Windward Community College

Accreditation Follow-Up Report

Submitted By:

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

Submitted to:
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2014
To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Douglas Dykstra, Chancellor
Windward Community College
45-720 Kea'ahala Road
Kane'ohe, Hawaii 96744

I certify there was broad participation by the campus community, and believe this Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Douglas Dykstra, Chancellor

Date

John Morton, Vice President for Community Colleges

Date

Ardis Eschenberg, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Representing Planning and Budget Council and Staffing Plan

Date

Judy Olivera, Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Representing Planning and Budget Council and the Staffing Plan

Date

Michael Moser, Director of the Office of Continuing Education, Representing Planning and Budget Council and Staffing Plan

Date

Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Dean Division I, Representing Staffing Plan

Date

Brian Richardson, Dean Division II, Representing Staffing Plan

Date

Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, Representing Planning and Budget Council
To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Douglas Dykstra, Chancellor
Windward Community College
45-720 Kea’ahala Road
Kane’ohe, Hawaii 96744

I certify there was participation by the University of Hawai’i Board of Regents, who believe this Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of Windward Community College.

________________________________________
Board of Regents Member

Date

________________________________________
Board of Regents Member

Date

________________________________________
Board of Regents Member

Date

________________________________________
Board of Regents Member

Date
Follow-Up Report | 2014

Report Preparation

An ACCJC letter dated February 11, 2013, made recommendations based on the Windward Community College’s (Windward CC) Self Evaluation of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness and the Team Evaluation Report. The letter stated that the Commission had reaffirmed Windward CC’s accreditation status. The letter also outlined five College Recommendations and five University of Hawai‘i Community College System Recommendations that were to be addressed in a Progress Report by October 15, 2013, to be followed by a visit thereafter. The recommendations were:

**College Recommendation 1:** As noted in the 2006 visiting team report and in order to meet the standards, 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 for student services, using the results for improvement of student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.3, I.B.7, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.B.4)

**College Recommendation 2:** In order to fully meet the standards, it is recommended that the college design, document, and implement an effective 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 improvement of learning and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1 thru I.B.7, II.A.2, II.B.4, II.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.1, III.D.3, III.D.4, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.3.g)

**College Recommendation 3:** In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop and implement 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)

**College 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 for funding for operations. (II.A.2, II.A.3, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, II.C.1.d, III.A, III.B, III.C)

**College 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 insure their integrity and effectiveness. The college should also widely communicate the results of the evaluations and use them as a 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)

**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)

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.e, III.C.1, III.C.1.c, III.C.2)

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)

In a subsequent letter dated February 7, 2014, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) reviewed the Follow-Up Report on Windward CC submitted by the Visiting Team from their November 13-14, 2013, visit. The Commission determined that the College met Windward CC Recommendations 1, 4, and 5 as stated above as well as UHCC Recommendations 1, 2, and 3, based on information and evidence presented in the October 15, 2013, Follow-Up Report.

The Commission also determined that Windward CC needed to submit a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2014, focused on full resolution of Windward CC Recommendations 2 and 3 and UHCC Recommendations 4 and 5. The College, additionally, would need to demonstrate compliance with Standard III.A.1.c by adopting and implementing the University of Hawai`i System Policy.
This Follow-Up Report will concentrate on addressing the following recommendations and referenced Standards:

**College Recommendation 2:** In order to 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 instructional 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, III.C.2, III.D.1, III.D.3, III.D.4, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.3.g)

**College Recommendation 3:** In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop and implement 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)

**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)

**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)

Upon receipt of the letter, Chancellor Dykstra appointed Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation; the entire Administrative Staff; Frank Palacat, the Special Representative of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to the Planning and Budget Council; and, Jeffrey Hunt, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, to research and report on Recommendation 2, and Ellen Ishida Babineau, Dean of Division I; Brian Richardson, Dean of Division 2; and Karen Cho, Human Resources Officer to research and report on College Recommendation 3.

The University of Hawai‘i Community College System Office collaborated with the campus during the summer to write the responses for the two System recommendations.

Jan Lubin, as Accreditation Liaison Officer, compiled and edited the Follow-Up Report, with Chancellor Dykstra being the final editor. The report was discussed at Convocation on August 18, 2014, after which it was uploaded to the web for campus-wide comment and revised accordingly before being sent to the University of Hawai‘i Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges Office and the Board of Regents for certification.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS
College Recommendation 2: Integrated Planning

In order to fully meet the standards, it is recommended that the college design, document, and implement an effective 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 improvement of learning and institutional effectiveness. (I.B.1 thru I.B.7, II.A.2, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.1, III.D.3, III.D.4, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.3.g)

I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

I.B.2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning processes are broad based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

I.B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

II.A.2. The institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, developmental, and precollegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, shortterm training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location.

II.A.4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.
II.B.2. The institution provides a Course Catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following:

a. General Information
   - Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s) and Website Address of the Institution
   - Educational Mission
   - Course, Program, and Degree Offerings
   - Academic Calendar and Program Length
   - Academic Freedom Statement
   - Available Student Financial Aid
   - Available Learning Resources
   - Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty
   - Names of Governing Board Members

b. Requirements
   - Admissions
   - Student Fees and Other Financial Obligations
   - Degree, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer

c. Major Policies Affecting Students
   - Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty
   - Nondiscrimination
   - Acceptance of Transfer Credits
   - Grievance and Complaint Procedures
   - Sexual Harassment
   - Refund of Fees

d. Locations or publications where other policies may be found.

III.C.1. The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

III.C.2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

III.D.1. The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.

III.D.2. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

III.D.3. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.
IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Standard IV.B.1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

IV.B.3.g. The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role-delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

In accordance with Standards I.B.7 and III.D.1, the College uses ongoing and systematic evaluations to make improvements based on the College’s Mission, Vision and Core Values (pp. 2-3). Windward CC has an ongoing, cyclical planning process that engages faculty and staff. Department Chairs with input from faculty, Program Directors, and Vice Chancellors create funding requests for upcoming years based upon information detailed within their respective annual assessments and five-year comprehensive program reviews, thus satisfying Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, and I.B.5.

Using systematically gathered evaluation data from the Spring 2009 Governance Sub-Committee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (GSIEC) Governance Perception Surveys, the newly arrived Chancellor, in accordance with Standards III.D.3, I.B.6, IV.A.1, and IV.A.5, proposed a major modification in the governance committees for planning and resource allocation. To enhance the effectiveness of decision-making on campus, the Budget and Strategic Planning Committees were consolidated into the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) in November 2009 after the Chancellor reviewed the results of the Governance Perception Surveys for both committees. The Chancellor determined there was an overlap in the information, purpose, and responsibilities of each committee. The consolidation of the two committees streamlined the planning and allocation processes while simultaneously assuring broad based representation following the tenets of Standard I.B.4 and III.C.1-2, with representatives from all units of the college community including Administrative Services and Technology as seen in the Charter (before publication).

Integrated Planning at Windward Community College

Integrated planning “is an interactive process in which an institution, through its governance processes, thoughtfully uses its values and vision to set priorities and deploy its resources and energies to achieve institutional changes and improvements at various levels of the organization in response to current or anticipated conditions.” (ACCJC News Fall 2009)
Windward CC’s integrated planning follows the evaluation process and the roles that the people involved designing, implementing and revising plans contribute. Further, it discusses the processes of assessing these plans, determining revisions (outputs) and introducing these revisions as inputs to create an evaluation cycle in accordance with accreditation Standards I.B1.1-B1.7, III.D.1-D3, and IV.A.5.

**Long Term (Strategic) and Short Term (Annual) Planning**

All planning activities are cyclical; some have a relatively short-term annual cycle, and some are strategic in nature having a longer cycle of five to twenty years. These combined activities support Standards I.B1.1-7, II.A.2, II.A.4, II.B.2, III.C.1-C.2, III.D.1-D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, and IV.B.1. Short-term planning includes:

- Annual updates to the Windward CC Catalog
- **Annual Reports of Program Data, Annual Assessments, Annual Committee Reports**;
- **Annual Departmental Reports** and **Annual Unit Assessments** that are required to develop program review
- Annual budget development and approval;
- **Annual resource allocation** for ongoing programmatic needs and one-time projects; and,
- Other annual planning activities.

Long-term strategic planning includes:

- The Strategic Plan, Chancellor’s Vision, and Facilities Master Plan;
- Departmental and Unit planning that is long-term in nature, but also feeds into the annual planning cycle;
- An analysis of success in addressing goals, such as the Strategic Plan Goals;
- An evaluation of existing programs as required for a comprehensive 5-Year Program Review; and
- An overall evaluation of the college planning process itself.

The long and short term planning cycles are shown graphically in Figure 1 on page 14 of this document.

The following example shows how Windward CC’s Planning Process follows the tenets of Standards I.B1.1-7, III.D.1-3, IV.B1, and IV.B.3.g illustrates how one item might move through the cycles shown in Figure 1. A veterinarian from the Windward community voiced a need for the program to one of the Dean’s at the College. The Dean requested that the Natural Sciences Department conduct a needs analysis to see if such a need really existed. The analysis was done and showed a need for Veterinary Assistants not only in the Windward area, but throughout the entire state. The department put the request to start a new program into their Annual Departmental Report and presented the Curriculum Committee with a Request to Plan a new program. The request passed the Curriculum Committee and went to the Board of Regents and the Windward CC Planning and Budget Council. The Board of Regents (April 16. 2009 Minutes pp 5-6) endorsed the program and set it up on Provisional Status as a Certificate of Achievement (CA) in Veterinary Assisting, and the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) allocated funds for new faculty as the request was tied to the Strategic Plan. In the following year the one year certificate was extended to a two-year Associate of Science in Veterinary Technology utilizing the same procedure. The PBC discussed, endorsed
and recommended that the Chancellor hire a Coordinator for the program, which was to be housed in Imiloa (the Natural Science building).

