed with the AS Degrees)

  Accounting  
  Business Technology  
  (Business Foundations Certificate* will be reviewed with the Business Technology AS Degree)  
  Digital Media  
  Information and Computer Science  
  Television Production

- **Associate in Applied Science Degree**

  Automotive Technology  
  Food Service  
  **Supervisory Management**  
  (E-Commerce Certificates* will be reviewed with the Supervisory Management AAS Degree)

- **Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (OCEWD)**

  *Academic Subject Certificates and certificates of 12 credits or fewer will be reviewed via course assessment and student achievement data

**Support Areas** (modeled after the College organizational structure) are as follows:

- **Office of the Chancellor**
  
  Academic Administration  
  International Education  
  Marketing
Appendix A

Funds Development

- **Academic Services**
  - Educational Media Center
  - Grants Writing
  - Information Technology Group
  - Learning Resource Center
  - Library
  - Innovation Center for Teaching & Learning
  - Assessment Office

- **Student Services**
  - Admissions & Records
  - Counseling
  - Financial Aid
  - Job Placement
  - Student Health Center
  - Student Activities

- **Administrative Services**
  - Business Office
  - Human Resource Office
  - Operations & Maintenance
  - Security
### Program Review Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Next Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Arts Degree</td>
<td>Academic Year 2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Academic Subject Certificates* will be reviewed with the AA Degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>Academic Year 2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Science Degrees:</td>
<td>Academic Year 2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Business Foundations Certificate* will be reviewed with the Business Technology AS Degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Human Services/Substance Abuse Counseling Certificate will be reviewed with the AS Degrees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>Academic Year 2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Applied Science Degrees:</td>
<td>Academic Year 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E-Commerce Certificates* will be reviewed with the Supervisory Management AAS Degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
<td>Academic Year 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Continuing Education &amp; Workforce Development</td>
<td>Academic Year 2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chancellor</td>
<td>Academic Year 2008-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Academic Subject Certificates and certificates of 12 credits or fewer will be reviewed via course assessment and student achievement data.*
# Program/Support Area Assessment Template

Date Submitted: ___________  Submitted by: _______________  Assessment Team Date: ___________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Program/Support Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) Mission/Purpose (Reference LCC Mission)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) LCC Strategic Plan (Reference Goals/Objectives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) Goal/Objective (Reference Program Goals/Objectives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) Outcome Measure (What is being counted or measured?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) Definition of Data Sample (Where or from whom will data be collected?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(When will data be collected?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(How many data samples are intended to be collected?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Why is this appropriate data?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7) Method of Data Collection (How will data be collected and by whom?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe assessment tool (survey, rubric, etc.) to be used; attach if possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8) Actual Level of Results (How many samples were collected?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What actual data (numerical results such as total count, percentages, averages, etc.) were collected?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9) Analysis (What have you learned, both in terms of the assessment process and student achievement of SLOs, as a result of this assessment?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10) Plan of Action (What changes do you propose to improve student learning (for the student learning outcomes assessed) or to improve the support area?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Budget Impact (How much will the action cost?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(How could the proposed plan be funded?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If a grant will fund the proposal, how will long-term funding be carried through?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty/Staff/Administration
- Completes annual revisit of the Strategic Plan (February-March)
- Completes comprehensive 4-year program reviews (May)
- Completes prioritization and budget implications

Institutional Research Office and Career Technical Education Researcher
- Collects common student achievement data for all programs annually
- Compiles “Annual Assessment Progress Report”
- Distributes “Annual Assessment Progress Report” including common data elements (August)

Assessment Team
- Compiles and forwards course assessment reports to IR Office (May)
- Posts Program and Support Area assessments templates to assessment website (May)
- Forwards Program and Support Area assessment templates to IR Office (May)
- Submits assessment analysis to IR Office (July)

Program Coordinator
- Submits course assessments to Assessment Team via Curriculum Central

Program Coordinator & Support Area Supervisor
- Submits assessment templates to Assessment Team annually (May)
Display Course

