ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES

*Western Association
of Schools and Colleges*

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
SHERRILL L. AMADOR
Public Member

Vice Chairperson
STEVEN KINSELLA
Administration

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
KRISTA JOHNS

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
JOHN NIXON

Associate Vice President
NORVAL WELLSFRY

MEMO TO: Dr. Douglas Dykstra, Chancellor
Windward Community College
45-720 Keaahala Road
Kaneohe, HI 96744

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President

DATE: December 17, 2013

SUBJECT: Enclosed <u>Corrected Report</u> of the External Evaluation Team

Previously, the chairperson of the External Evaluation Team (Evaluation Team) that recently visited Windward Community College sent you a draft External Evaluation Report (Report) affording you the opportunity to correct errors of fact. We assume you have responded to the Team Chair. The Commission now has received the final version of the Report, a copy of which is enclosed for you. Please examine the enclosed Report.

- If you believe that the Report contains inaccuracies, you are invited to call them to the attention of the Commission. To do so, you should submit a letter stating recommended corrections to the ACCJC President. The letter should arrive at the Commission office by end of day **December 19, 2013,** in order to be included in Commission materials. The letter may also be sent electronically as a PDF attachment.

- If the institution also wishes to submit additional material to the Commission, it should exercise care, keeping in mind the Commission cannot read and absorb large amounts of material on short notice. Material should arrive at the ACCJC office no later than end of day **December 19, 2013**.

- ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the Report. The Commission requires that the institution notify the Commission office **by end of day December 19, 2013,** or earlier, of its intent to attend the meeting. This enables the Commission to invite the Team Chair to attend. The CEO must provide any materials for distribution to Commissioners by December 19, 2013. Materials will not be accepted after that date.

The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on **January 8-10, 2014,** at the Sheraton Grand Sacramento Hotel, Sacramento, California. The enclosure, "Procedures for an Institutional Chief Executive Officer's Appearance Before the Commission," addresses the protocol of such appearances.

Please note that the Commission will not consider the institution as being indifferent if its CEO does not choose to appear before the Commission. If the institution does request to be heard at the Commission meeting, the chairperson of the Evaluation Team will also be asked to be present to explain the reasons for statements in the Report. Both parties will be allowed brief testimony before the Commission deliberates in private.

The enclosed Report should be considered confidential and not given general distribution until it has been acted upon by the Commission and you have been notified by letter of the action taken.

BAB/tl

Enclosure

cc: Ms. Jan Lubin, Accreditation Liaison Officer (w/o enclosure)

Procedures for an Institutional Chief Executive Officer's Appearance Before the Commission

The Commission considers institutional accreditation actions in January and June of each calendar year. ACCJC policy provides that when the Commission is deliberating or acting upon matters that concern an institution, it will invite the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the institution to meet with the Commission in Executive Session.[1] The appearance is for the purpose of discussing issues of substance and any Accreditation Standards deficiencies noted in the report. There is no requirement that the CEO attend the Commission meeting. If the Commission is considering institutional action as a result of an evaluation team visit, and if the CEO elects to attend the meeting, the Commission will also invite the Chair of the Evaluation Team (Team Chair) or designee to attend.

An institution must send written notification to the ACCJC office at least 15 working days before the scheduled Commission meeting if the CEO wishes to attend. The institution should bear in mind the evaluation of the institution is based upon the conditions at the institution at the time of the team visit.

At the meeting, the institutional CEO will be invited to make a brief presentation, followed by questions from the Commission. The CEO is expected to be the presenter, and should consult with Commission staff if there are plans to invite other representatives to join the CEO. On the day of the Commission meeting, ACCJC staff will escort the CEO (and additional representatives) to and from the designated waiting area to the meeting at the appropriate time. An institution's presentation should not exceed five (5) minutes. The Commission reserves the right to establish a different time limit on such presentations.

The Team Chair or designee will also attend the presentation, normally by conference call. The Commissioners may ask questions of the Team Chair after college representatives have exited. The Team Chair will then be excused, and the Commission will continue its deliberations in closed session.

The CEO will be notified in writing of the subsequent action taken by the Commission.