In order to pass its national professional accreditation, the Veterinary Technology program needed to have a facility that met national standards to care for animals. The proposal was forwarded to the Master Planning and Space Allocation Committee (MPSAC) and the PBC to both identify a location (tied to Facilities Master Plan) and secure funding to create the Veterinary Technology Center. The building was completed in Fall 2013, and instruction began immediately. The program also received its national accreditation. In accordance with Standards B.1-B.3, B.5, and IIA.2, the Veterinary Technology Center will be assessed on a regular basis as part of the Department Annual Assessment/5-Year Program Review Process and within unit planning. The Veterinary Technology program SLOs will be assessed as any other program, through the Annual Report of Program Data and other scheduled assessments. At each of these assessment points, the SLOs will be evaluated on their alignment with the college Goals, Strategic Plan, and Facilities Master Plan.
Figure 1: Windward CC’s Internal Institutional Planning Process
Windward Community College Planning Process

A discussion of the various plans, reports and documents used within the planning and budgeting process and the manner that they connect to one another is a crucial component of Windward CC’s Integrated Planning Model. These documents are created and evaluated by the constituent groups and reviewed by an outside reader from within the College. The process which is explained in Figure 2 below assures that Windward CC meets Standards I.B.1-7, III.D.1-3, and IV.A.5.

Figure 2: Windward Community College Planning Process

Draft documents are submitted for input during development and are reviewed by the constituency groups and third party reviewers utilizing rubrics (Instructional/Non-Instructional Rubrics) specifically created for these documents. After making any revision(s) needed based on third party reviews, the documents are then submitted to the PBC, where the PBC Representatives (future, Charter pp. 2-3) are tasked to review each PBC Form (PBC Form Notes) and substantiate the evidence by reading the related documents, such as Departmental Reviews, which are uploaded to the PBC web page specifically for that year. The Department Chair or Unit Head presents each of the PBC forms to the body as a whole for review and comment. After all the PBC forms are presented, the PBC ranks (PBC Rating Survey Results) the requests in order of importance as to which should be funded.
through anonymous individual voting based on a ranking rubric (PBC Ranking Rubric). This process and the rubrics used in the PBC evaluation process are assessed every other year to see if the changes, if any, implemented have improved the process.

**Windward Community College Important Documents**

If funds are available, $500,000 is allocated to Computer Resources and Instructional Media every year, as agreed to by the Planning and Budget Council (February 5, 2010) in 2009-2010 Academic Year. Additionally, financial proposals for amounts greater than $5000 require substantiation in the form of adherence to and support of Strategic Objectives (from the UH, UHCC, and the Windward CC Strategic Plans), Annual Assessment/Program Review recommendations, as well as other forms of institutional data. This focuses the actions of the College toward a defined institutional direction that has been developed in broad consultation with all college constituency groups as represented in Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, II.A.2, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.1, IV.A.1, and IV.B.1.

Although the College has many important documents, the core documents utilized in the planning and budgeting process are the Mission Statement, the Chancellor’s Vision Statement, the Strategic Plan, the Annual Reports of Program Data, and the Department and Unit Annual Assessments/5-Year Program Reviews, which include SLO Assessment data. Many of the core documents have relatively long-term objectives and life spans and help guide the planning of short-term documents as well as long-term documents as shown in Figure 3 below which is how Windward CC aligns with Standards I.B.1-7, II.A.2, III.D.1-3, IV.A.1, and IV.B.1.

As shown in Figure 3, at the very top of this hierarchy are the **mission and core values** of the College. Windward CC ensures that all plans are consistent with the college mission statement. Below the Mission Statement are the three essential types of Windward CC documents. Each of these documents is required for a well-integrated planning process. The first are the comprehensive campus Strategic and Master Plans. The campus Strategic Plan is aligned with the UH and UHCC Strategic Plans and is designed to provide the direction for the College and its programs. It outlines the strategy for addressing the mission, the college goals, and the goals of the various Annual Assessment/5-Year Program Review Reports. The Facilities Master Plan outlines structural changes to existing facilities and future facilities needed for the college based upon projected future growth and the Chancellor’s Vision Statement.

The resource allocation process described above is an important part of annual planning. It:

- Ensures that resource allocations are made in alignment with the College mission and goals;
- Provides a method whereby allocations are linked to strategic planning and program review;
In addition, the PBC also establishes priority rankings (PBC Ranking Survey Results) of the various PBC Form Requests (PBC Form Notes) and creates a priority list of projects and staffing needs to be recommended to the College Chancellor for funding. The process is designed to take into account the mission, goals and vision from the above documents in conjunction with the pragmatic needs of the plans and reports listed above.

The third tier documents are primarily short-term documents. This level includes the College Governance Assessment Reports, the General Education, Program, and Course Assessment results, the All Campus Discussion Results, and the Enrollment Report. Generally, these are developed each year and must refer to the Strategic Plan, college goals and mission for their support.

The Planning and Budget Council (PBC) is the campus participatory governance committee which oversees the Strategic Plan. It has two main duties:

- To revise, assess and publish the college's strategic plan while ensuring its coordination with the UH and UHCC Strategic Plans.
- To oversee the Budget Allocation Process.

In accordance with Standard B.1.7, the PBC Policies and Procedures were first established in 1999, when the Strategic Planning and Budget Committees were combined based on evidence provided by the Governance.
Perception Surveys. These were modified in 2013 when the following PBC Charter (future) was approved. The Charter provides for the PBC’s authority, purpose, membership and oversight. It also establishes a timeline for decision-making procedures, times and dates of meetings, and assessment and dissolution procedures. As a way to convey this information to all PBC members, a PBC Manual which appears in Appendix 1 of this report, was created in 2014 based on comments made by PBC representatives in their evaluations in 2010 and 2012 (2013 Assessment).

The manual begins by reiterating Windward CC’s Mission Statement and Core Values, as all planning and budgeting decisions are tied Windward CC’s Mission as outlined in Standard III.D.1.

The manual, then presents the Chancellor’s Vision Statement, which following Standard IV.A.1, sets forth a comprehensive plan for the College that provides specific direction and parameters for the implementation of programs and activities relating to the educational and support service programs of the College.

In accordance with Standard I.B.1, the Chancellor’s Vision Statement also includes recommendations that provide a basis for dialogue about the college’s effectiveness in fulfilling its mission. The Statement is revised based upon the objectives of the Strategic Plan and the Program Review documents thus creating an interdependent continuous improvement cycle, as mandated in Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5, II.A.2, and III.D.1.

Additionally, as mandated in Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.5, and IV.B.1, every organizational unit of the college completes an Annual Assessment Report and a Comprehensive Program Review every five years, as mandated by UH Board of Regents (UH BOR) policy (5-1.e, pp. 2-3).

The purposes of these reports are to:

- Systematically assess instructional programs, student support services and administrative services using quantitative, qualitative, and student learning data for the purpose of:
  - demonstrating, improving and communicating program effectiveness
  - identifying program strengths and emerging trends
  - facilitating improvements through substantiated goals
- Assess the degree to which programs and services effectively support the:
  - Mission (Statement, Core Values and Vision)
  - Strategic Plan
- Influence curriculum, college planning, decision-making, and resource allocation
- Promote collaboration and dialogue across campuses and disciplines.

The Annual Assessments/5-Year Program Reviews are part assessment, part evaluation, and part recommendation. These reports describe the process by which academic programs, student service programs, and administrative units assess their effectiveness. The different areas of the College then use the data presented in the report to recommend changes to improve their effectiveness. Long-term unit plans should inform planning documents like the Facilities Master Plan (1992-Plan Review Use for Five Year Master Plan for Windward Community College). For short-term goals, faculty and staff in program areas are expected to complete Action Plan Proposals as part of the budget planning process in order to meet needs that are identified in these reports as well as in annual SLO
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reports. This process exemplifies how the Facilities Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, and the Annual Assessment/5-Year Program Review Reports support each other.

The Department or Unit Annual Report or 5-Year Program Review template is provided by the Office of Institutional Research to the Department Chairs and unit heads in accordance with Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, and I.B.5, and includes the quantitative information extracted from the Operational Data Store following the subgroups and other parameters provided by the Department Chairs. The Department/Unit Annual Review is drafted by the Department Chair, reviewed by the Vice Chancellor/Dean/Director, reviewed by a third party, revised, and finally submitted to PBC in the fall semester for deliberation in the spring. It includes an executive summary, college, departmental, and other pertinent mission statements and student learning outcomes, departmental analysis of quantitative indicators, results of student learning outcomes assessments, curriculum revision, departmental analysis of qualitative indicators, departmental actions and budget requests, and any appendices the department wants to attach.

Coupled with these assessments, the Strategic Plan promotes continuous improvement by explicitly stating strategic goals and objectives for the College to address, meeting Standard B.2. In 2014, Windward CC will be modifying its current 2008-2015 Strategic Plan goals and promulgate the new 2015-2022 Strategic Plan. In accordance with Standards I.B.1, I.B.3 and I.B.6, the main goals of the 2008-2015 Strategic Plan, which are aligned with the UH and UHCC Strategic Plans, were modified by the PBC after thorough review in 2013.

In accordance with Standards I. B.1 and I.B.4, to improve and further support the PBC review process, supporting documents submitted by the departments and units of the College are reviewed by a “third party.” This review strengthens the evidence for PBC requests by suggesting improvements in the narrative sections to promote clarity and conciseness, and determine that, from the third party reviewer’s perspective, the existence of a strong rationale for the PBC requests.

The purpose of Windward CC’s third party review is to invite outsider eyes to help the department, program, or unit to improve the rationale for budget requests. Theoretically the third party reviewer is the request initiator’s best friend, pledged to carefully read the supporting document from beginning to end to identify what has been done successfully and where improvement may be or should be initiated.

In order to promote fairness and objectivity in the review, anonymous reviewers are assigned to review documents that are outside of their area using the Annual Assessment/Program Review Rubric, (pp.3) to provide constructive feedback. There were a total of 23 College (Departmental or Unit Reports) and Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD) reports (BOR-approved programs and remedial and developmental education) for 2013 that were assigned a reviewer.

The reviewer pool consists of administrators, department chairs, and faculty, thus meeting Standard I.B.4. The number of reports and reviewers may change as the College continues to develop new programs. What programs are assigned to which reviewer remains anonymous.

Planning and Budget Council Form

Part I of the Planning and Budget Council form (PBC Form Notes), also shown in Appendix 2, includes the title, requestor, amount, and alignment with the Strategic Plan, General Education Learning Outcomes, Student
Learning Outcomes, and process outcomes. It specifies Department Chair and Dean/Director, Vice Chancellor review. A summary and rationale must be provided by the requestor, along with accompanying documentation.

Part II of the Planning and Council Forms calls for the requestor to indicate the type of funding they are requesting. The definitions (Request Code Definitions) and the long title for each item in this section are listed in Appendix 3.