APPROVED CORE OUTLINE

A.A. Core Course: No Classification: N/A

1 Course Alpha and Number
   - ICS 101

2 Credit Hours
   - 3.0

3 Effective Date
   - Spring 2006

4 Review Date
   - 9/2/2005

5 Course Title
   - TOOLS FOR THE INFORMATION AGE

6 Discipline
   - Information and Computer Science

7 Division
   - Mathematics and Natural Sciences

8 Prerequisites:
   - What evidence exists that the course is taught so that skills are built on what
     has been learned earlier in the course (or in a previous course) and will lead
     to what will be learned in a future course? (addresses sequencing)

   Eng 100 and Math 100 or equivalent, all with a grade of C or better, or consent of
   instructor. The ICS Department has carefully planned the sequencing of all courses
   that lead to transfer to four year institutions. Much time was spent as a department
   reviewing prerequisites and skills required to maximize the learning experience of
   each student. The course sequence has been patterned after those of other
   community colleges in Hawaii as well as on the mainland. The College of Business
   at the University of Hawaii at Manoa has also contributed to the content design to
   prepare students planning to a business program. In addition it is designed to equip
   students to transfer to other campuses within the UH system.

9 Corequisites
   - None

10 Recommended Preparation
   - ICS 100

11 Catalog Description
This course examines the fundamental concepts and terms of computer technology, major application packages as tools in problem-solving, and computer technology trends and impact on individuals and society. * (45 lecture hours). (Formerly ICS 115)

12 What are the general student learning outcomes? (What knowledge and/or skills will successful completion develop in the student?)

The student will: Use a computer for basic operating system functions. Use the Internet to do research thus developing strategies for finding information on the Internet. Use a spreadsheet program to store and retrieve information. Use a spreadsheet program to format, calculate, and present data. Develop professional spreadsheets and graphs using features of the spreadsheet application. Develop and deliver a professional presentation using presentation software and basic presentation skills. Use web editor software to develop a web site with hyperlinks, text and images. Use applications to integrate with other programs such as a spreadsheets, graphs and presentation software. Use web based course content to retrieve course information and communicate with the instructor and others in the class.

13 Course Content: (Including approximate times spent on each topic.)

- Microcomputer Operating System 5%
- Internet 15%
- Spreadsheets 40%
- Presentation Software 25%
- Webpage Design 15%

This course was discussed at length with a system-wide articulation committee to ensure the breadth, depth and relevancy of the course. This is to enable students taking the course to transfer freely between campuses and to ensure minimum skills are met system-wide.

In addition, this course covers all topics normally included in an introductory course in computer literacy, as evidenced by all available texts in computer literacy and the topics covered by other college-level introductory computer courses, according to college catalogs and review of course outlines (e.g., UH-Manoa). The course covers all topics needed for successful use of a computer in business, education and personal need. Individual course syllabi, study guides, and required assignments and readings indicate the breadth and depth of the course.

Evidence that the course reflects current theory and practice in computer literacy is gained by comparing the course syllabus and tutorials with those for ICS 101 at other community colleges such as Honolulu Community College. Evidence can also be found in the continued use of new editions of introductory texts, which reflect notions of currency by experts in the field. Comparing detailed lessons and tutorials used over the past five years, and noting revision to reflect current theory and practice in the field, is also evidence. This material is available from the ICS department.

14 Course Curricular Function: (Please explain the function of this course as it
Based on the Mission Statement of Leeward Community College, the ICS Department strives to:

1. To provide vocational and technical programs, which both prepare students for immediate employment and provide the paraprofessional and trained workforce needed by the State.
2. To specialize in the effective teaching of general education and other introductory liberal arts and pre-professional courses.
3. To provide opportunities for personal enrichment, occupational upgrading, and career mobility through credit and non-credit courses and activities.