---

[1] Policies that are relevant to this process are the *Policy on Access to Commission Meetings, Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions, Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Members Institutions, and Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of ACCJC and Member Institutions.*

Follow-Up Visit Report

Windward Community College
45-720 Kea'ahala Road
Kane'ohe, Hawaii 96744

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
for Community and Junior Colleges
This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Windward Community College

on

November 13 - 14, 2013

Dr. Marilyn Meyer-Behringer   Former Vice President of Instruction   Reedley College
Name of Team Chair   Title   Institution

Deborah Campbell   Former Controller   Yosemite Community College District
Name of Team Member   Title   Institution

Follow-Up Visit Report

DATE: November 24, 2013

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Marilyn Meyer-Behringer, Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Windward Community College
November 13 - 14, 2013

Introduction

A comprehensive visit was conducted to Windward Community College in October 2012. At its meeting of January 9 – 11, 2013, the Accrediting Commission acted to require Windward Community College to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. The visiting team, Dr. Marilyn Meyer-Behringer and Ms. Deborah Campbell, conducted the site visit to Windward Community College on November 13 – 14, 2013.

The purpose of the team visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the College was accurate through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous and positive improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution has addressed the recommendations made by the 2012 and 2006 comprehensive evaluation teams, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

The team found that the College was welcoming and had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon with the Team Chair and by making appropriate documents available through the College's websites and online databases. Over the course of the two day visit the team met with the Chancellor of the College, the University Vice-President of Community Colleges (VPCC), the Accreditation Liaison Officer and Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, the Accreditation Follow-Up Report college team, the Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Affairs, the Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs, the Interim Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Director of the Office of Career and Community Education, the Director of Computer Resources, the Deans of Division I and Division II, members of the faculty, staff and students.

The Follow-Up Report and visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations:

Windward Community College Recommendations

Recommendation 1:
As noted in the 2006 visiting team report and in order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution complete the development and assessment of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs and general education, as well as develop and assess learning outcomes in student services, using the results for improvement of student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness. (ER 10, I.B.3, I.B.7, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.B.4)

Recommendation 2:
In order to fully meet the standards, it is recommended that the college design, document and implement an effective, integrated planning model, system of program review and resource allocation process which is inclusive of all institutional planning activities including administrative services and technology. The college should develop formal systematic evaluation mechanisms for assessing the quality and effectiveness of planning structures and processes and use assessment results for the improvement of learning and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1 through I.B.7, II.A.2, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, II.B, III.B.2, III.C.1, III.C.2, II.D.1, III.D.3, III.D.4, IV.A.1, IV.a.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.3.g)

Recommendation 3:
In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop a comprehensive staffing plan as well as a professional development plan designed to meet the needs of its personnel and fully implement the civil service evaluation process. (III.A.1.b, III.A.2, III.A.5, III.C.1.b)

Recommendation 4:
In order to fully meet the standard the team recommends that the college develop sustainable financial resources to provide adequate staffing, equipment, student and academic support services as well as funding for operations. (II.A, II,B, II.C.1, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d, III.A, III.B, III.C)

Recommendation 5:

In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the institution regularly evaluate its governance, decision-making structures, and planning processes in order to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The college should also widely communicate the results of these evaluations and use them as the basis for continuous and ongoing improvement of learning and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6, IV.A.4, IV.A.5)

University of Hawai'i Community College System (UHCC) Recommendations

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
In order to meet the standard for institutional effectiveness and integration of planning and resource allocation processes, including program review, it is recommended that:

• The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, on-going, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g. UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.

• The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.1.c. II.A.2.a,e,f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.4.a)

UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services
In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education. (ER 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b)

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources
In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate action to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

UH Recommendation 4: Resources
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning. (II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2)

UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them when necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards. (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g)

College Responses to the 2012 External Evaluation Team Recommendation

Windward Community College Recommendations

Recommendation 1:
As noted in the 2006 visiting team report and in order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution complete the development and assessment of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs and general education, as well as develop and assess learning outcomes in student services, using the results for improvement of student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness. (ER 10, I.B.3, I.B.7, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.B.4)

Findings and Evidence:

The College had established student learning outcomes for all courses prior to the 2012 team visit and many of them had been assessed. Courses were aligned to both the Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and the General Education Student Learning Outcomes (GE SLOs). GE SLOs are the same as Institutional SLOs. The College hypothesized in the Follow-Up Report that faculty may have mistakenly believed that because of the alignment, when they assessed the course SLOs they were evaluating the program SLOs and GE SLOs as well. In the year since the 2012 accreditation visit the college has completed the assessment of all Course and Program SLOs. The College has four GE SLOs: Global and Cultural Awareness, Critical Thinking and Creativity, Communication, and Information Literacy. In Fall 2012 the College established a schedule for assessment of the GE SLOs: Communication was assessed in Fall 2012, Information Literacy was assessed in Spring 2013, Critical Thinking and Creativity is being assessed this semester, Global and Cultural Awareness will be evaluated in Spring 2014. The College has established a cyclical timeline to ensure that future assessment of all SLOs is completed on a regular, ongoing, basis.