**Planning and Budget Council Form Rubric**

In accordance with Standard I.B.4, each department chair, unit head or their designee presents each Planning and Budget Request Form to the collective membership for discussion. The Director of Planning and Program Evaluation presents the results from the All-Campus Forum (Campus Wide Dialogues) on Course, Program, and/or General Education/AA in Liberal Arts degree assessment as further evidence supporting a specific budget request if relevant.

PBC members are expected to do their due diligence and read the supporting evidence provided on the PBC web page as well as review the form prior to the meeting. The form is presented in accordance to Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, and IV.A.5. Additionally, PBC members can ask for clarification and additional information from the person presenting the form as well as assigning a ranking to the form based on the rubric (PBC Form Notes). The requestor should also use this rubric to establish which tier (see PBC form 9 in Appendix 2) the request falls into. This is different from the rubric (PBC Rating Rubric) that will be used in the final step when members prioritize all the PBC Request Forms presented, which will form the PBC’s recommendation to the Chancellor on what the College should request the UHCC System to include in the UH System Budget Request to the Hawai‘i State Legislature in Biennium and Supplemental Budget Request years.

**Planning and Budget Council Prioritization Rubric**

After all the Planning and Budget Council Request forms have been presented to the members, the Director of the Office of Institutional Research sends a survey (PBC Survey (closed)) to the membership requesting their prioritization of the forms. Members use the rubric (PBC Rating Rubric) displayed in Appendix 4 to prioritize each of the items. The Office of Institutional Research then ranks the items (PBC Rating Survey Results) according to the overall rankings of the PBC members, and submits the results to the Chancellor as well as posting them on the PBC website, following the tenets of Standards I.B.3-5, III.D.3, and IV.A.1.

These recommendations are treated as advisory by the Chancellor who reserves the right to accept them, in whole or in part, or refuse them. If the Chancellor does not implement or accept the Council’s recommendation, the Chancellor will provide a written explanation (Chancellor Annual Report 2012-2013) to the Council.

**Planning and Budget Council Evaluation**

As dictated in Standards I.B.6 and I.B.7, the PBC did an evaluation of its mechanisms in Spring 2010. The non-voting, Institutional Effectiveness Representative to the PBC constructed the survey. Twelve of the 22 members of the PBC responded to the survey. The survey consisted of eight questions. No benchmark was set as this was
the first year that the PBC was in existence. A second survey was completed in Spring 2012, which contained eight of the same questions and four of additional questions. The results of the surveys are presented below. First all questions from the first survey are presented, with follow-up results from the second survey where they overlapped. Then, questions specific to the second survey are discussed. Actions and outcomes based on the results are provided throughout.

**Question 1: It was clear what items should be requested through the PBC request form**

In 2010, 50 percent of those responding to the survey strongly agreed or agreed that it was clear what items should be requested through the PBC. This question was repeated again on the 2012 survey. Of the 22 members of the PBC, 14 responded. Of those who responded 57 percent strongly agreed or agreed that it was clear what items should be requested through the PBC request form. This did not meet the benchmark of 67 percent of the respondents strongly agreeing or agreeing.

In response to this question on the 2010 Survey, a glossary (Request Code Definitions) of budget request classification codes with expenditure amounts was created and presented to PBC members at the November 5, 2010, meeting. However, since the response rate in 2012 was still below the 67 percent benchmark, and members of the PBC change every two years, training (PBC Training Information) for members prior to beginning deliberation on the Strategic Plan and Budget Requests was initiated.

The PBC 2012 Self-Assessment indicated that PBC members needed to be explicitly informed of major changes in the process in order to make the PBC more efficient. Therefore, the Chancellor initiated the following training sessions to take place prior to the first PBC meeting on October 24, 2013:

1. Departmental Annual Report Template Training;
2. Third Party Reader Training; and,
3. PBC Form Training.

Windward CC has been using Department Annual Reviews or 5-Year Program Reviews as the source for budget allocation since 2004. As mentioned above, the template used for these documents was modified in Fall 2013 to include an executive summary, a table of contents, departmental goals and/or mission statements, degree/certificate SLOs, a more thorough analysis of all quantitative indicators and Academic Subject Certificates (ASCs) offered by the department, accountability for SLO assessment with an analysis of how the current assessments link to the budget process, a more rigorous analysis of any curriculum revision that has taken place in the department, and a more explicit closing of the loop involving assessment, curriculum revision, budget, and planning process as described in the important documents section above.

The Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA), the Director of Institutional Research, and the Director of Planning and Program Evaluation planned the training that took place on August 15, 2013, for the Deans of Division I and II, the Department Chairs, and the Institutional Analyst charged with providing the data for the Departmental Annual Reports. The training consisted of the Interim VCAA and the directors going through the entire template section by section, as well as introducing the new timeline. As mentioned in above, because of the addition of the third party reader, the timeline for completion of the first draft of the report by the
Department Chairs was moved up a month – from November 15 to October 15. In addition, the Interim VCAA and the Directors introduced a rubric constructed for the third party review.

The Department Chairs gave feedback regarding the template, and asked for clarification on what they needed to do by October 15. The meeting was quite interactive, and lead to a more thorough understanding of what was expected from the Chairs on October 15. The Office of Institutional Research worked with the Chairs and the Discipline Coordinators within the departments to help alleviate any data issues.

The second part of the training was using the new rubric to review two of the Departmental Annual Reports from last year. The five Department Chairs, the Interim VCAA, the Deans, and the Director of Planning and Program Evaluation took part in this facet of the training. Two Department Annual Reports—Math/Business and Language Arts—were used as a basis for discussion. Using the rubric, the discussion revolved around what areas in the reports were strong and what areas could be strengthened.

The final two trainings took place on September 20. The first training session was for the third party reviews. The training consisted of going over the rubric, how it should be used, and what kind of feedback should be anticipated. The training also covered the new template, but only to inform the third party reviewers of the information that should be contained in the report and how it was covered by the rubric.

The second training on September 20 was for all PBC members. It consisted of going line by line through the PBC Form, so that the Chairs and other PBC members would know exactly what information should be included in the form and how it connected to the budget and planning process. Time was spent on explicitly including institutional, program, and course SLO assessment in the budget request as well as connecting those assessments to the strategic plan.

These trainings will be repeated as necessary prior to the first meeting of the PBC every Spring. A training on reviewing and modifying the Strategic Plan will take place prior to the first meeting every Fall. At the training meeting in the Fall meeting, the Chancellor will also recap what occurred at the PBC the previous year, the current UH System/UHCC Budget Process along with a review of the PBC process, thus closing the loop on how assessment and the strategic plan are linked to the planning and budget process.

**Question 2: The budget request form provided enough information for rating each request.**

Of the 12 respondents surveyed in 2010, 67 percent strongly agreed or agreed that there was enough information provided on the form. This question was asked again in 2012 and 71 percent responded that they either strongly agreed or agreed that the budget request form provided enough information for rating each request. Thus, the 67 percent benchmark was attained.

However, comments included the fact that the form did not give any hard data to look at. Therefore, adding how the request may impact the college and students and how the request will fulfill the mission and vision of the College would be important information to add. A suggestion was also made that if Windward CC’s vision was to become a top ranked community college, then monetary investment towards reaching that goal may be outside the Associate of Arts and General Education Learning Outcomes, i.e. facility and faculty improvements, technology upgrades, etc. Therefore, it would be more helpful if responses in the alignment with Strategic Plan portion of the
form included more than mere codes. Specifically, it would be very more helpful if the alignment was clearly addressed in the Documentation portion of the form by articulating HOW the request fulfills/addresses the item in alignment with Strategic Plan. Also, a suggestion was made that requests be sorted into categories before prioritizing was made.

In response to this, the instructions for the documentation area of the form have been expanded to state the following:

_In addition to the Strategic Plan, what other source(s) of documentation for the request exist? Provide an alignment with or connection to a supporting document, i.e. program review, annual assessment, departmental report, SLO/process outcome assessment/analysis, grant proposal or other documents/reports._

The idea of sorting the requests prior to prioritizing them will be discussed prior to the training that will be given in Fall 2014.

**Question 3: A handbook or guide would be helpful in understanding the process and procedures.**

In 2010, 50 percent of those surveyed responded either that they strongly agreed or agreed that a Handbook would be helpful in understanding the process as there are no real clear guidelines in the process. In 2012, the number increased to 64 percent; not making the 67 percent benchmark, but still stating that a handbook was desirable.

A thorough understanding of the process and procedures should result in better responses on the requests forms. Committee members should have a basic orientation of the process at the beginning of each fiscal year (as new people join each year), but after that they need to take responsibility for reading, coming to meetings and asking questions at the meeting if they do not understand.

After the 2010 survey, instead of producing a handbook, a training was held at the first meeting of the Planning and Budget Council to go over the form, glossary, and to answer any questions that new and former members had. Since the percentage requesting a handbook has increased by 14 percent, a Handbook of the Procedures and Processes, which comprises the middle section of this report, will be produced for use in Spring/Summer 2014. This handbook (see Appendix 1) will be utilized in future trainings and will be posted on the PBC website.

**Question 4: The rating rubric was helpful in the final rating of items.**

In 2010, 67 percent of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed that the rating rubric was helpful. Most felt that the rubric provided a basis for their ratings. It standardized ranking decisions by the evaluators and minimized personal biases. The rubric helped the authors of PBC request forms to write more meaningful responses knowing what PBC members would be using in the ranking process. However, in 2012, only 57 percent of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed that the rating rubric was helpful, thus the benchmark of 67 percent was not reached.

Although the rubric was changed once since it was first constructed, it may be beneficial to look at modifying it again now. Also training on how to use the rubric more effectively to rate the PBC items will be initiated in the training scheduled for Fall 2013, and more details on the rubric and how to use it will be put in the Handbook.
Question 5: Training on the process was provided to members early in the Academic year.

In 2010, 75 percent of the people surveyed responded either that they strongly agreed or agreed that training was provided in 2010, which decreased to 38 percent in 2012. Thus, the outcome did not make the 67 percent benchmark.

Training was provided at the first and/or second PBC meeting each academic year since its inception. However, some members weren’t appointed by their constituencies until after the training took place. This is where a handbook would be useful, and/or the suggestion above of placing new members together with old members. Also many members might have felt the training was just an open discussion on PBC forms. Therefore, the training should be conducted prior to the first PBC meeting of the Fall.

Question 6: Training for using the PBC request form was available.

In both 2010 and 2012, approximately 45 percent of those surveyed, responded that they strongly agreed or agreed that a workshop or training was provided on how to complete the PBC form, not meeting the 2012 benchmark of 67 percent.