**Justify the need/demand for the proposed course. (Attach documentation, e.g., surveys, reports, advisory committee recommendations, etc.)**

This course has been in existence since 1969. It has been revised over the years to reflect current demands of education, industry and personal computing. Currently it is undergoing close scrutiny by all UH campuses. Changes as a result of this process will be reflected in future course modification.

**Justify the level of proposed course:**

What evidence exists that the course appropriately covers areas with sufficient emphasis for a remedial, a developmental, or a college-level course? (addresses rigor)

This is an introductory level college transfer course. It is assumed that students will have little or no knowledge of microcomputer applications.

This course was thoroughly researched by the PCC for ICS/IS/Data Processing to determine level and content. All Community Colleges agreed on minimum entry-level and exit-level skills for reading and computation skills.

The course syllabus, tutorials, and course requirements indicate the high expectations held for students in this class. Feedback for students is prompt and frequent. Homework matters in this class, and collaborative learning is encouraged whenever possible. The level and quantity of reading, writing, and analysis required is consistent with that normally required in college-level classes, and requires students to spend from 5-6 hours a week in independent reading and writing for the class (homework). In addition the course has undergone close scrutiny by all Hawaii Community Colleges to ensure articulation between campuses.

**How is this course related to the educational needs and goals of the division, college, and community as reflected in the ADP? How is it related to courses and programs in other disciplines?**

This course relates to the ADP by satisfying the demands of industry for basic computer skills. Additionally it is required at Leeward Community College for the Automotive AS Degree and the Digital Media Certificate. The class also addresses community needs for those wishing to upgrade job skills or to pursue general interest courses.

**For what program was the course designed? Is it an approved program? Will the course be required or elective? Will the course lengthen the time for the students to complete the program? Will it replace another course?**

This course is designed to articulate with all UH campuses for computer literacy requirements. It is currently not required by the ICS program at LCC but is required by other programs within the UH system such as the College of Business.

**How many hours will the students spend per week in lectures, laboratories, seminars, or other supervised instruction?**

This course is designed for 3 semester credits or 45 semester hours. Weekly time will vary by delivery mode but will be comparable to 2.5 hours per week.
Students are expected to spend two hours outside of class for every one hour in class reading the text, completing project assignments and preparing for exams and quizzes. In addition, group projects may be assigned that require additional time meeting with others. Any variation in delivery modes will assure that students cover the same material as those attending a face-to-face class.

**Distance Education**

a) What methods will be employed to ensure timely and effective interaction between faculty and students and student to student? b) What technological skills will students need to succeed in this course? c) How will the instructor execute and ensure the rigor and breadth of the course through electronic delivery?

a) When ICS 100 is taught as a Distance Education course, it is offered on the Internet as a WebCT course. WebCT has built-in email and the instructor checks and answers email daily. In addition, there is an on-line bulletin board (asynchronous communication) in WebCT that is utilized for discussion questions posted by the instructor and/or students. WebCT also provides a means of chatting privately or in groups as needed. Students communicate with each other via email and the bulletin board. They are encouraged to form small study groups which can also be used for group projects. The instructor is also available using conventional synchronous means of telephone, and face-to-face office hours.

b) Student need basic computer and keyboarding skills, including being able to log onto the Internet, use WebCT email, send email attachments, and explore linked websites. Some students may need the class software and are directed to the LCC helpdesk for instructions/problems with installation.

c) This course is identical in content and requirements regardless of whether it is taught live or via the Internet. The same standard of evaluation for exams and written assignments is used. Only the method of delivery is different.

20 **What independent work will be required of students? (Reading, research, writing, special projects, etc.)** For written or other special projects, identify the usual number and length of projects. For reading, where the entire book or pamphlet is not used, indicate the portion of the material to be used. The students will be required to complete independent projects using the microcomputer applications. Students are typically required to complete eight projects, each taking approximately one week to complete.

21 **What experiential or professional preparation is required to teach this course?**

- Do we have a full-time faculty member who meets these requirements? If not, who will teach the course?
  
  We have sufficient full time faculty who meet the requirements to teach this course.