In the 2013 – 2015 Windward Community College Catalog all courses have Student Learning Outcomes listed. The System Administration section of the College Institutional Research website contains complete student learning outcomes assessment matrices for all Course, Program and institutional General Education Student Learning Outcomes.

All student service areas worked together at quarterly meetings to examine current objectives and reflect on how they impacted student success, then to develop Student Learning Outcomes. All student services units have completed development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. The Student Affairs SLOs and assessment matrices were included in the College Follow-Up report.

The Office of Career and Community Education (OCCE) has created Program Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes for all of its workforce training courses and certificates. The OCCE has assessed all of the Student Learning Outcomes as shown in the

appendix of the College Follow-Up Report, Stand-alone community enrichment classes, such as ukulele, do not have formal SLOs. They are assessed using student satisfaction surveys.

SLOs were also redefined for non-instructional support areas including Academic Affairs, Academic Support, Student Affairs, Computing Services, Administrative Services and the Chancellor's Office. Results from SLO assessments for these areas are included in Department Annual Reports. These reports and assessment results are available on the Planning and Budget Council website.

Each unit of the College must complete a budget request form that is submitted to the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) for all requests for funding. These requests are prioritized by the Council based upon the information provided on the form. The information must include alignment with the College Strategic Plan, alignment with GE SLOs, alignment with area SLOs and alignment with process outcomes as well as a detailed rationale for the request.

Conclusion:

The College's student learning outcome development, assessment, reflection and revision processes are well defined, complete, and demonstrate a cycle of continuous improvement. The team believes that the College has fully met the expectations of the recommendation and now meets Standards.

Recommendation 2:
In order to fully meet the standards, it is recommended that the college design, document and implement an effective, integrated planning model, system of program review and resource allocation process which is inclusive of all institutional planning activities including administrative services and technology. The college should develop formal systematic evaluation mechanisms for assessing the quality and effectiveness of planning structures and processes and use assessment results for the improvement of learning and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1 through I.B.7, II.A.2, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, II.B, III.B.2, III.C.1, III.C.2, II.D.1, III.D.3, III.D.4, IV.A.1, IV.a.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.3.g)

Findings and Evidence:

While the College does not have any document entitled "integrated planning" there is considerable evidence that College planning is indeed integrated through activities and documents of the Planning and Budget Council. The PBC includes representation from all WCC constituencies as verified by their membership list. The PBC considers and modifies its forms and processes annually.

The PBC is responsible for reviewing and modifying the College Strategic Plan. PBC is also responsible for WCC's efforts and response to the UHCC Strategic Plan. The PBC is reviewing the current WCC Strategic Plan this semester, has discussed proposed changes, and has created a draft modified WCC Strategic Plan. Both the WCC Strategic Plan and the WCC response to the UHCC Strategic Plan are reviewed annually by the PBC.

All requests for supplemental funds to area budgets are submitted to the PBC for review and prioritization. Budget requests considered by the PBC are allocations for supplies, equipment, position reallocation, and new positions. PBC budget request processes are documented in a flowchart that includes a timeline showing the annual cycle. Documentation submitted with each request includes SLOs and process outcomes, annual assessments, and departmental, unit or program reviews, their analysis, and application to budget requests. Finalized system requests are the result of PBC resource allocation discussions. All budget requests must include an explanation of how the request aligns with the College Strategic Plan, institutional, degree and course SLOs, and alignment with process outcomes.

The PBC has decided to create a Handbook that will reflect what is currently happening in terms of the budget cycle and the implementation of performance evaluation indicators. The Handbook will also incorporate material from the trainings that were given prior to the first PBC meeting of the 2013 - 2014 academic year in response to suggestions from the PBC 2012 self-assessment. These trainings included departmental annual report template training, third party reader training and PBC form training.

Conclusion:

The College's PBC exhibits an integrated system of program review and resource allocation process which is inclusive of all institutional planning activities. The College has developed a formal systematic evaluation mechanism for assessing the quality and effectiveness of planning structures and processes. The College uses assessment results for the improvement of learning and institutional effectiveness.

