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Introduction

At its January 2005 meeting, the Commission acted to require of Windward Community College an April 2005 progress report and visit based on Windward Community College’s October 2004 Progress Report. The college was placed on warning and was requested to correct the deficiencies detailed in the Commission’s college-specific recommendation on program review tied to educational planning and the five University of Hawaii Community College (UHCC) system-specific recommendations. The progress report visit was conducted by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador and Mr. Joseph L. Richey on April 6, 2005.

The purpose of the visit was to evaluate the college’s progress report and the evidence provided to determine if sufficient progress had been made by Windward Community College and the UHCC system on the Commission recommendations since the October 2004 Progress Report. The Commission expected the college and the system to have taken prompt action to address the recommendations.

The team received the Windward Community College Progress Report in time for the visit and the college was prepared for the visit. Staff at the college and system arranged the requested interviews for team members with faculty, administrators, students, and staff. Documentation supporting the recommendations was available to the team.

The college’s progress report outlined its initial program review planning activities and actions since October 2004 with supporting documentation. Also included was a section entitled “Report on the Substantive Change Request Related to the System Reorganization and Other Commission Recommendations” which was written by the system staff and community college chancellors.

A separate team report on the January 2005 Commission recommendations for the UHCC system follows this Windward Community College report and is titled, “University of Hawaii Community College System, Progress Visit Team Report.”

The team members met with the Chancellor; members of the Chancellor’s Executive Committee; members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee; two co-chairs of the Faculty Senate; members of the Budget Committee; faculty members who had been involved with departmental initiated program reviews; the Accreditation Liaison Officer; and the interim institutional researcher (faculty member on reassigned time).

The team found that the college and the UHCC system were attempting to respond to the Commission recommendations on program review. It appeared to the team that at both
the college and UHCC system level staff were grappling with the “big picture” of how to develop a systematic, standardized, and integrated program review and assessment process which inform college and system level plans and budget allocations; therefore, a cohesive program review process currently has not been implemented at the college. The college indicates in its progress report that the initial implementation of program review for some programs is scheduled for spring 2006.

**College Response to the Commission Recommendation**

The following is the January 2005 Commission recommendation (and the continuing Commission recommendation from January 2001) and the team’s assessment of progress at Windward Community College.

6. **The College shall carry out its educational planning in a way that draws upon program evaluation results and ties educational planning directly to planning for staffing, budget development, and program elimination/addition.** (Standards 4.A.1, 4.D.2, 4.D.6)

Based on the December 3, 2004, minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), the chancellor had indicated a need for the college to have a program review policy. The policy was to be drafted by administration, and IEC was asked to provide feedback and recommend the timetable for program review. At this meeting, the committee began the discussion of what constitutes a “program” for review. Also, IEC previously was charged with the responsibility for developing the process for student learning outcomes assessment. The team recognized the college’s success to date with its workshops, institutional dialogue, and departmental mapping activities on student learning outcomes.

An Assessment and Program Review Workshop was held on March 4, 2005, for college staff. The IEC was in the process of following up on the outcomes from that workshop. The team was presented with a March 30, 2005 draft of the college’s policy on program review. The draft had many unanswered questions and incomplete projects, such as “should the institutional researcher be a member of IEC?” “Who will use the results of the reviews, Campus Council or who?” The IEC recognized that progress review forms, directions for completion, and templates need to be developed, but no samples were provided the team. IEC policy draft included a list of programs and support units to be reviewed, identified the data to be used in the reviews, and stated that the first reviews would be completed in spring 2006 in time for the college comprehensive self-study report. The team was presented with a draft of college’s planning and budgeting cycle, which was being circulated to campus constituents. The team learned that the final details of the cycle timelines and sequencing were still being discussed for appropriateness and timing with other institutional activities. There appeared to be an underlying past assumption that program review was not really necessary because UHCC system resource allocation decisions for the college were based on new programs, not improvement and enhancement of existing program and services.
The team found that the Strategic Plan Committee had not met during the 2004-05 academic year. The chancellor indicated that the staff had been too busy with other issues. Therefore, the team determined that an on-going, systematic assessment of its 2002-2010 Strategic Plan actions and priorities had not occurred to date. The team’s discussions with the Budget Committee (BC), in existence since late 2003 indicated the chancellor had not provided a clear mandate as to its role and function; but BC was in the process of developing budget guidelines (operational) and these were being reviewed by the chancellor. It appeared that budget is still driving planning and institutional decisions. And because program review has not been implemented, it is not informing planning or budgeting decisions. The team did learn that with a few individual programs, due to external requirements or individual department and staff initiatives, some form of program review or assessment had taken place, e.g. academic support (library), the office of instruction, the Employment Training Center; but the staff interviewed indicated there efforts were not a formalized system of the college.