At the start of any academic year, there is much confusion regarding the use of the PBC Request form. Modifying the request form is usually discussed at the last meeting of the previous semester or during the discussion of “corral” issues (the corral being a holding pen for non-agenda issues that arise during discussion and are deferred to a later meeting when they can be put on the agenda) at the first meeting of the new semester. Training has been provided after the modifications are made, usually the first and/or second meeting of the current semester, and further training has been available for those who requested it. A new more formalized training will take place prior to the first meeting of the PBC in any Fall semester.

Question 7: The PBC process was clear to me.

In 2010, only 45 percent of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed that the PBC process was clear. However, in 2012, 61 strongly agreed or agreed that the process was clear, which although it did not meet the benchmark of 67 percent, showed that the process was clearer to more members. Many feel that they are still learning the process, but that it worked overall. In 2010, some felt that meetings should be scheduled for twice a month to allow for orientation/training of members, discussion on any improvements to be made, time for discussing planning issues, and assessment of the process.

In response, since 2011 PBC meetings have been scheduled on the second and fourth Fridays of every month. The process still may need streamlining and should become clearer with the training provided and the production of a handbook.

Question 8: The overall PBC process was efficient.

In 2010, 45 percent of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed that the overall PBC process was efficient. This increased to 53 percent in 2012, which did not meet the benchmark of 67 percent, but did show that members felt that the process had improved.

In 2010, PBC members felt that oral presentations of each PBC request should be eliminated because people could read the requests before the meeting, and that the meeting should be dedicated for discussion and Q/A before committee members ranked the requests. Ranking could be done using clickers following the discussion and Q/A period, but everyone would need to be familiar with the rubric and use it to make their rankings. How to
use the clickers and how to use the rubric can be done before PBC members come to the meeting when the
clickers are used to input the rankings through trainings and through the Handbook. The Handbook should clearly
define the criteria for each type of request as well as include the proper department/office to send requests not
meeting the PBC request criteria. For example, if a request is for supplies, then it should be sent to the department
chair/unit head if a request is for equipment below $500, and to the appropriate Vice Chancellor if it is above $500
instead of the PBC.

Trainings will be held on how to fill out the forms. The use of clickers will be discussed, and if it is decided that
they will be used, training will be provided. This was addressed detail in the Handbook.

As mentioned above, the 2012 assessment of the PBC functions and processes was developed by the Institutional
Effectiveness non-voting member of the PBC and was conducted in May 2013. The survey consisted of four major
questions that had a variant number of attributes attached to each question. The survey was sent out to all 22 PBC
members. Fourteen members responded, two more than in 2010. A benchmark of 67 percent of those responding
that they strongly agree or agree was set for meeting the outcome. A similar survey will be done at the end the
Spring semester every other year. A summary of the responses for questions that did not appear on the 2010
survey is shown below.

**Question 1:** The goals of the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) are to ensure that the College is best
positioned to:

1. Utilize and/or leverage the College’s strengths;
2. Strengthen the College’s areas of weakness;
3. Take advantage of new opportunities; and,
4. Monitor and respond to external complexities.

To the best of your knowledge, please rate the following statements on the PBC goals. The second category did
not meet the benchmark of 67 percent. Only 57 percent of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed that the PBC
strengthened the College’s areas of weakness. All other categories exceeded the 67 percent benchmark with 70
percent of those surveyed responding that they strongly agreed or agreed that the PBC utilized and/or leveraged
the College’s strengths, 71 percent responding that the PBC took advantage of new opportunities, and 79 percent
responding that it monitored and responded to external complexities.

Training will be done for PBC members prior to beginning PBC deliberations in the Fall that will include how to
fill in the form, what kind of evidence needs to be included, what items should or should not be requested, and
how that evidence extends to the Chancellor’s Vision Statement for the College, presented to the PBC on
December 2, 2011. This statement is the Chancellor’s vision for Windward CC and will be the basis for moving
the College forward – building on its strengths and strengthening its weaknesses.

**Question 2:** The primary mission of the PBC is to:

1. Review, evaluate, and update the College Strategic Plan, at least once a year;
2. Prioritize strategic actions based on program reviews, annual reports, and summary reports from the deans and
directors; and,
3. Review, evaluate, prioritize, and make recommendations to the Chancellor regarding the use of resources in the
College budget, and regarding resource requests for future funding.

To the best of your knowledge, please rate the following statements about the PBC mission.
The first two categories within this question did not meet the 67 percent benchmark. Only 29 percent strongly agreed or agreed that the PBC reviewed, evaluated, and updated the College Strategic Plan at least once a year, and 63 percent strongly agreed or agreed that the PBC prioritized strategic actions based on program reviews, annual reports, and summary reports from the deans and directors. The last category was divided into two sub-categories, both of which exceeded the 67 percent benchmark. Of those surveyed 85 percent strongly agreed or agreed that the PBC reviewed, evaluated, prioritized, and made recommendations to the Chancellor regarding the use of resources in the College budget, and 86 percent strongly agreed that the PBC did the same for resource requests for future funding.

Elements of the College Strategic Plan have been discussed each year that the PBC has met. However, no updating took place from 2009-2012. During this time period, it may have been better to separate this item into three sub-sections: Review, Evaluate, and Update rather than to have them addressed as one because people may have answered negatively because no updating took place. At the first meeting of the Planning and Budget Council in the Fall 2013 semester, the membership looked at the Windward CC-specific items in the Strategic Plan and modified it as shown Appendix 4.

The Strategic Plan will be revised during the 2014 AY, using the UH System Strategic Plan, the UHCC System Strategic Plan, and the Chancellor’s Vision Statement as a basis. Faculty and Staff will have input through open forums, departmental discussion, and website review and comment. The Plan will then be vetted and voted upon by the Faculty Senate and the PBC.

The revision of the Departmental Annual Assessment template should help raise the response to sub-category 2 above. Trainings will continue to be conducted with the Department Chairs, who are responsible for writing this report with input from departmental faculty. The trainings will include a thorough discussion on how to present and analyze the data in the report so that the PBC request form will show that the actions taken by the PBC are tied to the Strategic Plan, the College Mission, the Chancellor’s Vision, SLO assessment and program review. As described above, the deans, directors, and Vice Chancellors are integrally involved in this process.

Question 3: To the best of your knowledge, please rate the following statements about the PBC process.

Responses to some of the statements regarding the process appear above as the questions were first asked of PBC members in 2010. Below is the summary of the additional questions regarding the PBC process.

The 67 percent benchmark was met by members responding that they strongly agree or agree with actively participating in discussions, 94 percent; reading and coming prepared to meetings, 94 percent; sharing information with one’s department, 86 percent; and, allowing the College to share individual views, 79 percent. However, only 36 percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the final allocation of funds followed the recommendations of the committee.

The prioritization of PBC Requests by the committee can be found on the Planning and Budget Council website for all years since its inception. It is ultimately the Chancellor’s decision to fund requests as the PBC is only recommending what should be funded. However, if the Chancellor does not follow the recommendation of the committee, he must respond to the committee in writing. These responses are discussed at the PBC, and then posted on the PBC website.
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Question 4: To the best of your knowledge, please rate the following statements about the 2010-2011 recommendations.

Only the list of proposals were sorted by type of request, as opposed to a numerical list, so that committee members could see the overall pattern of requests reached the 67 percent benchmark with 79 percent of the respondents strongly agreeing or agreeing that this modification took place. All the other modifications did not reach the 67 percent benchmark.

Only 57 percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the PBC form was reviewed and modified so that essential data and pertinent yet succinct rationale/justification for the request was provided. The revision of the Departmental Annual Assessment template and the Annual Report of Program Data template by the UHCC System should help raise members’ perception that this has occurred.

Only 46 percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that either a training or an information sheet that needed to be included on the PBC form was provided to the committee members prior to filling out the PBC form. As mentioned above a number of times, a more formalized training prior to the beginning of regular PBC meetings is being organized for Fall 2013 that will be mandatory for all PBC members to attend. At this meeting members will receive an information sheet that they will be able to use during PBC deliberations.

Only 38 percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the proposal review process was restructured to be more efficient and streamlined. This will be taken up during the discussion of corral issues prior to the beginning of PBC deliberations every fall.

Only 43 percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that campus priorities/goals were clear at the beginning of the process. Old and new members of the PBC will be required to read the Chancellor’s Vision for the College prior to beginning PBC deliberations. It will be covered in the mandatory training scheduled prior to beginning deliberations in the fall and appended to the PBC Handbook. The middle section of this document contains the information that will appear in that Handbook.

In addition to the self-assessment done by the PBC, the Institutional Surveys of Students, Faculty, and Staff, first done in Fall 2005 and then in Fall 2011, provide a broader perspective on governance areas to be addressed. Quantitative results are published on the web in an effort to create as much transparency as possible. Specifically, since the last re-accreditation visit in 2006, particular attention has been paid to ensuring greater staff and student representation. Comparing the College’s institutional surveys from 2005 and 2011, this has been shown to be successful. In 2006, 51 percent of students felt their “overall level of student involvement in campus decision-making” was excellent or satisfactory (Item 14a), and in 2011, this figure increased to 69 percent (Item 14a). Regarding “opportunities to participate in campus activities and student government,” 62 percent of students provided a response of excellent or satisfactory in 2006 (Item 14e), which increased to 82 percent in 2011 (Item 14e). It can be speculated that the growth in student satisfaction is partly due to an increase from 2005 to 2011 in activities available to students.

Staff perceptions also showed an increase. In 2005, staff rated “overall involvement of staff in campus decision-making” at 28 percent satisfactory (0 percent excellent; Item 8a), but that increased to 60 percent in 2011 (excellent or satisfactory; Item 8a). Staff also rated “overall availability of opportunities to evaluate college governance and decision-making process” at only 24 percent satisfactory (0 percent excellent) in 2005 (Item 9p), but that increased to at 57 percent in 2011 (excellent or satisfactory; Item 9u). These increases may partially be
due to the creation of the New Initiatives Forum, or online discussion boards, that allow faculty and staff to learn about or remark on topics that impact the campus, as well as the opportunity to participate in open forums regarding the hiring of executive and managerial positions.