The College will benefit from explicitly explaining its integrated planning model in the planned PBC Handbook.

The team believes this recommendation has been fully addressed. Once the PBC Handbook is complete in the Spring of 2014, the standard will be met.

Recommendation 3:
In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop a comprehensive staffing plan as well as a professional development plan designed to meet the needs of its personnel and fully implement the civil service evaluation process. (III.A.1.b, III.A.2, III.A.5, III.C.1.b)

Findings and Evidence:

The College currently has an informal staffing plan that is linked to the annual assessments submitted to the Policy & Budget Committee (PBC). However, the College is in the process of creating a more formal, long-range plan for staffing that will plan for five (5) years and beyond. A committee has been formed for this New Staffing Plan. The committee has begun meeting and will continue to meet until a written plan is developed and published. The target completion date for this plan is the end of Spring 2014.

The College's staff development activities have increased. In fact, the College exceeded its strategic plan targets for professional development in 2012-13. Evidence of the college's success in the area of staff development is documented on the College website.

The College also created a staff evaluation reminder system for Civil Service employees that became operational in Fall 2013. This system uses a password-protected local SQL database that tracks the evaluation timeline. The database tracks when staff are to be evaluated, and by whom. Evaluators can see a complete list of all of the people they are responsible for evaluating and when each evaluation is due. Human Resources personnel can access a complete list of the evaluation schedule. Email reminders are generated one month prior to the scheduled evaluation. The system will be evaluated in Spring 2014 and any needed improvements made during Summer 2014.

Conclusion:

The College recognizes the need to have a more comprehensive staffing plan and is actively pursuing that objective. The College has increased staff development opportunities. The College created an evaluation reminder system for Civil Service employees.

The team believes this recommendation has been fully addressed. Once the New Staffing Plan is complete in the Spring of 2014, and the Civil Service evaluation reminder system has been finalized, the standard will be met.

Recommendation 4:
In order to fully meet the standard the team recommends that the college develop sustainable financial resources to provide adequate staffing, equipment, student and academic support services as well as funding for operations. (II.A, II,B, II.C.1, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d, III.A, III.B, III.C)

Findings and Evidence:

The College has implemented the following key initiatives in order to ensure a sustainable supply of funds to the College:

1. Tuition Increases
2. Summer School Enrollment Increases
3. Performance-based Allocation Achievements
4. Extra-mural Contracts and Grants Growth
5. Facilities & Administrative Costs (Indirect Costs) Increases
6. New Veterinary Technology Program Fees and Other Proposed New College Fees
7. Energy Savings
8. Salary Savings (due to Faculty & Staff Retirements)

The team verified these initiatives and their resulting increases in funding through interviews with staff and reviews of data on the College website.

Conclusion:

The eight (8) initiatives above demonstrate that the College is committed to developing and sustaining staffing, equipment, student and academic support services as well as funding for operations. The team believes that the College meets the standards.

Recommendation 5:

In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the institution regularly evaluate its governance, decision-making structures, and planning processes in order to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The college should also widely communicate the results of these evaluations and use them as the basis for continuous and ongoing improvement of learning and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6, IV.A.4, IV.A.5)

Findings and Evidence:

The College formed a committee on Governance Assessment in February 2013. The committee created a plan for on-going assessment and has implemented the plan. Governance, decision-making structures, and planning processes have been assessed, and will continue to be assessed on a cyclical basis. In the Spring of 2013 the committee distributed its first survey to faculty, staff and students. The results have been reviewed and published on the college website. A second survey was distributed in the Fall of 2013. A third will be distributed in the Spring of 2014. After three years, all aspects of the college governance structure will have been assessed. As a second form of assessment, the PBC performs an annual self-assessment.

The College recognizes that the campus communication structure has not been adequately assessed. A new Website Advisory Committee began operating in Fall 2013. The committee will be responsible for assessing the communication structures on campus with a focus on the website. (It is the primary vehicle for communicating governance-related documents.)

Conclusion:

The College has developed a good system for assessing its governance, decision-making structures, and planning processes. The College is currently working to strengthen communication of governance activities and assessments to the college community.

The team believes that the College meets the standard.