22 **Will this course require additional staff, equipment, facilities, or other cost items? If so, are they available? Are they included in the budget, or will they be covered by reallocation?**

This course will not require any additional staff, equipment or costs.

**Distance Education**

What type of academic support and technology training will be required to ensure pedagogical development of the instructor for this course?

Depending on the degree of competency of each individual instructor, instructors will need periodic workshops/seminars in basic to advanced WebCT and other workshops and/or individual mentoring in using various software to prepare lessons and tutorials for students. Opportunities to discuss problems/solutions unique to distance education—such as those provided by the LCC Media Center and UH Manoa’s TALENT program—help to ensure pedagogical development of the instructor, as does access to on-line/live conferences on Internet instructions.

23 **Is a similar course taught at any other community college? Any other UH college? If so, provide information about the course identification and content of similar courses. If this course differs in important ways from existing similar courses, explain how.**

This course is taught at all other community colleges as well as Manoa. Per PCC
If this course is comparable to a course taught on a four-year campus, and is intended to count in lieu of that course, the proposal must contain evidence of up-to-date information as to the content and objectives of the course on the four-year campus. (This information may be obtained through discussion with faculty teaching the course on the four-year campus or by obtaining a copy of the course syllabus or outline.)

This course is also taught at Manoa and articulates with the College of Business Administration as well as the College of Education. On-going articulation conversations are in progress for this course. Current course syllabi are available in the ICS Department at LCC to show evidence of compatibility.

If the course is appropriate for articulation with the UHM general education core or with any other department or college requirements on a UH four-year campus, provide a brief rationale.

This course is also taught at Manoa and articulates to the College of Business Administration as well as the College of Education but is currently not part of their general education core.

Expectations for Student Participation. Students are expected to spend at least two hours outside of class for every hour in class by means of the following activities:
- Homework assignments (reading and problem solving)
- Research project(s)
- Computer project(s)
- Rehearsal time

Method of Instruction:

What methods of instruction are used in this course? What discussions have occurred about their effectiveness?
- Lecture/Teacher’s demo
- Class discussion
- Use of overhead projection, video, film, and slides
- Computer activities

Others - Discussions on effective methods of teaching computer science courses are on-going between the full and part-time faculty in the ICS Department, and informally between full and part-time faculty within the Math and Science Division. This discussion is extended to all campuses, including UH Manoa, West Oahu and UH Hilo. Current meetings to ensure transferability and articulation are on-going between the campuses of the UH system.

Distance Education

How will specific technology be integrated into the course, and how will its use be appropriate to the nature and objectives of the course?

If taught as a distance education course, this course is offered via the Internet using WebCT. All course lessons, with appropriate links, illustrations, PowerPoint presentations, etc., are available as part of the course. In addition, much of the supplemental material is available on CD ROM for those students who must interact using a slow means of connection to the Internet. By the very nature of this course, students must learn to independently access the Internet and use computer applications as part of the learning process. Software tutorials are provided both online, in hard copy and on CD ROM. Students are encouraged to interact with each other to solve software problems needed to complete assignments.

Method of Evaluation:

Mastery of course content and objective by:
- Exam
- Written projects, critical-thinking/exercises
- Take home assignments

Currently Available Textbook Option and Supplies, If Required:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I
SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The purpose of this reorganization is to establish a new organizational infrastructure between the University system and the autonomous community colleges and four-year campuses. The University is proposing the establishment of the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges which will be responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, and development of appropriate support services for the seven community colleges. A dual reporting relationship is being proposed, whereby the Community College Chancellors report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges for leadership and coordination of the community college operations, and concurrently report to the President for system wide policy making. This dual reporting relationship is designed to preserve previous Board action to promote and facilitate campus autonomy in balance with system wide academic and administrative functions and operations.

The reorganization proposes to realign the community colleges academic and administrative affairs support services to the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The academic affairs support functions are being transferred from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy and the administrative affairs support functions from the Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer.