The interim institutional researcher is working with the Institutional Researcher Cadre (IRC), a group of college and UHCC system staff, on how to use the current system level data (MAPS) for program review. Also, it was reported that the system community college chancellors have agreed to the data elements from this data base that will be used for program review. It did not appear to the team that there was a specific direction, specific structure, or specific activities in place to define, develop, and implement a standardized, systematic, and integrated process for program review at the system level. Therefore, the result is that the college is developing a program review process that is unique to its purposes only. The team had concern that this situation, given seven colleges, may not provide the most effective mechanism for determining educational quality at the college and UHCC system levels in the future. The team suggests that current UHCC system program review policy be reviewed and the important administrative procedures be revised to address this fundamental issue.

The team observed that the college has no governance document that clearly outlines the charge and purpose of committees, their relationship to each other, and their role in decision making processes affecting planning and resource allocation. The team suggests the college determine the specific role institutional research will have in all of its, program review, student learning outcomes assessment, planning, and resource allocation processes.

**Conclusion**

The college has not implemented a formalized program review process that is tied to educational planning and budgeting. The March 30 college program review policy reflects intent to implement a program review process. Because program review was not the foundation for the college’s current educational planning and resource allocation processes, the college is still grappling with how to integrate all the components for an institutional effectiveness system leading to educational improvement. The college has not met this recommendation.
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Introduction

In spring 2003, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) gave conditional approval to a Substantive Change Request submitted in January 2003 by the University of Hawaii Community Colleges. The request sought approval of a plan to reorganize the Hawaii Community Colleges by eliminating the Chancellor’s Office, creating a reporting structure from each of the seven colleges directly to the President of the University of Hawaii, and redefining the campus chief executive officer positions from provost to chancellor. At the time the request was made, the University had not fully identified all other changes that would accompany these proposed changes, nor had it calculated fully the costs and sustainability of the proposed changes. The UH Community Colleges anticipated resolving certain key issues, such as final University and Community College system structures, in stages, to be completed by Fall 2004.

The ACCJC granted approval to the request with reservations, and required the University of Hawaii Community Colleges to provide reports to the Commission in November 2003, April 2004 and November 2004 that would address its progress in resolving the final structure and funding of the UH Community College system, as well as addressing Commission recommendations that developed after each visit. The UH Community Colleges submitted the Report on the Substantive Change Request Related to the System Reorganization and Other Commission Recommendations in October 2004. This report was followed by a team visit and report.

In January, 2005, the Commission reviewed the 2004 Substantive Change Report and the Team Report. The Commission asked that the UH Community Colleges report by April 1, 2005, on progress made in addressing the five recommendations that were developed by previous visiting teams and which remained outstanding as of January 2005. On March 31, 2005, the Colleges submitted a report on progress made in addressing these five recommendations (items 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7) from the November 2004 team report.

In April 2005, a team comprised of Dr. Marie Smith, Mr. Joseph Richey, Dr. Sherrill Amador and Dr. Barbara Beno visited the UH System. With other individual team members, they also visited Kauai Community College, Honolulu Community College, Windward Community College; one team member visited Kapiolani Community College and the team met with several individuals representing Maui, Leeward and Hawaii community colleges in group meetings.
In preparation for the visit, the team read the April 1, 2005 UH CC report entitled *Report on the Substantive Change Request Related to the System Reorganization and Other Commission Recommendations* and its supporting documentation, previous UH CC system reports and team reports, and the college reports that were submitted to the Commission in spring 2005. During the visit, the team interviewed the UH President, the UH Vice President for Policy and Planning, three members of the Board of Regents, including the President of the Board, the seven community college chancellors, the vice chancellors/deans of instruction for the seven colleges, the faculty senate chairs for the colleges, the UH system Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Associate Vice President for Administration (Community Colleges). Some of these meetings occurred via the University’s two-way video and audio conferencing system. The team found the regents and employees of the University of Hawaii and its community colleges extremely helpful, candid and cordial. The UH CC *Report* was well organized, factual and well documented.