UHCC System Recommendations

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

In order to meet the standard for institutional effectiveness and integration of planning and resource allocation processes, including program review, it is recommended that:
- The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, on-going, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g. UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.
- The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, II.A.1.c. II.A.2.a,e,f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.4.a)

Findings and Evidence:

Per UHCC Policy, Strategic Academic Planning, the VPCC convenes the full UHCC Strategic Planning Council (SPC) in the spring and fall of each year. The membership of the UHCC Strategic Planning Council consists of the Chancellor, Faculty Senate Chair, and student government chair from each college, and the Vice President and Associate Vice Presidents for the Community Colleges. The fall meeting is used to look at the strategic planning process and to introduce and/or review system-wide Strategic Planning initiatives. The spring meeting is used to review UHCC strategic outcomes and performance measures. The SPC monitors and advises on progress toward the UHCC Strategic Planning goals. The VPCC uses the meeting to gather impressions and reactions to progress to date and to emphasize and maintain the focus on the things the UHCC has identified as important. The VPCC follows each meeting with visits to each college to present college-level detailed data.

The visiting team to Windward Community College was able to attend the VPCC's fall presentation at the College. The presentation included data on progress towards the current Strategic Plan goals and future enrollment projections. The presentation outlined possible changes from the current Strategic Plan that expires in 2015 to the next 2015 – 2020 Strategic Plan that is currently being developed. The organization and process for updating the Strategic Plan had been shared with the College during VPCC's spring 2013 College presentation. At the conclusion of the presentation there was a lengthy question and answer session. The College employees who attended the presentation were attentive and seemed, on the basis of the question and answer session, to be comfortable with the data and possible changes. The College Chancellor shared that he finds the proposed changes to the UHCC Strategic Plan to be realistic and farsighted, The College appreciates that the development of the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan is incorporating ideas from the field and is more inclusive of Arts and Humanities than the current UHCC Strategic Plan. The Chancellor especially appreciates this because he reports on the

College results with regard to the UHCC Strategic Plan and is held accountable for those results.

UHCC uses an outcomes funding model that is directly linked to the University's established strategic outcomes. The measures adopted are directly from the strategic plan and the targets are the specific targets identified in the strategic outcomes adopted by the University in 2008.

Under this performance funding model the College has been able to meet all of the outcomes criteria and receive the supplemental funding which results in approximately a 4% increase to the College funding base each year. The College is satisfied with this funding model. The College Chancellor is somewhat concerned about meeting the required number of degrees and certificates, but considers performance based funding measures to be fair.

The Annual Reports Program Data (ARPD) is standardized system-wide and is used by each College to operate its own program review process. Windward Community College provides annual reports for all degree and certificate of achievement programs that feed into the system ARPD.

Since the comprehensive accreditation visit in October 2012, all key data users have been surveyed to determine if any of the current data elements should be eliminated or if any new data elements should be added to the ARPD. The surveys identified a gap in data information provided at new faculty, staff, and administrator orientation. The UHCC Institutional Research Cadre is developing key data information to be included in orientations as well as website "cheat sheets" to direct inquiries to available tools and data.

Conclusion:

The College reaction to resulting changes is positive. Please see the UHCC System Report attached and made part of this report.

UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services
In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the rigor of the English and math courses needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education. (ER 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b)

Conclusion:

This recommendation does not apply to the College. Please see the UHCC System Report attached and made part of this report.

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources
In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate action to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1.c)

Findings and Evidence:

At Windward Community College all faculty, staff and administrators are evaluated on a regular basis. UHCCP modified the lecturer and faculty five-year evaluation policies in September 2013 to include student learning outcomes. This has not yet been implemented.

Conclusion:

Please see the UHCC System Report attached and made part of this report.

UHCC Recommendation 4: Resources
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning. (II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2)

Findings and Evidence:

The UH System has created an outline for a system-wide Technology Plan (on-line resource). While the Technology Plan (online resource) is still in development, significant work has been done. The UH System website currently includes an Overview, Infrastructure, Enterprise Business Applications, and a placeholder for Academic Applications. A draft document has been completed for Academic Applications, but it is still under system review and approval before it can be posted to the website. It is important to note that information on Distance Education is currently available elsewhere on the system website, and will be included in the future Academic Applications component. The College is very involved with developing the system-wide Technology Plan (online resource) according to discussions with college staff.

Conclusion:

The team determined that the UH system is well on its way to meeting this standard. The system should continue its good work on the system-wide Technology Plan (online resource). Components of the plan that still need to be posted on the "itplan" website include: 1) Academic Applications, 2) Business Process Improvements, and 3) IT Policies. Please see the UHCC System Report attached and made part of this report.