The proposed reorganization is envisioned to have three positive outcomes: 1) improve the performance of the community colleges as a system and as individual campuses in light of accreditation standards for both the system and the community college campuses, 2) promote coherence in the conduct of activities such as program reviews that may lead to resource allocation decisions, and 3) enhance the advocacy for the community colleges as a group.

Additional funding required for the proposed reorganization is estimated at $25,000 annually and to be addressed through the reallocation of non-instructional funds. Charged against the $25,000 will be a portion of the salary of the Vice President and office equipment for the new Vice President and a Private Secretary. General funds made available as a result of the conversion of the funding source of other positions will be used for the new Vice President’s salary. Cost of the Private Secretary salary will be funded through an internal reallocation of funds. Consultation with faculty, staff, students and the unions has been completed.
PROPOSED REORGANIZATION FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI’I SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

I. PRESENT ORGANIZATION

As the chief executive officer of the University of Hawai‘i, the President is responsible for administering and coordinating University-wide functions through appropriate senior executives and managers. The UH System administration is currently comprised of the President, 16 senior executives, and 1 senior manager. At the system level, the following positions are direct reports to the President: Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy, Vice President for Research, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Administration, and Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer. A chancellor for each of the ten campuses comprising the system also directly report to the President: University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, University of Hawai‘i at Hilo, University of Hawai‘i at West O‘ahu, Hawai‘i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kapi‘olani Community College, Kaua‘i Community College, Leeward Community College, Maui Community College, and Windward Community College. The Vice President for Legal Affairs and University General Counsel and the Director of Internal Audit report directly to the Board of Regents.

The following summarizes the results of the November 2004 system level reorganization:

- Three executive classes were abolished (Chief of Staff, Vice President for External Affairs and University Relations, and Vice President for International Education); one executive class created (Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer); and five vacant positions abolished (position counts to remain with the University; one position count was used to convert a temporary Private Secretary position to permanent status), with an estimated annual budgeted cost savings of approximately $876,000.

- The Chief of Staff position was redescribed to Vice President for Administration.

- The staff and functions of the Office of Human Resources, Office of Information Technology Services, Office of the former Vice President for External Affairs and University Relations, and Office of Capital Improvements were reassigned to the Office of the Vice President for Administration. The Office of Information Technology Services reports to the President for planning and policy functions and the Vice President for Administration for operational functions.

- The staff and functions of the University Budget Office, Financial Management Office, Community Colleges Administrative Affairs, and Central Administrative Affairs were realigned to report to the Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer.
• The staff and functions of the Office of Internal Audit were realigned to report directly to the Board of Regents with an indirect reporting line to the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer.

• The staff and functions of the University Risk Management Office were reassigned to report to the Office of the Vice President for Legal Affairs and University General Counsel.

• The Vice President for Academic Affairs was retitled to Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy.

• The staff and functions of the Office of the former Vice President for International Education were reassigned to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy.

• The staff and functions of the Distance Learning Office were reassigned to the Office of Planning and Policy.

• Changes to the functions of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs were adopted.

• The Council of Chancellors and Council of Community College Chancellors were recognized not as administrative units, but entities that provide advice and guidance on strategic planning and program development guidance to the President.

• The informal line of communication between the President and the Pūko‘a Council and Student caucus was recognized.

II. PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

The reorganization proposes to create the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges which will be responsible for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges. The new Vice President for Community Colleges will be the central leadership position, reflecting the collective mission of the community colleges.

The Community College Chancellors will report to the Vice President for Community Colleges, but will also have a dual reporting relationship to the President. The Community College Chancellors will report to the Vice President for Community Colleges for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges and to the President for system wide policy development, on par with the chancellors of the four-year campuses.
The proposal plans to retain the following community college executive positions:

- 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 executive positions of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Associate Vice President for Administrative Affairs will be retained, but realigned to report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges.

The reorganization proposal involves:

- Establishing the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges to report to the President.

- Creating a dual reporting relationship for the Community College Chancellors. The Chancellors will report to the President for system wide policy matters and to the Vice President for Community Colleges for operational matters.

