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This Institutional Follow-Up Report is submitted to provide information regarding the specific recommendations identified by the Commission in its evaluation of Windward Community College based on a site visit on November 17, 2007, and to report progress in meeting those recommendations.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe that this report accurately reflects the progress made to responding to the Commission’s recommendations.

___________________________________________________________
Dr. David McClain  President, University of Hawaii

_________________________  ________________________
Date

___________________________________________________________
Dr. John Morton  Vice President for Community Colleges

_________________________  ________________________
Date

___________________________________________________________
Dr. Angela Meixell  Chancellor, Windward Community College

_________________________  ________________________
Date

___________________________________________________________
Mr. Allan R. Landon  Chair, Board of Regents

_________________________  ________________________
Date
In a letter dated January 31, 2008, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges reaffirmed Windward Community College’s accreditation with the requirement that the College submit a Follow-Up Report by March 15, 2009. The report was to focus on two Recommendations from the Evaluation Report of the November 17, 2007, site visit.

Upon receipt of the letter, Chancellor Meixell appointed Kathleen French, Instructor in Sociology, to research and report on Recommendation 5, and Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, to research and report on Recommendation 1. The findings and recommendations of their reports resulted in several actions by the College to assure compliance with all standards. Jan Lubin, as Accreditation Liaison Officer, then compiled and edited the Follow-Up Report. The report was uploaded to the web for campus-wide comment and revised accordingly before being sent to the Board of Regents for certification.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS
BACKGROUND

An ACCJC letter dated January 31, 2007, made recommendations based on the Self Study and the Team Evaluation Report. It stated that the Commission had removed WCC from warning and reaffirmed its accreditation status. The letter outlined five recommendations that were to be addressed in a Progress Report by October 15, 2007, to be followed by a visit thereafter. The recommendations were:

1. To evaluate institutional effectiveness, the College should continue to improve its strategic planning processes by developing measurable performance indicators for setting institutional goals and strategic directions;

2. To improve student learning and success, the team recommends that the College completes its cycle of program reviews and incorporates into these program reviews the assessment of SLOs at course, program, and degree levels;

3. The College should define the at-risk population, develop and implement strategies for addressing the needs of the at-risk population, and create mechanisms for the continuous assessment and improvement of services to this population;

4. In the interest of improvement beyond the standard, the College should act diligently to secure funding which will ensure the construction of the proposed future library facility;

5. The team recommends, to ensure appropriate participation and input, that the College refine its current governance structure policies by including written definitions of the roles and responsibilities for all constituent groups and formalize processes and structures for clear, effective communication and reporting relationships. In addition, the
College should implement an annual evaluation process to access the effectiveness of leadership and decision making which leads to institutional improvement.

WCC’s October 15, 2007, Progress Report outlined in detail what the College had done to improve what had been accomplished regarding the aforementioned five recommendations. An Evaluation Team came to Windward on November 13, 2007, and in its letter dated January 31, 2008, the ACCJC acknowledged that Windward had met recommendations 2, 3, and 4, but still had not completely met Recommendations 1 and 5. The team noted that the College had not met Recommendation 1 as the strategic planning process that would tie strategic planning to the budget process had just been implemented. They also noted that the College had not developed measures to determine its institutional effectiveness nor had it defined how its plan and processes relate to the research function and accountability measures. The team found that the College had met Recommendations 2, 3, and 4. The team also found that the College had partially met Recommendation 5 by defining its governance structure, but still had no evaluation process in place. In addition, one group needed to be established as the monitor of the evaluation process with the responsibility of making recommendations based on what is learned from the evaluation.

RECOMMENDATION 1: IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

To evaluate institutional effectiveness, the College should continue to improve its strategic planning processes by developing measurable performance indicators for setting institutional goals and strategic directions. (Standard 1.b.7)
The Strategic Planning Process

The Strategic Planning process at the college has undergone major transformation since the November 2007 Progress Report and visit. As the following description illustrates, this has been due to factors both internal and external to the College.

In October of 2007, just before the ACCJC’s November visit, the College began reworking its strategic plan with planning consultant Dr. Julie Slark. For three days Dr. Slark and approximately 35 of Windward’s faculty, staff, and administrators dissected the existing plan and came to the following conclusions: First, the College’s current Strategic Plan also included the College’s Operational Plan and these needed to be separated if the College was to run more effectively. Second, the College needed to make sure that the Strategic Plan had an over-arching vision statement. Third, the College needed to establish goals with measurable outcomes that had established timelines, assigned responsibilities, and monitoring mechanisms. The College immediately set out to accomplish these items.

During the Fall 2007 semester, while Windward was reworking its Strategic Plan, The University of Hawai`i System (UH System) and the University of Hawai`i Community Colleges (UHCC) modified their System Strategic Plans. The original UH System and UHCC plans which ran from 2002 to 2010 were supplemented by strategic outcomes documents with performance measures set to run from 2008–2015. The documents contained initiatives committing the University System to participate in Achieving the Dream (AtD) and enhance the output of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) students for the state’s workforce.