UHCC Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH BOR adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them when necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards. (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g)

Findings and Evidence:

At the time of the 2012 External Evaluation Visit, there was breaking news of a $200,000 loss to the system due to a failed concert. As a result of this news and financial loss, the UH Board of Regents engaged in a period of intense self-assessment. In addition to responding to recommendations received by the State Senate, the UH Board of Regents also responded to a lengthy list of recommendations created by their own newly formed Advisory Task Group (TAG). During the course of this last year's work, the UH Board of Regents has reviewed its Board Polices and has identified areas that changes and/or improvements are needed. Additionally, the UH Board of Regents is planning to convert its manual system of maintaining Board Polices to an Online Policy Management System. However, this work has not yet begun.

Conclusion:

Please see the UHCC System Report attached and made part of this report.

Follow Up Visit Report

This Report is Appended to and Made Part of the

College Follow Up Report

University of Hawai'i Community College System

2444 Dole Street

Honolulu, HI

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting
Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

University of Hawai'i Community College System

November 15, 2013

Dr. Helen Benjamin, Chair

System Evaluation Team

University of Hawai'i Community College System

Dr. Helen Benjamin (Chair)
Chancellor
Contra Costa Community College District
500 Court Street
Martinez, CA 94553

Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman
Retired Interim Chancellor
San Francisco City College
3881 Errante Dr.
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Introduction

On November 15, 2013, Dr. Helen Benjamin and Dr. Thelma Scott-Skillman conducted a Follow Up Visit to the University of Hawai'i Community College System (UHCC). A comprehensive visit for the six colleges in the System and the System Office was conducted in October of 2012. Prior to the 2012 visit, one of the chairs of the college teams served as the "chair of chairs" and conducted the evaluation of the System Office. However, in the 2012 comprehensive visit, a separate team was established to conduct a visit for the System Office. Therefore, for the first time, a separate team was established for the one-day Follow Up Visit. The primary purpose of the Follow Up Visit was to document the progress the System had made toward resolving recommendations made by the comprehensive visiting team in 2012. The responses to the five System recommendations were included in the follow Up Report for each college.

The team chair met in advance of the visit by phone and through electronic means with the UHCC Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC). Team members received the Follow Up Report in advance of the visit and had the opportunity to review the materials and visit the college and UHCC websites for information prior to their arrival at the System Office and the Hawaii Community College campus.

During the one-day visit, team members spent the morning at the System Office and the afternoon at the campus of Hawai'i Community College. The System Office was well prepared for the visit. The VPCC, the Director of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, and the Executive Assistant to the VPCC met with the team to provide additional requested information, respond to queries needed in order for the team to complete its work, and provide details of actions taken by the System and the colleges in meeting the recommendations. A "tour" of the System website was provided, demonstrating easy access to and broad dissemination of essential information for all college and System constituencies as well as members of the public. Following the System Office visit, the team accompanied the VPCC to Hawai'i Community College where they continued discussions with the VPCC and met with the college chancellor, and attended a forum conducted by the VPCC. The forum held at Hawai'i Community College, was broadcast live with remote access to West Hawai'i Campus employees, located in Kona, HI. The VPCC updated more than 50 college employees in attendance on the progress on the System's strategic plan and the impact of the plan on their college in particular. The presentation, entitled "Moving Forward…2021", proved to be informational and inspirational for those in attendance.

The visit was very successful. It was obvious from the outset that the System Office and the colleges had taken the recommendations seriously and made considerable progress in the short time between receiving the recommendations from the Accrediting Commission on the October 2012 visit and the Follow Up Visit. Upon receiving the report of February 2013, the System Office led the colleges in focusing their collective energy on fulfilling the requirements made in the recommendations.

Recommendations made by the comprehensive visiting team of October 2012 and progress to date follow.

UHCC Recommendation 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

In order to meet the Standards for institutional effectiveness and integration of planning and resource allocation processes, including program review, it is recommended that:

- The VPCC and the Chancellors develop broad-based, ongoing, collegial dialogue between and among the UHCC and the colleges to better assess the breadth, quality, and usefulness of UHCC analytical tools (e.g., UHCC Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)) and planning processes through feedback from college stakeholders. In addition, the UHCC and Chancellors should provide training for the appropriate use of the tools to support on-going improvement and effectiveness.
- The Chancellors provide clear descriptions and training regarding the planning timeline and budgeting process. The information and training should be available to all college constituencies and reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy for resource allocation that leads to program and institutional improvement (Standards I.B.3, I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.b.4, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.6).