- Realigning the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (Community Colleges) from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy to the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The office will continue its respective functions, including providing leadership among the community colleges and insuring the integration of community colleges affairs with system functions.

- Realigning the Associate Vice President for Administrative Affairs (Community Colleges) from the Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer to the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges. The office will continue its respective functions, including providing leadership among the community colleges and insuring the integration of community colleges affairs with system functions.

There will be no other organizational or functional changes to the system wide offices. All ten chancellors will continue to report to the President and collectively meet as the Council of Chancellors, which is not an administrative unit, to advise the President on strategic planning, program development, and other matters of concern. The community college chancellors will meet as the Council of Community College Chancellors, which is also not an administrative unit, to provide advice to the President and Vice President for Community Colleges on community college policy issues and other matters of community college interest.
III. BACKGROUND AND REASONS FOR THE REORGANIZATION

Prior to January 2003, the University had a chancellor serving as the chief executive officer for the community college system and a provost for each of the seven community colleges. The community college chief executive officer was responsible for community college system policy to include all aspects of its management, operations and administration. In December 2002, the Board approved a reorganization of the system offices resulting in the abolishment of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges and realignment of the provosts as direct reports to the president. The Provosts were subsequently retitled to Chancellors.

The proposed reorganization creates a new Vice President for Community Colleges that will be responsible for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges. Each community college chancellor would retain responsibility and control over campus operations, administration, and management. Community college chancellors would continue to have direct access to the President for University system-wide policy, on par with the chancellors of the four-year campuses.

In a January 2005 report, the Commission on the Accreditation of Community and Junior Colleges expressed concern that a lack of clarity, coherence, support, and advocacy persists regarding operational decisions distinct to the role and mission of the community colleges within the University of Hawai‘i System due to the current organizational structure. The proposed reorganization to create the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges and a dual reporting relationship for the Community College Chancellors is intended to create an organizational structure responsive to the Commission’s concerns. The proposal preserves the Community College Chancellors direct access to the President for policy matters, and their role, responsibility and authority for the operations, management, and administration of their campus.

The proposed reorganization is envisioned to have three positive outcomes: 1) improve the performance of the community colleges as a system and as individual campuses in light of accreditation standards for both the system and the community college campuses, 2) promote coherence in the conduct of activities such as program reviews that may lead to resource allocation decisions, and 3) enhance the advocacy for the community colleges as a group.

The proposed reorganization of community colleges is consistent with the objectives of the System Strategic Plan, in that the proposal seeks to “…allocate and manage resources to achieve continuing improvement in organization, people, and processes and to secure competitive advantage.” The reorganization will not adversely impact the services to programs and students.
IV. IMPACT ON STAFFING AND RESOURCES

Positions will be redescribed as necessary, commensurate with the new functional statements. The following staffing changes are being proposed:

- Vacant Position No. 89001, formerly assigned to the Office of International Education, will be transferred to the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges and redescribed as the Vice President for Community Colleges.

- Vacant Position No. 100041, formerly assigned to the Office of International Education, will be transferred to the new Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges and redescribed as a Private Secretary for the Vice President.

- The staff and functions of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (Community Colleges), Position No. 89222, will be organizationally realigned to report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges. There will be no changes in position duties or office functions as it relates to community colleges.

- The staff and functions of the Associate Vice President for Administrative Affairs (Community Colleges), Position No. 89140, will be organizationally realigned to report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges. There will be no changes in position duties or office functions as it relates to supporting the community colleges.

The additional cost to implement the proposed reorganization will be approximately $25,000 from the reallocation of non-instructional funds. The salary of the new Vice President for Community Colleges is comprised of a portion of the $25,000 and from funds made available due to the conversion of other positions’ funding from general to extramural funds. Office equipment for the new Vice President and Private Secretary will be charged against the $25,000. Cost of the Private Secretary salary will be funded through an internal reallocation of funds.