This report recounts the recent change in the UH system organization (made or proposed in fall 2004), it reflects the team’s findings at the system level, and to the degree they are interconnected with system issues, it includes some of the general findings at the individual community colleges. The report is arranged in order of the five recommendations that were to be addressed.

**Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and Program Review**

Concerned about the lack of a systematic and regularly employed process for assessing community college effectiveness and using the results to inform decision making and plan and implement improvements to educational quality, the fall 2004 visiting team made the following recommendation to the UH CC system:

2. **The Team recommends that the U.H. Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:**
   - that the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;
   - that the community college system as well as each college set priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;
   - that the colleges and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
   - 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 and 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.)
The visiting teams that examined the UH CCs and the UH CC system before spring 2005 identified significant inconsistencies in college and system behavior around institutional assessment, planning and improvement. The Commission’s action in January 2005, which placed six of the seven community colleges on the sanction of warning, reflected the Commission’s concern with the lack of ongoing and systematic assessment, planning and improvement practices.

Following the January 2005 Commission action letter, the UH Community Colleges developed and adopted eight principles for program review. The principles call for a program review at least every five years, resulting in improvement plans that link to each college’s Strategic Plan, an annual report of some subset of program data and analyses, some comparability of measures across all campuses, publication of the results of program review, and linking of program review results to resource distribution. These broad principles add some detail to how existing requirements of Board and Administrative policy would be implemented. At the time of the team visit in early April, these principles had not yet resulted in concrete changes to the practices of the colleges or the community college system.

The teams found that although the University of Hawaii has long-existing Board of Regents policies that require institutions to engage in program review, and Executive Policies that describe the purpose, process and some data elements of the required program review, some of the individual colleges were inconsistent in conducting program review and were unable to provide much evidence that program review was linked to planning and resource allocation systems at the college or system level. At two colleges, program review processes are fairly well developed and faculty driven, but one of them lacked an overt link between program assessment and institutional planning. On the other end of the spectrum, two of the colleges could not demonstrate they had any ongoing activity around program review, planning and improvement. Two more colleges have been struggling since the institutions’ 2002 comprehensive accreditation review to develop strategies for program review and one of them still has no viable strategy, while the seventh college developed a program review process and began implementing it in the last two years. The colleges have all designed program review processes that are somewhat unique, despite the availability of eleven years of program data available from the system research function. In some cases, the teams found college staff had designed review processes that were too onerous to conduct on a regular basis or that were so different across an institution’s various programs as to make comparisons within an institution difficult. The lack of agreement on common core data elements as well as the lack of adherence to Board policy requiring regular program review contribute to system-level decision making and planning that are relatively devoid of information about which programs need to improve.

In discussion with members of the Board of Regents, the team learned that Regents recalled seeing the results of program review only when the affected program was a new, proposed program or was being eliminated. The Board does not receive reports on institutional effectiveness aggregated at the level of the community college system; these data and analyses are developed by the system research office. There appears to be no
systematic and ongoing process for communicating the results of college-level program review and plans for improvement to the governing board, making it hard for that policy body to support ongoing institutional improvement or to assess effectiveness of individual institutions.

While the colleges that have done program review stated (and evidence supports) that they have created institutional priorities based on program review and analyses, the system has yet to move beyond the initial step of establishing eight principles for program review.

Several of the colleges have incorporated these priorities into their resource distribution processes. Several teams found demonstrations of program review analyses used in decisions about resource distribution within a college. All of the colleges with extant program reviews stated they used the results to develop priorities for the legislative biennium budget or the supplemental budget requests. The UH system asked institutions to reprioritize their budget requests; the teams were told the community colleges that had completed program reviews were more organized to do the re-prioritization because they had data. However, the UH system does not require budget requests to be backed by program review data and analyses. In addition, the System’s total budget request included only those projects that colleges felt would fit UH priorities and be of sufficient interest to gain legislative support. The UH system budget process involves a request for “new funding” from the legislature but does not regularly provide reallocations to address needs identified through assessment. The latter must be met through campus reallocation where possible.

The UH Community Colleges have not yet developed or implemented a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals as identified in institutional plans for improvement. The colleges have made one report to the BOR on their progress in addressing institutional assessment.