Broad-based dialog and assessment of analytical tools:

The team found that there was on-going dialog regarding planning and the use of analytical tools provided by UHCC. Per UHCC Policy, Strategic Academic Planning, the VPCC convenes the full UHCC Strategic Planning Council (SPC) in the spring and fall of each year. The membership of the UHCC Strategic Planning Council consists of the Chancellor, Faculty Senate Chair, and student government chair of each college, and the Vice President and Associate Vice Presidents for the Community Colleges. The fall meeting is used to look at the strategic planning process and to introduce and/or review system-wide Strategic Planning initiatives. The spring meeting is used to review UHCC strategic outcomes and performance measures. The SPC monitors and advises on progress toward the UHCC Strategic Planning goals. The VPCC uses the Fall and Spring meetings to gather impressions and reactions to progress to date and to emphasize and maintain the focus on items/areas the UHCC has identified as important. The VPCC conducts follow-up visits to each college to present college-level detailed data and obtain feedback on the planning process, goals, and data.The following web site provides comprehensive information and evidence of the integrated planning process for the UHCC system and its colleges: http://uhcc.hawaii.edu/OVPCC/strategic_planning/appendixA.php

All college chancellors and appropriate staff are represented on various system-wide councils and committees that review tools for accuracy and usefulness. In turn, similar training and broad-based dialog occurs on each campus for faculty and staff who are responsible for utilizing the tools to conduct program reviews, curricular updates, and the like. College researchers work closely with the system research office to further explore the use of the analytical tools and the interpretation of the data. The team was provided examples of how the college's requests for data and/or explanation of data and formulae were provided by the system.

The analytical tools provided by UHCC are utilized system wide allowing for comparable data and economy of scale in development. One example is Curriculum Central that has been used as a common repository for all curricula in the community college system. There will soon be a replacement, the Kuali Student/Curriculum Management System, which will continue to be the single repository for community college curriculum in the UH system. The visiting team received feedback that there was expressed concern regarding the lack of a common system for SLO assessment. Several colleges are developing their own in-house assessment tool. There was concern that this multiple college-level approach would lead to duplicate use of resources and non-comparability of data across the system. It was expressed that the UHCC system was not supportive of developing a common SLO assessment system.

Planning description and training:

All of the community colleges in the University of Hawaii system are responsible for allocating funds received by the system and retained by the college according to planning and program review priorities. The UHCC system's Associate Vice President of Administrative Affairs meets regularly with the college to present information on its allocations, trends, and projections. The Chancellors and the College Councils in the system have been actively improving the planning and budgeting system to respond to changing needs and improve the system based on college participants' input. The colleges view these processes and the policies that support them as "living documents," meant to be regularly examined and changed based on experience. For example, the budgetary system was reviewed at the end of the previous academic year. This process resulted in increased and ~~current~~ updated information for consideration in allocating resources. Several visiting site teams observed the involvement of all appropriate groups in the budget and planning process and found evidence of changes to the processes that resulted from that involvement.

The visiting team for the UHCC system was able to attend the VPCC's fall presentation at Hawaii Community College, Hilo, HI. The presentation, which was live broadcasted, provided opportunity for employees at other college sites to receive data on progress towards the current Strategic Plan goals and future system and college enrollment projections. The presentation outlined possible changes from the current Strategic Plan that expires in 2015 to the next 2015 – 2020 Strategic Plan that is currently being developed. The organization and process for updating the Strategic Plan had been shared with the colleges during the VPCC's spring 2013 campus presentation. At the conclusion of the presentation, there was opportunity for questions and answers. Employees in attendance were attentive and seemed, based on the question and answer session, to be comfortable with the data and possible changes. Similar observations were shared by visiting team chairs of the colleges who were able to attend a presentation. Feedback on the planning and budget process obtained from both system and college employees conclude a more realistic and farsighted approach occurring now than in previous years. The current plan is evident of the inclusion of more ideas generated from the open dialog and process across all colleges.

UHCC uses an outcomes funding model that is directly linked to the University's established strategic outcomes. The measures adopted are directly from the strategic plan and the targets are the specific targets identified in the strategic outcomes adopted by the University in 2008.

Under this performance-funding model, most colleges have been able to meet all of their outcomes criteria and receive supplemental funding resulting in modest increase to campus funding base each year. Observation and analysis by visiting site team chairs conclude there is satisfaction with this funding model. While there is some concern regarding some of the 'bench marks', the campus leadership considers performance based funding measures to be fair.