Moreover, faculty, staff, and student perception of representation has remained consistent between 2005 and 2011 for ratings on the involvement of another division, but there were increases in excellent and satisfactory responses for ratings within one’s own group. The College’s Fall 2005 Institutional Surveys for the 2006 Self Study showed that while faculty satisfaction with their involvement was 61 percent (excellent or satisfactory; Item 11o), only 32 percent of the staff were satisfied with their level of involvement (Item 9m). However, in 2011, staff rated their involvement at 44 percent excellent or satisfactory (Item 9p), while faculty remained relatively constant at 60 percent (Item 11g). Further, while in 2005, 74 percent of faculty rated their “overall involvement of faculty in campus decision-making” as excellent or satisfactory (Item 10a) that number increased to 78 percent in 2011, with “excellent” ratings increasing from 12 percent to 29 percent (Item 10a). The ratings boost from staff and faculty could perhaps, again, be related to having the opportunity to provide feedback through New Initiatives and open forums.

In 2005, faculty members were unimpressed with student involvement, with only 40 percent perceiving it as excellent or satisfactory and 28 percent unable to judge (Item 10b). The perception remained the same in 2011 for faculty at 41 percent (Item 10b), but students’ perception of their own involvement increased from 51 percent in 2005 (Item 14a) to 69 percent in 2011 (Item 14a). It can be speculated this difference has to do with what each group perceives involvement to be, and what each group participates in. Faculty may distinguish participation as being through meetings and committees, which students do not always participate or have a seat in, while students may define involvement on a broader scope, as they have a wide range of opportunities, such as events, student clubs, service-learning, etc., to take part in. Also, the ASUH-WCC has markedly increased its presence and role on campus, in part fueled by the increased number of students during this period.

A similar set of institutional surveys is scheduled for 2016 to assess whether changes made in response to the 2011 surveys have changed student, faculty, and staff perceptions.

In summary, the College has policies and procedures in place to ensure that there is a continuous cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement to ensure that student achievement and student learning is effectively accomplished and tied to planning and budget. It has regularly assessed these processes and has modified them so the College can continuously improve its planning and budgeting. All constituencies of the College have been represented on the Committee from its inception, including Academic Support and Administrative Services. The present membership of the Council includes representatives from Computer Services and Media Technology, as well as Facilities Maintenance and Security.
College Recommendation 3: In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop and implement 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. (IIIA.1.b, III.A.2, III.A.5, III.C.1.b)

IIIA.1.b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

IIIA.2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution’s mission and purposes.

IIIA.5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

IIIC.1.b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.

The Windward Community College (Windward CC) Staffing Plan and Guidelines reflect the College’s commitment to providing quality education for our students in a “supportive and challenging environment” as stated in the College’s Mission Statement. This document provides an overview of the process and elements involved in the hiring and maintaining of quality faculty and staff to execute the Mission and the Core Values of this College.

Mission Statement

Windward Community College offers innovative programs in the arts and sciences and opportunities to gain knowledge and understanding of Hawai’i and its unique heritage. With a special commitment to support the access and educational needs of Native Hawaiians, we provide O‘ahu’s Ko‘olau region and beyond with liberal arts, career and lifelong learning in a supportive and challenging environment — inspiring students to excellence.
Core Values
The college and its mission, goals and actions are guided by core values that reflect the Hawaiian culture.

Na’a‘auo — Learning
- Student-centered learning environment
- Excellence in academics and workforce training
- Creativity and critical thinking
- Intellectual freedom
- Lifelong learning
- Global awareness

Ho’okomo — Access
- “Open-door” admissions policy
- Excellence in financial aid service
- Need-centered education
- Diverse approaches to learning
- Disability sensitivity
- Educational outreach to communities

Laulima — Collaboration
- Shared accomplishments
- Shared governance
- Service to community
- Campus and community engagement
- Experiential learning

Ho‘ihi — Respect
- Cultural awareness and aloha
- Student voice
- ‘Ohana-style inclusiveness
- LGBTI Safe Zones

Mea Hou — Innovation
- Creative use of research and technology
- Positive transformation in student learning, curriculum, and campus growth
Units Involved in the Staffing Decision-Making Process

- Windward CC Chancellor
- Academic—Instructional Departments (Language Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Math/Business)
- Academic—Non-Instructional Units (Library, Media/Duplication, Testing Center)
- Student Affairs (Counseling, TRiO, Advising, Registrar, Financial Aid)
- Administrative Services (Maintenance, Landscaping, Janitorial Services, Business Office, Human Resources)
- Office of Career and Continuing Education, Workforce and Personal Enrichment (OCCE)
- Office of Institutional Research (OIR)
- Planning and Budget Council (PBC)
- Office of Planning and Program Evaluation (OPPE)

At the campus level, instructional departments (academic departments) and the non-instructional units (Student Affairs, Academic Support, Administrative Services, and Community and Continuing Education) complete annual department reports using data provided by the Windward CC Office of Instructional Research (OIR). These reports, including funding requests, are submitted to the PBC, which reviews all assessment reports and accompanying budget requests for prioritization.

The University of Hawaii Community College System (UHCC) also requires the completion of Program Reviews (ARPD) for certificate and degree programs such as Liberal Arts, Agripharmatech and Veterinary Assisting. Other units or programs (Academic Support, Developmental Education, and Student Affairs) also complete these program reviews. The ARPDs include budget requests, which are found in the campus annual reports. The data for these reports come from the UHCC Vice-President’s Office of Academic Planning, Assessment and Policy Analysis.

Each of these units has an integral role in a decision-making process that uses assessment to drive and determine resource allocation, including staffing. However, other factors may affect staffing decisions.

Factors Affecting Staffing Decisions

PBC budget and resource allocations priorities and decision-making are based on campus, community college, and system-wide strategic plans and outcomes as well as on the program reviews and annual assessment reports of the campus units.
External Factors

1. University of Hawai‘i Strategic Plan, 2008-2015
3. Windward CC Strategic Plan; Strategic Action Outcomes, Update: 2008-2015
4. UH System Administration and Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges Guidelines and System-wide Priorities

Internal Factors

1. Windward CC Strategic Plan and Chancellor’s “Tactical Targets for Windward Community College” (Vision Statement)
   a. Diversified certificate and degree offerings in order to meet the College’s goals for enrollment growth;
   b. Increased enrollment of non-traditional students, which entails increased night and weekend offerings, recruitment of faculty for online offerings; planning for a child-care facility and staffing;
   c. Development of accelerated developmental English and mathematics offerings
   d. Institutionalization of Achieving the Dream projects to increase persistence, graduation, and successful transfer rates; and,
   e. Increasing Windward CC’s presence in the areas of Waimanalo and Kahuku through face-to-face and video-conferencing course offerings

2. Financial Resources: While the College has sufficient funding to support student learning programs and services and to improve the institution’s effectiveness, it is always mindful of the updated “Strategic Action Outcomes” where additional funding is tied to reaching particular performance goals, the balance between increasing tuition and restricted General Fund appropriations from the State Legislature.

3. Externally funded positions: The College has been successful in securing external funds to improve student learning and academic programs. Federal funding sources such as Title III and C3T have provided temporary faculty and staff positions to achieve grant outcomes. However, if the position(s) is deemed essential once funding is no longer available, the unit or department submits budget requests to the Planning and Budget Council for review and prioritization.

4. Realignment and Reassignments of current positions: Changes in program and degree offerings and other institutional changes such as enrollment increases, retirement of faculty and staff are considered when reviewing current and soon-to-be-vacant positions.
Employee Positions

Personnel policies and procedures specific to Windward CC are published on the College website, including those at:

- College Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines
- Office of Academic Affairs Guidelines, Policies and Procedures

Personnel practices also conform to collective bargaining agreements and to federal and state employment laws.

In accordance with Standard III.A.2, personnel at the College generally fall into one of the following four position categories:

1. Executive and Managerial (E/M)
   College personnel in this category include the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Deans of Academic Affairs, Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs, Vice-Chancellor of Administrative Services, and Director of Career and Community Education. The Classification and Compensation Plan for University of Hawai‘i Executive Classes is published at [http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/bor/emcompp.htm](http://www.hawaii.edu/ohr/bor/emcompp.htm). E/M positions are excluded from collective bargaining.

2. Faculty
   College personnel in this category include instructors, counselors, librarians, and computing and media coordinators. UH Executive Policy E5.221 “Classification of Faculty” includes the classification plan and compensation policy for community college faculty (pages 37-53). Faculty constitutes Collective Bargaining Unit 7 and is represented by the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (UHPA). The 2009-2015 faculty contract is published at [http://www.uhpa.org/uhpa-bor-contract/100129-2009-2015-agreement-for-website.pdf](http://www.uhpa.org/uhpa-bor-contract/100129-2009-2015-agreement-for-website.pdf). (Should we mention that a tentative agreement for 2015-2017 will be voted on by faculty this summer?)

3. Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT)
   College personnel in this category include registrars, financial aid officers, personnel officers, IT specialists, electronics technicians, educational specialists, and marketing staff. The Classification and Compensation Plan for APT Personnel is documented in UH Administrative Procedure A9.210 at [http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9210.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/apm/pers/a9210.pdf). APT personnel constitute Collective Bargaining Unit 8 and are represented by the Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA).

4. Civil Service

College personnel in this category include secretaries, account clerks, office assistants, janitors, and maintenance workers. Civil service position classification and compensation are determined by the State of Hawai‘i’s Department of Human Resources Development (DHRD) and documented at http://hawaii.gov/hrd/main/eccd/. Clerical staff constitute Collective Bargaining Unit 3 and are represented by the Hawai‘i Government Employees Association (HGEA). Maintenance staff constitute Collective Bargaining Unit 1 and is represented by the United Public Workers (UPW).

The University of Hawaii Office of Human Resources (UHOHR) prepares and publishes clear procedures for recruiting and selecting college personnel. These include:

- A9.620 Recruitment and Reassignment of Executive and Managerial Personnel.
- A9.540 Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Personnel.
- Policy No. 300.003 Competitive Recruitment for Civil Service Positions.

Before recruiting for any vacancy, a position description is created that accurately reflects the duties and responsibilities, the minimum qualifications, and the desirable qualifications. Positions descriptions are reviewed and approved at the division, Vice-Chancellor or Director, and Personnel Officer levels before they are advertised.

The document, “Minimum Qualifications for Faculty Positions” dated August 2011, affirms that a Master’s degree is typically required for faculty positions, and degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established. Successful experience teaching at the community college level and experience in assessing student-learning outcomes are usually among the desirable qualifications for faculty.