V. CONSULTATIONS DURING THE REORGANIZATION PROCESS

Copies of the proposed reorganization for consultation purposes were provided to the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) and the Student Caucus. Comments from the ACCFSC and Student Caucus were taken into consideration and incorporated as appropriate.

Consultation with the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA) and the Hawai‘i Government Employees Association (HGEA) was completed. Comments and recommendations of the UHPA and HGEA were taken into consideration and incorporated as appropriate. Although blue-collar workers are unaffected by the
proposed reorganization, the United Public Workers (UPW) has been informed of the proposed reorganization.

The proposed reorganization addresses comments and recommendations made by the Office of Human Resources and University Budget Office.

VI. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Five organizational models were considered.

(1) **Separate community college system and governing board model (Kentucky model):** The community colleges would become a separate system with its own governing board. Community college chancellors would report to a chief executive officer for the community college system, who would report to the board. Community college administrative and academic policy/support functions would report to the chief executive officer for the community college system. A Hawai‘i variant would have the community college chief executive officer report to the current Board of Regents. *The separate community college system and governing board model was rejected because of the need to realize potential synergies between the community colleges and the baccalaureate campuses.*

(2) **Community college system chief executive officer model (Tsunoda 1983-2002):** A community college system chief executive officer would be responsible for community college system policy, management, and administration and report to the president. Community college chancellors would report to the system chief executive officer. The system chief executive officer would sit on the president’s cabinet and represent community college interests. Community college system administrative and academic policy/support functions would report to the community college system chief executive officer. *The community college system chief executive officer model was rejected because the campus Chancellors need sufficient authority as chief executive officers of their institutions to be responsible to their dynamic local environments and to be able to fulfill all of the expectations of the chief executive officer for a separately accredited college within a community college system.*

(3) **Community college coordinator model (Melendy 1965-72):** A vice-president level position would be created for community college coordination. Community college chancellors would report to the President. Community college system administrative and academic policy/support functions would report to the coordinating vice president. A variant would have the vice president exercise more control over such system functions as planning and system budgeting, and where policy, law, or accreditation dictate that the community colleges be treated as a system. *The community college coordinator model was rejected because the legal and Board of Regents structures for the community college system, such as a common legislative budget and common faculty classification and personnel policies, require more than just a coordinating function.*
(4) **Community college collective leadership model:** There would be no community college system chief executive officer. Community college chancellors would report to the president. Community college system decisions would be decided by the Council of Community College Chancellors with the council naming a permanent or rotating chair. The Council Chair would serve as a member of the president’s cabinet. Community college system administrative and academic policy/support functions would report to the chair. The community college collective leadership model was rejected because of the lack of clear decision-making authority.

(5) **Current organization (status quo):** The president serves as the community college system chief executive officer. Community college chancellors report to the president. Community college system administrative support functions report to the Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer, and community college academic policy/support functions report to the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy. The current organization (status quo) was rejected because it does not address the current organizational ambiguities and operational needs of the community colleges.

Chancellors and faculty generally agreed that there were a number of positive attributes to the present organization; in particular, some Chancellors and their faculties expressed the desire to maintain a direct reporting relationship between the Community College Chancellors and the President. At the same time, they recognized that more “coherence” among community college operations is needed in order to satisfy the current Accrediting Commission on the Community and Junior College standards. Other Chancellors and their faculties were more accepting of a reporting relationship through a community college system chief executive officer to the President.

In light of organizational concerns expressed by the Commission on the Accreditation of Community and Junior Colleges and the results of discussions with the community college chancellors and others, it was concluded that the appropriate organizational structure would be to establish for the Community College Chancellors a dual reporting relationship to the President and to a new Vice President for Community Colleges. Functionally, the new Vice President for Community Colleges will be responsible for community college related system policies, resource allocation, and central services and support for the seven community colleges. Each community college chancellor would retain responsibility and control over campus operations, administration, and management. Community college chancellors would continue to have direct access to the President for University system-wide policy, on par with the chancellors of four-year campuses.