The Annual Reports Program Data (ARPD) is standardized system-wide and is used by each campus to operate its own program review process. Each college is provided annual reports for all degree and certificate of achievement programs that are used by the colleges for their comprehensive program reviews.

Since the comprehensive accreditation visit in October 2012, all key data users have been surveyed to determine if any of the current data elements should be eliminated or if any new data elements should be added to the ARPD. The surveys identified a gap in data information provided at new faculty, staff, and administrator orientation. The UHCC Institutional Research Cadre is developing key data information to be included in orientations as well as website "cheat sheets" to direct inquiries to available tools and data.

Each college web site and the system web site provide easy navigation, clear, and comprehensive information on the strategic planning and budget process. Reaction from the system administration and college constituent groups to resulting changes with the integrated planning and budget process is positive.

Conclusion

The System has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standard.

UHCC Recommendation 2: Student Learning Programs and Services

In order to meet the Standards, degrees offered by the colleges must be consistent with the general education philosophy as outlined in the college catalog and the rigor of the English and math courses

needed to fulfill the degree requirements must be appropriate to higher education (ER 11, Standards II.A.3, II.A.3.b).

At the time of the visit in October of 2012, the System was aware that four colleges (Hawai'i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kaua'i Community College, and Leeward Community) were out of compliance with granting the Associate of Applied Science degree (AAS). The level of English and math courses required for completion of the AAS degree was at or below the developmental education level and should have been higher.

In May of 2012, the General Education requirement to satisfy the recommendation was codified in UHCCP #5.200 General Education in All Degree Programs. Math and English requirements are now at the transfer level equivalent. It has been documented that all four colleges offering the AAS degree have implemented the new policy.

Conclusion

The System has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standard.

UHCC Recommendation 3: Student Learning Programs and Services and Resources

In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate actions to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

It was concluded in the October 2012 visit that the System met all of Standard III.A except Standard III.A.C.1, as a tenured faculty member who does not request promotion, or a faculty member who has completed all requirements of tenure and promotion, does not have the same requirement to analyze student-learning outcomes for improvement of effectiveness. The team found on this visit that the System has negotiated with its bargaining unit, developed, and approved a policy that has been updated for the first time since 1990. The updated policy reflects current ACCJC requirements and includes a provision for the inclusion of the tenured faculty member's obligation to be evaluated based on, among other things, his/her effectiveness in producing student-learning outcomes. In addition, a policy on the evaluation of lecturers has also been negotiated and approved. While the change in evaluation requirements has been negotiated, there has not been the opportunity since negotiation of this new evaluation provision to implement the change at the colleges and document evaluations with this component.

Conclusion

The System has addressed the recommendation and meets the Standard. However, implementation of the negotiated evaluation requirements has not yet happened and been documented.

UH Recommendation 4: Resources

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.2, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2).

The System took a novel, creative, and appropriate approach in its response to this recommendation. The System is in the process of creating "a dynamic, online resource" rather than develop a written plan that will provide pertinent information to users. The major sections of the resource follow infrastructure, enterprise business applications, business process improvements, academic, applications, and policies. The resource is currently under development and scheduled for completion in the spring of 2014. The team previewed the web site and found it to be an excellent resource for users with "just in time" information on current and future projects as well as long-term trends. The resulting information should strengthen the program review process and strategic planning to support resource allocations.

Conclusion

The System is in the process of addressing the recommendation but does not yet fully meet the Standard.

UH Recommendation 5: Board and Administrative Organization

In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH Board of Regents (BOR) adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self-evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.g).

The Board has been undergoing a thorough self-assessment that began during the October 2012 visit. They engaged the services of an experienced consultant who has led them through a rigorous process reviewing every aspect of their responsibilities. The result is a list of recommendations that will improve the effectiveness of the board.

Regarding the adoption of a regular evaluation schedule for the review of BOR policies and procedures, the UH System is in the process of developing an online policy management system that will allow for regularly scheduled development, review, revision, and tracking of policies and procedures. Because of the self-evaluation during the last several months, the BOR is on schedule with its self-evaluation and meeting the requirement of board policy that indicates that the evaluation must be dedicated solely to the work of the BOR. Indeed, this has been the case.

Conclusion

This recommendation has been partially addressed. Because the process for developing the policy management system is underway, the System partially meets the Standard.