Conclusion

The seven community colleges vary in their current ability to conduct program review and to use data and analyses to guide institutional decision making and improvements in educational quality. In addition, individuals at the system level, including the Board of Regents and the president, could not provide evidence that program review-inspired plans for improvement were known, discussed and included in system priority setting and resource distribution. Individual colleges may use their programmatic needs to identify college priorities, but without system-wide discussion of program strengths and weaknesses, the governing board cannot fulfill its role in assuring the quality of education and supporting educational improvements. Without a system-wide discussion of the results of program review, colleges lose the opportunity to share strategies for achieving excellence and the chance to use collaborative efforts to improve common program weaknesses or challenges.
The team finds that this recommendation has not been fully addressed. The commitment to the eight principles reaffirms commitment to the extant Board of Regents policy. What is now needed is clear action to put in place a program review, planning and improvement process that addresses the components of recommendation #2. The team also recommends that the UH Community Colleges examine the existing Board and administrative policies to determine whether they are adequate, particularly with regard to the provision that program review be conducted every five years. Review as infrequently as every five years will be insufficient for some programs where more current educational practice and curriculum is essential (such as vocational programs) or where student outcomes (achievement and learning outcomes) are less than what the institution has set as goals.

The system-wide lack of adherence to existing policy suggests that the colleges lack support or incentives to perform the program reviews as described by policy, and that the system has not established consequences for failure to follow policy. Ongoing assessment and improvement require the participation of college and system leadership, the Commission’s recommendation includes the requirement that the Board of Regents regularly review the results of program review.

**University of Hawaii Community College Organizational Structure**

The team’s findings regarding the UH Community Colleges’ response to recommendations four and six are discussed together because they are so intricately related.

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

6. **The 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.)**

For purposes of accreditation, the ACCJC has considered the seven colleges as part of a larger community college system. The community colleges comprise the UH Community College System, which is by legislative act a subsystem of the University of Hawaii with its own separate funding stream. The 2002 reorganization eliminated the community college system CEO, created a direct reporting line between the seven college chancellors and the President of the University of Hawaii, and delegated responsibility for community college coordination and cooperation to the Council of Community College
Chancellors. The UH CC’s original request for approval of the reorganization preceded a clear definition of what positions and salaries would be finally implemented. The UH CC system’s reports to the Commission, and the observations of the visiting teams since spring 2003, attest to the continuing evolution of the UH system structure and the UH CC system structure.

The 2002 reorganization was intended to allow decentralization of authority to the community college chancellors and to campus decision-making groups. By elevating the college chief executives to the same title as the chief executives of the three universities, the reorganization also intended to facilitate discussion and cooperation across the entire higher education system. A Council of Chancellors, comprised of the university president and all ten chancellors, was to facilitate work across all of higher education, while the Council of Community College Chancellors was to provide for coordination and collaboration among the community colleges.

Community college system-wide support administrators were subsumed under the university’s vice presidents of academic affairs and administrative services but retained as intact functions (rather than integrated in to UH system functions) to continue to provide college support services. However, the two Associate Vice Presidents who direct the system-wide support services do not have a direct line relationship with the chancellors (they do not supervise or report to the college chancellors) and were organizationally relegated to an indirect role in supporting the colleges. Because they report to system vice presidents, their role in directing the colleges on behalf of the president or in helping the colleges develop consistent practices is compromised. The two Associate Vice Presidents serve as a resource for the colleges, but cannot effectively assist the president by acting on his behalf without specific designation to do so on any particular issue.

In June 2004, with the departure of the university president who had proposed the system reorganization, the new Interim President and the staff of the University began to consider whether structural changes were needed to address aspects of the system that were not working well. As the UH Report notes, the 2002 system reorganization was predicated on an assumption that there would be a major infusion of funding, but that funding was not forthcoming from the legislature. The Interim President therefore proposed reorganization in fall 2004 to align organizational structure and funding. The 2004 reorganization reduced the number of system Vice Presidents (including Chief of Staff) from eight to five and thereby reduced the number of direct reports to the university president (including the ten institutional chancellors) from eighteen to fifteen. The team believes that the university president’s span of control, with fifteen direct reports, remains quite large and poses significant challenges for the president.