Executive/managerial, faculty, and APT vacancies are advertised with application instructions through the Work At UH website, the Sunday edition of the Honolulu Star Advertiser newspaper, and in some cases national publications such as The Chronicle of Higher Education. Civil service vacancies are advertised through the State’s Department of Human Resources Development website.

Faculty and staff play a significant role in selecting new employees by serving on ad hoc personnel screening committees. Screening committees consist of three or more members with a mix of gender, ethnicity, and job classifications. They develop the interview questions and optional exercises that are used to determine the qualifications and abilities of applicants. Applicants for instructional positions are typically required to teach a short lesson on an assigned topic as part of their interview. The screening committee submits its findings and recommendations to the Dean (for faculty positions) who then makes recommendations to the appropriate Vice-Chancellor or Director. The Vice-Chancellor or Director advises the Chancellor on the final hiring decision.
Employee Evaluations

As dictated by Standard III.A.1.b, the College adheres to State and University of Hawai‘i personnel policies and procedures in the hiring and evaluation of Windward personnel:

- State of Hawai‘i Human Resources Civil Service Policies and Procedures
- Board of Regent Policies, Chapter 9 Personnel
- UH System-wide Administrative Procedures, Volume III – Personnel (A9.000)
- UH System-wide Executive Policies, Section E9.000 Personnel
- UHCC System Policies

Executive and Managerial (E/M)

Board of Regents Policy Chapters 9-12 requires that all E/M employees be evaluated annually between March and June for performance and accomplishments (BOR Policies, Chapter 9-12, pages 9-30). The procedure for accomplishing this is outlined in UHCC Policy #9.202, “Executive Employees Performance Evaluation.” The process calls for establishing written objectives at the beginning of the evaluation period; obtaining anonymous feedback from subordinates, peers, and constituents; completing an end-of-period self-evaluation; and having a performance review discussion with the supervisor. Anonymous feedback is collected through an online 360° Performance Assessment tool administered by the UHOHR, as directed by the University President. The 360° instrument collects ratings on nine attributes (leadership, relations with others, planning, decisiveness, problem solving, organizational abilities, EEO/AA, safety, and overall rating) plus any comments the reviewer would like to make.

Beginning in Fall 2008, the College conducted surveys to evaluate leaders and governance documented at http://www.wcc.hawaii.edu/ir/GIC/GovernanceMenu.htm. Based on an assessment of the 2008 process conducted by Dr. David Mongold in 2012, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee restructured the governance assessment process with the creation of the Committee on Governance Assessment. The committee simplified the assessment process and provided assessment results that could identify possible staffing needs.

Faculty and Lecturers

Lecturers (adjunct faculty) participate in an annual self-assessment and performance evaluation in accordance with UHCCP 9.104 Lecturer Evaluation (effective December 2013). Lecturers are ranked at step levels A, B, or C depending on the total number of credits they have taught in the UH System. Lecturers compile and submit self-assessment materials including student evaluations for every course taught during the previous calendar year, peer evaluations, and a discussion of accomplishments and contributions since the last evaluation. By April 1, the Department Chair completes an assessment of strengths and weaknesses and typically provides recommendations for improvement. By April 30, the Dean and Vice Chancellor complete their reviews. The assessments at each level are documented and kept on file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

Non-probationary faculty (such as those hired on grant funds) are hired on one-year contracts, and probationary faculty in tenure track positions are hired on two-year contracts. Their effectiveness and performance are evaluated when they apply to renew their contracts, and the procedures and criteria for this are documented in the UH Community Colleges Contract Renewal Suggested Guidelines and forms. Contract renewal applications are due in mid-October and are expected to include a self-assessment of teaching ability including a self-analysis of the degree of attainment of student learning outcomes in the classes taught, discussion of student evaluations, discussion of peer evaluations, outline of accomplishments (curriculum development, professional development, and college/community service), responses to reviewers of the previous contract renewal application, and goals and objectives for the coming contract period. Reviews by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC), the Department Chair, the Director or Vice-Chancellor, and the Chancellor are completed by mid-January. The assessments at each level are documented and kept on file with the employee’s personnel records.

Probationary faculty may apply for tenure after completing four years of service, and all faculty may apply for promotion after four years as an Instructor (Rank 2), three years as an Assistant Professor (Rank 3), or three years as an Associate Professor (Rank 4). The UH Community Colleges Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion documents the process and criteria for evaluating the effectiveness and performance of applicants. Tenure and promotion applications are due in early October and are expected to include a discussion of: philosophy and goals regarding teaching, counseling, or appropriate area of instructional support; perceptions about the students served, including their needs and aspirations; a self-analysis of the response to these educational needs including a self-analysis of the degree of attainment of student learning outcomes in the classes taught; the impact and contributions made toward achieving professional objectives and meeting students’ needs; and evidence that the performance criteria of the rank being applied for has been met. Reviews by the DPC, the Department Chair, the Vice-Chancellor, the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC), and the Chancellor...
are completed by March. The assessments at each level are documented and kept on file with the employee’s personnel records.

Tenured faculty are evaluated at least every five years in accordance with the post-tenure review procedure documented in UHCP 9.203, Faculty Five-Year Review effective September 2013 (formally CCCM #7200 Faculty Evaluation Procedures). Faculty submit information regarding the nature and extent of contributions in each area of duties and responsibilities, including evidence relating to the quality of those contributions. The Chancellor or a designee evaluates performance and, if there is a need for improvement, jointly develops a professional improvement plan with the faculty member.

Department Chairs are evaluated annually by their department colleagues. The division secretaries tabulate and collate comments. The Dean and the Department Chair discuss the results of the assessment and action plans are developed based on areas needing improvement.

**Administrative, Professional, and Technical (APT)**

APT personnel are evaluated annually in accordance with UH Administrative Procedure A9.170 “Performance Evaluation of Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Personnel.” The standard evaluation period for all APTs is November 1 through October 31. At the beginning of the period, the supervisor and employee jointly develop and document performance expectations. Throughout the year, the supervisor is expected to monitor performance, reinforce positive behavior, and immediately correct performance problems. Near the end of the period, the supervisor evaluates actual performance against the defined expectations, discusses the assessment with the employee, and documents the ratings of competence, quality, and productivity. The University maintains an online Performance Evaluation System that facilitates this process and the documentation of expectations and performance appraisals. The probationary period for APT employees is three years.

**Civil Service**

Civil service employees are evaluated at the end of their probationary period (generally six months) and annually thereafter. The process is specified in the Performance Appraisal System (PAS) Supervisory Manual. It calls for communicating performance expectations/requirements and goals/projects at the beginning of the evaluation period, monitoring performance and coaching throughout the period, and completing and filing a performance appraisal at the end of the period.

As a result of the 2012 Accreditation Self-Study, an online system to identify and inform supervisors of upcoming annual evaluations for Civil Service employees was created and is now operational. This web-based supervisor notification system has recently been added to the college's website at
http://windward.hawaii.edu/human_resources/Performance_Appraisal.php, to allow the Office of Human Resources to track when employee evaluations are due and to send email notifications to the supervisors alerting them of which employees should be evaluated at what point. The system involves an online database of employees and a password-protected interface that can only be accessed by people in Human Resources and those working on the website. The Office of Human Resources maintains the database. <Get from Stacie Sato the latest % of Civil Service evals. Completed and report it here.>

**Current Staffing**

Current numbers of employees by position categories can be provided by Windward CC’s IRO and can also be accessed through the University of Hawai’i Institutional Research and Analysis Office IRAO: https://www.hawaii.edu/institutionalresearch/facstaffReport.action?reportId=FAC01

Current staffing information is used to maintain and ensure Windward CC’s commitment to “employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission”\(^3\). According to the *Summary of WCC Employees* provided by WCC IRO, the following are the staffing numbers for 2013, thus meeting Standard III.A.2:

**Summary of WCC Employees, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Categories</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, Professional, and Technical (APT)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/Managerial (E/M)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
<td><strong>182.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Accrediting Commissions for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Standard III.A.4.b. 2012.
Professional Development

The College’s Strategic Plan recognizes the importance of providing and funding professional development opportunities. Action Outcome 5.2 (pp. 14) calls for the college to “develop and support professional development opportunities for all faculty and staff, and include professional development funding as a base budget line item equaling 1-5 percent of each division’s personnel costs.”

In accordance with Standard III.A.5, WCC participates in numerous professional development programs coordinated at the system level to meet needs that are common among faculty and staff throughout the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCCs). These include:

- The Wo Learning Champions initiative, which was established in 2000 with a $1,000,000 endowment from two Wo Family Foundations. The Wo Learning Champions (WoLCs) are representatives selected from each of the UHCCs who serve an 18-month term and receive a personal $2000 professional development stipend. The WoLCs are collectively responsible for designing a program of professional development for faculty/staff renewal and enrichment that will keep learning at the center of its focus, have system-wide impact, and allow for expansion and enrichment of activities as new resources become available. In addition to coordinating workshops at each campus, they present annual Wo Innovation Awards and Wo Community Building Awards to recognize outstanding initiatives that might be replicated on other campuses.

- Scenarios Online: Teaching in the Learning College, an eight-week course primarily for new instructors that is designed to orient faculty to learning-centered teaching and assessment practices, increase student engagement and rapport between students and faculty, foster supportive connections among new faculty cohorts, introduce new faculty to the Laulima learning management system from a participant’s perspective, and provide a safe and confidential space to ask questions and reflect on classroom experiences.

- The W.A.C+ Summer Institute, a two-week program conducted every other summer that focuses on writing across the curriculum and assessment. It assists college teachers in all programs and subject areas to use writing as a tool for thinking and learning, to prepare to teach a writing-intensive course, to gain confidence and practice in their own personal writing, and to explore effective approaches to teaching and learning.

- The Hawai‘i National Great Teachers Seminar, a summer retreat that brings teachers together to learn from each other and exchange teaching innovations and solutions to teaching problems.

---

- **UHCC Achieving the Dream Hawai‘i Strategy Institute**, an annual two-day conference at which participants from UH Community Colleges and invited guest speakers share lessons learned and best practices in meeting strategic plan goals and Achieving the Dream goals; identify practices that will increase student success and ensure quality; and increase capacity for data analysis, program evaluation, and data-driven decision-making.

- **TALENT** (Teaching And Learning with Electronic Networked Technologies), a faculty development program that provides instruction on various online tools and pedagogical strategies surrounding the design, creation, delivery of Internet-supported course materials.

- The **Community Colleges Leadership Champions** program that was established in 2004 to identify, encourage, develop, and support the next generation of community college leadership.