The community college system has also clarified the managerial structure of each of the seven colleges. Each college was permitted to decide whether to elevate its chief instructional, student services and administrative officers to the title “vice chancellor”. The new executive class position “vice chancellor” was created to permit this title change. The institution’s Report describes the resulting changes in title. Five colleges
changed the chief instructional dean to vice chancellor, one changed the student services dean to vice chancellor, and four changed the director of administrative services to vice chancellor. There were no additional costs associated with this change.

In the view of the visiting team, the Council of Community College Chancellors has not yet demonstrated its ability to enforce decisions that it makes, and it is not clear to the team whether it has a means of assuring accountability among its peer members. The college chancellors had reported the Council of Chancellors worked well for purposes of coordination and cooperation among institutions, and for system planning purposes. Previous ACCJC teams had observed that the lines of authority and responsibility between the system administrators and the community colleges were unclear. (See recommendation #6, below).

The community college chancellors believe that the new structure and their own access to the president of the university are positive outcomes of the 2002 reorganization that eliminated the community college CEO position. The faculty senate leadership of the colleges strongly prefers the current structure where college chancellors report directly to the university president; they believe it provides faculty leadership with greater access to the university president than they had under the 2002 structure. The chancellors also believe their ability to sit as “equals in title” with the university chancellors benefits the colleges. Certainly, work done in the last two years to improve articulation of courses is one example of the potential benefit that might accompany of discussion among chancellors (as well as academic administrators and faculty) across the entire higher education system.

Yet, chancellors and other administrators also stated that the Council of Community College Chancellors has not developed its capacity for making decisions when there is not consensus. There are creative and strong people in key leadership roles, but there is also a style of leadership which appears to require consensus before a decision or action can be taken. The team saw one concrete example of the Council’s tendency to work on a consensus basis but be unable to make key decisions when there is not consensus. Working together for several months, the seven colleges developed agreement on cut-off scores for the system-wide Compass (precollegiate) placement tests in order to address the colleges’ need to better identify skills of incoming freshman and provide more effective educational services. The colleges were prepared to implement the new placement system when one college withdrew its support for the decision. The placement testing was stopped.

When asked by the visiting team what the Council does when it cannot reach agreement on a needed decision, the chancellors stated that the university president makes the decision. Yet the team did not find evidence that the President has demonstrably made decisions the Council was unable to make. In interviews, the President has stated that he has limited ability to provide direct intervention in college affairs on issues that are not of critical importance due to the scope of his responsibilities for the entire system. The team is concerned with the absence of strong community college leadership, advocacy and
coordination that results from the present organizational structure for the UH CC system and the UH system.

Recently, the President convened a Cabinet that will meet biweekly to discuss system-wide issues. The Cabinet is composed of the three university chancellors, two chancellors selected from the seven community college chancellors, and the five vice presidents of the system. This group of ten is considered less “unwieldy” than the entire group of fifteen that reports to the president. Clearly, the university president is making adaptations to try to make the current organization more effective, but the number of direct reports that he must supervise is daunting.

The chancellors and the university president also told the visiting team that the role of community college “advocate” within the system and to the public had been diminished by the 2003 reorganization. The university president cannot advocate for the community colleges, as he represents the entire university system (and the public often considers the senior university to be the institution that the university president represents most clearly). The Council of Community College Chancellors cannot provide that clear advocacy role, although individual chancellors may advocate for their own institution.

At the time of this team’s visit in April, the University was considering another reorganization that would create a system Vice President for Community Colleges or a comparable position to restore more direct leadership and advocacy to the community college subsystem. The two associate vice presidents for community colleges would then report directly to the Vice President for community colleges and would presumably have their roles and authority more usefully defined.

As the institutional Report indicates, the university president and the college chancellors began discussing organizational alternatives in December 2004, and continued discussions in January and February 2005. The Report describes some of these deliberations, and the team found evidence through interviews that there has been significant discussion of options for further refinement of the organizational structure. Not all college chancellors are in agreement with the need for a change, and some would like to preserve the direct access they currently have to the university president. In the interests of preserving the chancellors’ direct report to the university president, one proposed structure creates dual reporting for chancellors to both the University President and the (proposed) Vice President for Community Colleges.

The University President intends to discuss proposals for structure with the colleges and the system, the faculty senate and the Board of Regents over the next two months. The UH CC’s and the University of Hawaii are doing thoughtful work to identify the best structure that allows them to provide needed coordination and decision making as well as advocacy, reduce the span of control (and consequent workload) of the University President, and also maximize the goal of college autonomy and the benefits that have been achieved by the 2002 reorganization. The University plans to make a decision on whether to create a Vice President position and to identify any new reporting arrangements by the end of the current academic year.
Conclusion on Recommendation Four

The team concludes that the UH Community Colleges have adequately addressed this recommendation that they identify the organizational structure, job titles and associated costs. The team recognizes that the community college system’s response to Recommendation Six may again change the organizational structure and costs of the system, but will consider Recommendation Four fully addressed at this time.

Conclusion on Recommendation Six

The team finds that the UH Community College’s current organizational structure has created some vacuums in leadership which results in the institutions inability to act decisively when there is need for action. The Council of Chancellors appears to be a consensus-based decision making body with little or no ability to act when there is not consensus. The inability to move beyond a consensus-based model is at times paralyzing. The lack of an individual able to play the role of community college system chief executive contributes to the organization’s inability to take decisive action. The persistence of status quo on the issue of assessment exam scores, and the slow collective response to the Commission’s requirement that the colleges and system engage in ongoing assessment and improvement are evidence of the negative impact and lack of clear leadership for the UH CC system. The UH President cannot effectively lead the community colleges and also fulfill all of the other responsibilities of the President.

The University of Hawaii is working to identify an organizational structure that will provide adequate leadership and advocacy for its community colleges. At present, this recommendation is not fully addressed.

Salary Placement Policies and Practices

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

As the University of Hawaii began its reorganization in 2002, it adopted new titles for both system and institutional administrative leadership. In recruiting persons from outside to fill administrative vacancies, the University needed to develop a competitive and attractive salary scale. The University revised Board policy and adopted salary adjustments to the executive and managerial positions that were indexed to the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR). This policy is available on the University’s web site.
The University proposed to hire new administrators at the minimum level of the median of the CUPA-HR benchmarks, and to stage salary increases for incumbent administrators over three years by enacting incremental increases on July 1 of 2002, 2003 and 2004. However, the University did not adhere to this schedule, nor did it adequately inform the executive and managerial classes of its plans to adopt incremental increases. The first salary increment for incumbents was implemented July 1, 2004. Thus the matter was brought to the team’s attention in fall 2004. At the time of the team visit in fall 2004, the University was just about to release a memo to the Chancellors describing the University’s plans to make the incremental salary adjustments. This memo was shared with the visiting team. After the team visit in fall 2004, the University and the Board approved salary adjustments to bring all incumbents to the 20th percentile of the CUPA-HR benchmarks. The University informed the team of its intention to raise salaries in an order of priority that reflects institutional size and individual performance.

The University has plans to continue the incremental salary adjustments for two years, on July 1 2005 and 2006, to finally bring incumbents to the policy-defined salary-goal of at least the median of the CUPA-HR. Currently, fifty percent of the incumbents in the executive class have salaries at or above the CUPA 40th percentile, while fifty percent have salaries between the 40th and 20th percentile. Currently, slightly over fifty percent of incumbents in the managerial class have annual salaries at or above the CUPA median while forty seven percent have salaries below the CUPA median.

Conclusion

The University has posted its salary policy and communicated clearly to administrators its plans to achieve CUPA-HR median salary benchmarks. At the same time, the University is re-examining the benchmarks set to better reflect institutional size. This recommendation has been satisfactorily addressed.

Community College System Governance

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

Since the January 2005 Commission action letter, the University of Hawaii has begun “informal” discussions at the administrative leadership and Board of Regents level about how the Board might enhance its role as a community college governing board and better meet the ACCJC standards. The institution’s Report indicates the Board of Regents is considering changing the manner in which it considers college issues by increasing the size of the Community College Subcommittee of the Board of Regents and setting a meeting schedule different from its regular schedule, perhaps a schedule of quarterly...
meetings to consider community college policy issues and other matters in greater depth. The visiting team confirmed with members of the Board that these discussions have occurred. The University expects to decide upon any changes to the Board of Regents meeting schedule as well as the composition of the Community College Subcommittee by the end of the academic year.

Conclusion

The University of Hawaii Community Colleges have not yet addressed this recommendation, although they have conducted meaningful discussions to begin the process of improving the Board of Regents role in governing the community college system.

//