- The President’s **Emerging Leaders Program** that identifies and develops future campus and system leaders through a program that provides each cohort with a base of knowledge about higher education and an opportunity to reflect upon their leadership potential and how they might make a difference in the UH campuses and system.

Several college groups and departments also develop and conduct professional development activities that are designed to meet the particular needs of WCC faculty and staff. These include:

- The **Staff Development Committee** (SDC) which plans and implements development workshops, raises funds to support staff development activities, and reviews and approves proposal for professional improvement mini-grants up to $1000. The committee consists of faculty and staff volunteers, and they administer an annual budget of $12,000. The SDC annual reports review the workshops and other activities conducted and the mini-grants awarded.

- The **Subcommittee for Professional Development in Assessment** (SPDA) of the **Institutional Effectiveness Committee** (IEC) was formed in 2010 to identify essential assessment workshops to be conducted during the academic year, to create a schedule of workshops, to plan for a consistent cycle of professional development in assessment, and to assist in institutionalizing these professional development efforts.

- **Excellence in Education Day / Wo Innovations in Learning Day** (WILD) is an annual non-instructional day that the college devotes to personal and professional development activities every first Friday in March. The Staff Development Committee and the Wo Learning Champions alternate with each other to plan and organize each year’s program.

Faculty and staff are also provided with employee benefits that encourage them to engage in ongoing personal and professional development. These include:
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- **Tuition waivers** for faculty and staff employed on a half-time basis or more. This applies to courses at any UH campus, up to six credits per semester.

- **Sabbatical leaves** for faculty. After six years or 12 semesters of full-time creditable service, faculty may apply for a one-year sabbatical leave at half pay, or a one-semester sabbatical at full pay (Administrative Procedure A9.400, Guidelines for Sabbatical Leave for Faculty, WCC Sabbatical Leave Procedures for Faculty).

Since 2006, all sabbatical applications received have been approved and funded, as listed in the following table.

**Sabbatical Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Year</th>
<th>Half Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Professional Improvement Leaves for Administrative, Professional, and Technical** (APT) employees. After six continuous years with the University, APT employees qualify for a professional improvement leave of up to six months at full pay or up to one year at half pay.

- Professional travel & training opportunities. The Strategic Plan goal for these expenditures for 2011-12 was 4.7% above target at $261,768; expenditure for 2012-13 was 30% above Plan target at $356,747.

**Determining Staffing Needs**

College units conduct an Annual Department/Unit report, which includes Demand, Effectiveness, and Efficiency data; an analysis of the data; achievement of goals; an action plan; and resources required to maintain and/or improve the quality and the effective and efficient functioning of the department or unit.
General Process

1. All instructional departments in Academic Affairs (Language Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Math/Business) and academic support units (Media/Duplication, Computing Services, the Library, and Testing Center), Student Affairs, Administrative Services, the Chancellor’s Office, and Office of Career and Community Education complete Annual Department Reports analyzing the data provided by Windward CC’s OIR and providing an action plan that may include the personnel resources requests to be submitted to the Planning Budget Council (PBC).

2. Once staffing needs are identified via department/unit reports, PBC request forms (PBC Form Notes) are created for each need. The PBC request form includes data from the department/unit reports and justification for the position.

3. When requesting a new or reallocating an existing position to meet growing workload demands and/or to implement new programs, all units complete the Request to Fill a Critical Need Attachment to the Request for Position Action SF1, University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges, form. The form includes a summary of position duties and responsibilities, the number and type of similar positions assigned to this program/unit, the reason the position is critical and the impact if the request is not approved, alternative methods of delivering the required service, and how a program/unit from which a position is to be reallocated will be affected.

A Request to Fill a Critical Need form can be completed at any time during the year by the appropriate administrator or unit head; however, a formal PBC request must be submitted with the department’s annual report to the College’s PBC. As indicated in the response to Recommendation 2 above, the PBC includes representatives from across the College. The representatives review, evaluate, prioritize, and make recommendations to the Chancellor regarding the use of resources in the College budget and resource requests for future funding.

As described in the Response to Recommendation 2 above, the PBC prioritizes proposals for new positions and future funding using a rubric that considers the linkage to system priorities, the linkage to College goals and priorities, the assessment data demonstrating a need, the immediacy of the need, the contribution to health and safety, and the scope of impact at the College.

The Chancellor considers the PBC’s ranking of position requests in deciding whether to pursue the necessary funding for them through requests to the UH System, to the legislature, or through grant applications. At times, the Chancellor may not use the prioritized PBC ranking for a new or vacant position if programmatic needs take precedence or if it does not align with the Chancellor’s “Tactical Targets for Windward Community College,” (Vision Statement)which outlines the four areas of meeting our Strategic Plan: Diversified Certificate and Degree Offering, Outreach Non-Traditional
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Students, Accelerated Remedial Learning Initiative, Institutionalizing Achieving the Dream, and Cultivating Community Connections.

If a new position is approved by the PBC, a Request for Position Form (UHCCP 9.495, Attachment 1) is completed by the Chancellor and submitted to the Vice-President for the Community Colleges for approval. If the position is allocated to the campus, the Human Resources Officer then initiates the hiring process on campus. See Figure 1 Staffing Process.

If a position is not approved for funding, the position request may be submitted to the PBC the following year. The ranking for each position from the previous year is considered when reviewing and prioritizing budget requests.

**Academic Affairs Staffing Criteria**

In 2011, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs drafted a policy, which identified the criteria for requesting reallocated positions:

As faculty positions become available through retirement or resignation, a routine review by the position supervisor, the appropriate Vice Chancellor or Director, and the Chancellor will be initiated to determine if the primary purpose of the position should be maintained or redescribed, or if the position should be reallocated.

The process will be as follows:

When an existing position becomes vacant, the appropriate supervisor (department chair, director, dean) recommends to the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor that the position be refilled as is, changed, or reallocated. The recommendation should include the following information:

- Summary of duties and responsibilities of current and proposed position (If different from current) and how the position relates to the mission, vision, and core values of the institution.
- Critical nature of work
- What programmatic functions/purposes the position directly supports
- How the position might collaborate with other positions to address the strategic plan
- Alternative method(s) of delivering required service if recommendation is not approved

---

• Appropriateness of the current position description

• If the position description were to change, would it change the nature of the position to the extent that it becomes, in fact, a new position

• Extent to which the current position fits the mission and strategic plan of the program/department/unit and College

For teaching faculty positions, the recommendation should also include the following information:

• List of classes likely to be taught by this position

• Current and projected ratios of lecturer-taught classes to those taught by full time faculty

• Fill rate of at least 90 percent for classes in the discipline for the last three years

• Number of potential lecturers available to staff classes in the discipline

• Critical workload factors outside of teaching (e.g. studio oversight, discipline coordinator, performance director) associated with this position

The Chancellor will review the recommendation with the appropriate Vice Chancellor(s) and director. If the recommendation is to reallocate a position from one unit to another, the Vice Chancellors/director of both units will be consulted.

If the Chancellor’s decision is to reallocate a position, positions in the top tier for new positions (See Process for Prioritizing New Faculty Positions) will be given strong consideration.

Staffing for new programs requested by the State or supported by the mission and strategic plan of the College, but not yet included in the new faculty priorities, will also be considered.

A policy to Prioritize New Faculty Positions was drafted at the same time. In this policy draft, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs provided an Overview and the steps for prioritizing new positions:

---

Overview

To ensure that Windward CC continues to meet its academic goals through expanding and reallocating resources, it is imperative that a process be put in place to prioritize requests for new faculty positions.

New faculty positions may be created in one of the following ways:

- By Board of Regents PCRs (Program Change Requests) initiated by the System and submitted to the BOR for eventual submission to the Legislature as part of either the biennial or supplemental budget process.

- By institutional requests initiated by the College in response to a current need, or to staff a proposed program, then sent to the System, to the BOR, and to the Legislature.

Normally, it is encouraged that new positions be proposed at 1.0 FTE.

Program Change Request Process

Because the changes connected to the Program Change Request process include broader issues than specific faculty requests, faculty positions created by BOR PCR are not subject to routine internal new faculty request and prioritizing processes. Departments that have proposed new programs to the PBC which entail creating new faculty positions may get both the program and the new positions approved if the UH System office and the BOR decide to recommend such programs for approval in the budget process.

In the event that a new program containing a new faculty position is approved through the regular system process (e.g., submission of an Authorization to Plan [ATP] reviewed and approved by appropriate levels, a final program proposal reviewed and approved at appropriate levels, rather than through the tentative approval implied by the PCR process), the new position will be included in Tier One on the PBC Request Form.

Internal Review Process

New faculty positions must initially be proposed in departmental annual reports. Departments, through the appropriate Dean or Director to the Planning and Budget Council, will subsequently propose these positions. Because it is often impossible to prioritize accurately the faculty needs of one discipline over another, Windward CC will create two tiers from which the Chancellor, advised by the PBC, can select new positions as the opportunity arises. New faculty requests will be grouped in two tiers, based on the critical need for such positions as judged by the PBC and the Chancellor, and the tiers will be reviewed and revised on an annual basis.
The following criteria may be used in placing requests for new faculty in Tier One (higher priority) or Tier Two (secondary priority):

**Teaching Faculty**
- Ratio of classes in a discipline taught by full-time (FT) vs. lecturers (The higher the lecturer to FT faculty ratio, the more critical the need). Ratio will be compared to the College average ratio.
- Ratio of student FTE to FT faculty in a discipline. Ratio will be compared to College average ratio.
- Fill rate for current classes in that discipline for past three years. Fill rate will be compared to College average fill rate.
- External requirements (e.g., disciplinary accrediting agency demands)
- Number of qualified PT or temporary faculty available to staff sections.

**Non-Teaching Faculty**
- Student/faculty ratios
- Workload
- Appropriate professional staffing standards

**Both Teaching and Non-Teaching**
Position that was grant funded in the past and is judged to be of continuing importance to the mission of the department.

**Relationship to and support of the Strategic Plan and College Mission**
Of course, these criteria are suggestive, and not assumed to be conclusive. Other data may be submitted as appropriate. Department and unit heads requesting new faculty positions are encouraged to include any pertinent data to support the proposal.

**Administrative Services, Student Affairs, and the Chancellor’s Office, Community and Career Education Units Staffing Criteria**
Each unit applies various factors to determine staffing needs. In addition to demand, efficiency, and effectiveness metrics, other criteria such as unit mission statements, campus and system initiatives, and appropriate staffing standards are considered. Rationale for personnel requests are based on the
assessments and analysis of data included in the Annual Assessment Reports and/or Annual Report of Program Data.

**SUMMARY**

Guided by the UH System, UH Community College and campus policies, the quality of faculty and staff is maintained. Using assessment results from Annual Department/Unit reports and the PBC process provides a systematic means of determining staffing needs as seen in Figure 1: Staffing Process below.
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.1, III.C.2)

**Standard II.A.1.b** The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.

**Standard II.A.1.c** The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

**Standard II.A.2.c** High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.

**Standard III.C.1** The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.

**Standard III.C.1.c** The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.

**Standard III.C.2** Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

In accordance with Standards III.C.1, III.C.1.c, and III.C.2, the development of University of Hawai‘i System technology planning has involved three separate but related activities.

1. The development of a comprehensive, system-wide web site that captures current and planned technology infrastructure, enterprise applications, and system-wide academic applications. The site will provide all community college campuses with a ready reference to system technology efforts that can inform local technology planning and decision-making.

   The technology plan site development is under the leadership of Steve Smith, Interim UH Vice President for Information Technology. The site will be continually updated to reflect changes in the technology environment, application development, and timeline of any projects in active development.

   The site is available at [http://www.hawaii.edu/technology/strategicplan/](http://www.hawaii.edu/technology/strategicplan/)
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2. Modification to the UH System Strategic Directions

Based on Standard II.A.1.b, the UH System Strategic Plan, which currently covers the period 2008 – 2015, is undergoing revision to address the period 2015 – 2021. The broad strategic directions of this plan includes the goal of becoming a high performing system of higher education, and includes the following action items related to distance education:

University of Hawai‘i Strategic Directions Report Action Strategy 2:

UH increases opportunity and success for students through leveraging system resources and capabilities. Integrated academic planning across disciplines, levels and campuses, and collaborative/shared student services prevent unnecessary duplication and efficiently provide students throughout the State with access to educational opportunity and the support they need to succeed.

Tactics

- Employ best practices in student-centered distance and online learning using technology and by leveraging University Centers.
- Develop degrees and certificates as part of integrated pathways for students enrolled throughout the UH System.
- Ensure that transfer and articulation policies are student-centered, transparent, and well communicated in order to support student mobility and success throughout the System.
- Review academic offerings for unnecessary duplication and opportunities for improved collaboration.
- Standardize and collaborate to increase consistency for students and improve operating efficiency in student support areas such as (but not limited to) transcript evaluation, financial aid processing, admissions, and monitoring of student progress, early alerts and intervention strategies.
- Reduce cost of textbooks and ancillary needs.
- Modify financial aid policies and practices to maximize access and success of underserved and underrepresented populations in cost-effective ways.

The current draft of the UH strategic directions can be viewed at http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/StrategicDirections_V15_062614.pdf
3. Also, utilizing the tenets in Standards ILA.1.b, and ILA.2.c, the UH Community College System is also updating its strategic directions for the period 2015 – 2021. One of the major components of that update is the identification of and creation of the strategic use of distance education.

Distance Education has been a significant component of community college delivery of instruction with 1,626 completely online classes offered in AY 2013-2014 with 28,015 registrations. An additional 481 Distance Education mixed media classes with 4,974 registrations were offered in the same time period. However, the planning group has recognized that much of the current distance education is driven by individual faculty initiative and not as a strategic component of addressing student access to programs and degrees across the state.

Given the geography of Hawai‘i which does not permit easy access to campuses other than on the home island of students, the use of distance technology is essential to ensuring student access.

As part of the planning effort, the community colleges are:

a. Identifying which degree or certificate programs should be offered, in whole or in part, through distance education and what resources, training, and support systems would be necessary to ensure student access and success to those programs;

b. Identifying which courses that are part of a transfer degree sequence should be offered through distance education. This effort has been informed by examining each of the baccalaureate degree pathways to determine major requirements intended to be taken in the student’s first two years but which may not be available in-person at one or more community colleges. As with the degree programs, the intent is to establish the resources, training, and support to assure the student that the pathway is available to the student on a consistent basis.

c. Designing and implementing a plan to move to open educational resources (OER) for as many courses as possible in an effort to reduce textbook costs for students. Textbook costs are a significant part of the student cost of attendance and eliminating this expenditure could significantly lower the out-of-pocket expenses for students and avoid the negative consequences of students opting to not purchase textbooks because of their cost.

The revised plan, setting the community college strategic directions, goals and metrics for 2015-2021, is still in development and will be shared with the UHCC Strategic Planning Council in October 2014 and with the broader campus community in a series of meetings in November 2014. The intention is to adopt the plan in Spring 2015.
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, IV.B.1.g)

Standard IV.B.1.e The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Standard IV.B.1.g The governing board’s self evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

Board Revision of Policies

The Board of Regents (BOR), as a follow-up to recommendations of the Advisory Task Group report to the BOR, continues to review and update its policies in accordance with Standard IV.B.1.e. Within the past year, BOR action has been taken to review and update the following policies or procedures:

August 22, 2013 – Interim Modification of Personnel Committee Procedures

New interim procedure requires that the BOR personnel committee approve all salaries in excess of $150,000.


September 19, 2013 – Chapter 9 – Amendment to Allow Internal Recruitment for Managerial Positions

This amendment modifies the recruitment policy for academic managerial appointments to allow internal recruitment as an alternative to national recruitment.


October 17, 2013 – Modification to BOR By-Laws on Committee Quorum Requirements

Clarifies that all BOR members may attend any committee meeting as a non-voting member, but that quorum remains based on the committee membership only.
Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/20131017.regular.pdf

November 21, 2013 – Chapter 10 – Amendment Clarifying the Role of the BOR in Land and Real Property Transactions
This amendment establishes the broad policy purposes for land and real property transactions and the role of the BOR in approving such transactions. It also directs the creation of a related executive policy.
Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201311210000.regular.pdf

November 21, 2013 – Chapter 8 – Amendment to establish an University reserve policy
This amendment establishes a University-wide targeted reserve policy for all funds with regular reporting to the BOR on campus reserve levels.
Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201311210000.regular.pdf

November 21, 2013 – Amendment to BOR By-Laws – Hiring of Outside Counsel
This amendment clarifies that in the event of any legal matter involving a conflict between the UH executive and the BOR that the BOR shall be empowered to hire outside counsel.
Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201311210000.regular.pdf

January 23, 2014 – Amendment to the UH Mission and Chapter 4-1 related to Sustainability.
Modifies the UH mission to reflect a commitment to sustainability and incorporates related language into Chapter 4, Planning.
Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201401230000.regular.pdf

January 23, 2014 – Modification to the By-Laws of the BOR related to Community Colleges
Follow-Up Report | 2014

This by-laws modification establishes a clearer responsibility for the oversight of the community colleges through the community colleges committee with an emphasis on strategic directions and outcomes.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201401230000.regular.pdf

February 20, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 8 on Investments
This modification allows the use of non-traditional instruments as a part of the portfolio for UH endowment and other investments.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201402200000.regular.pdf

February 20, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 6 on Student Fees
Clarifies that all student fees must have an approved expenditure plan prior to the time the fee is first assessed.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201402200000.regular.pdf

March 20, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 10 – Land and Physical Facilities
This modification clarifies language on the purpose and intent of land development and the overall goals of the University and the campus responsible as caretakers of the land asset.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201403200000.regular.pdf

April 17, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 9 on Faculty Housing
Changes the name of the program to the University Housing Assistance program, modifies the purposes and priorities for housing assistance, and clarifies the enforcement procedures for the program.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201404170000.regular.pdf

April 17, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 9 – Executive and Managerial Compensation
Follow-Up Report

Updates the guidelines for establishing executive and managerial compensation and terms of employment

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201404170000.regular.pdf

April 17, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 9 – Faculty Tenure

Establishes the conditions under which tenure upon hire is granted for new executive/managerial personnel and establishes that the faculty fallback salary should be established at the time of initial hire.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201404170000.regular.pdf

May 15, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 9 – Emeritus/Emerita Title

Clarifies the guidelines for the granting of emeriti titles to retiring faculty and other personnel.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201405150000.regular.pdf

Modification of BOR Policies and Update of Related University Executive Policies

The University President established a System-wide committee of twelve members to undertake a systematic review of the overall University policy environment, including:

a. Common format for all policies;
b. Future review dates for each policy;
c. Date of last review/update;
d. Archive of updates for each policy; and,
e. Designation of the owner/responsible office for the maintenance, and interpretation of each policy.

Among the accomplishments of the task force to date are:

• New policy templates have been adopted for Board of Regents Policies, Executive Policies and
Administrative Procedures. The templates contain elements recommended by the Advisory Task Group. These elements include:

a. 3-year scheduled review dates with automatic review alert notices to be issued and tracking of completed periodic reviews;
b. Citation of prior policy amendment dates;
c. Hot-links to related policies;
d. Definition sections that will be aggregated into a master dictionary;
e. Delegations of authority that will be aggregated into a master listing; and,
f. Hot-links to references and abolished policies.

- Policies have been reorganized into parallel 12 Chapters (current Chapter titles) of BOR Policies, 12 Chapters of Executive Policies, and 12 Chapters of Administrative Procedures.
  a. To date, 17 obsolete Executive Policies have been abolished;
  b. To date, 59 Executive Policies (61% of non-abolished Executive Policies) have been converted and posted for review by the task group with additional converted policies being received daily;
  c. All 12 Chapters of Board of Regents policies have been redrafted and are pending technical review;
  d. A new Policies and Procedures Information System web page has been created and is being tested; and,
  e. An automated system-wide staff notification system is being tested to provide notices whenever new policies are created or existing policies are amended or abolished.

The revised policy environment is expected to be completed by September 2014, and when completed can be found at [http://www.hawaii.edu/policy/](http://www.hawaii.edu/policy/).<will we have a date of completion before this goes to press?>

**UH BOR Self Evaluation**

The UH Board of Regents (UH BOR) had originally planned a tentative retreat in Spring 2014 that included a self-evaluation to meet Standard IV.B.1.g. This retreat was postponed because of the heavy...
workload of the UH BOR in conducting and managing the Presidential search and in implementing its new committee structure. This presidential search was completed in June 2014, and new BOR leadership was elected at the July 2014 meeting. The BOR retreat/evaluation session is now scheduled for November 2014.