(Note: AtD is a national initiative that was created to help more community college students, particularly low income and minority populations, succeed -- that is, to complete courses and earn certificates and degrees. It is built on the belief that broad institutional change should be informed by student achievement data. Participating colleges, like the UHCCs, have agreed to use data to drive strategies, monitor progress, and evaluate outcomes; develop strategies to close performance gaps among students; involve their faculty, students, staff and
communities in their efforts; report data and outcomes broadly, both on and off campus; form partnerships with their communities, local businesses and others; and advocate for state and national policy changes as needed. The initiative, therefore, helps member colleges to focus on a student-centered vision, build a culture of evidence, and promote the twin goals of equity and excellence.

In light of the UH System initiative, the UHCC System Strategic Planning Council began to evaluate and propose **UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Data** that would conform to the **UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015**. The Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) visited each college to review benchmarks, baseline data, and suggested performance targets. The colleges were asked to review the proposals and agree or suggest new targets. The Office of the VPCC (OVPCC) compiled the responses and established the **UHCC System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015 for each College**. The Performance Measures for 2015 became the Strategic Plan Action Outcomes measures for the updated 2008-2015 WCC Strategic Plan (**Appendix 1**).

To stay in sync with these changes, Windward once again had to revisit its Strategic Plan. The broad areas that had just been modified in October with Dr. Slark now had to be aligned with the directives and outcomes of the new UH System and UHCC Strategic Plans before being presented to the campus for review and comment.

To coordinate its strategic planning activities, the College hired a Director of Planning and Program Evaluation in December 2007. The Director supports the Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committees and sits on the Budget Committee. At Convocation on January 8, 2008, after reviewing the UH System and UHCC Strategic Plans, the Director led an activity (**Appendix 2**) in which both non-credit and credit faculty and staff participated in developing the over-arching vision of the new Strategic Plan.

The Director then made appointments to participate in a follow-up activity (**Appendix 3**) with individual departments during the Spring 2008 semester. For Instruction, this activity was based on each department’s Annual Assessment or 5-
Year Program Review and culling out data pertinent to the Strategic Plan. Unfortunately, soon after the Convocation, the Director of Planning went on medical leave, so a faculty member on the Strategic Planning Committee visited each of the academic departments and worked with them on the follow-up activity. The Chancellor, the Dean of Administrative Services, the Dean of Students, and the Director of Vocational and Continuing Education met with their constituencies and developed new outcomes as well. These were presented to the Strategic Plan Committee for review and comment throughout the Spring 2008 semester. The modified version of the 2008 Strategic Plan, using comments and suggestions from the Committee, was used for the Biennium Budget Stocktaking presented by Chancellor Meixell on April 28, 2008 (Appendix 4), and for the Legislative Budget Requests (see Appendix 5) submitted to the Vice President for Community College’s Office on June 1, 2008. It was uploaded to the web for review and comment from the entire campus beginning in May 2008.

After feedback was received from the entire College, the Strategic Plan was discussed thoroughly and modified once again at the first meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee in October 2008. This modified plan (see Appendix 1) and the separate Operational Plan were presented to the Faculty Senate on November 18, 2008. The Operational Plan is still under development and will be under constant review by the Strategic Planning Committee and Budget Committee as they assess the Strategic Plan Performance Outcomes.

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

University of Hawai`i System Philosophy

This section of the Progress Report contains the Windward Community College Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures developed by the Strategic Planning Committee which were reviewed by the Faculty Senate, and the faculty and staff as a whole. They are aligned with the objectives introduced by the UHCC Strategic Planning Council and the goals of the University of Hawai`i (UH) and University of Hawai`i Community Colleges (UHCC) Strategic Plans 2008-2015.
The following quote from the UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015 brochure dated May 2008 sums up the University of Hawaii System philosophy for measuring outcomes. (http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/uhplan/SOPM.pdf):

During the 2007-08 academic year, the University community and its public revisited the strategic plan. Participants broadly affirmed our strategic goals and the values underlying our goals. They recommended we better differentiate system and campus roles, and establish clear and measurable outcomes to assess performance and progress. Participants agreed that articulating our plan in terms of the higher education needs of the State adds a valued dimension and reaffirms our University’s commitment to serving the State. Based on these recommendations, the University developed this companion piece to our plan which assigns strategic outcomes and performance measures to be accomplished by 2015. This update will guide the future priorities of the University and inform our budget planning process for the next three biennia.

Performance measures assigned to each strategic outcome demonstrate our willingness to be held accountable and enable us to effectively assess our progress. The goals we have set for 2015 are stretch goals, and challenge us to reinvent ourselves. We use quantitative measures to provide evidence of our efforts, but acknowledge that many of our core values – academic rigor and excellence, integrity and service, aloha and respect – while not addressed here, are central to our mission.

The Process of Measuring Outcomes at Windward Community College

In the 2008-2010 Academic Year, the Strategic Plan and Budget Committees will adhere to the following cycle:

2. The measurable outcomes for the year 2015 were included in the WCC Strategic Outcome Objectives, which were reviewed and revised by the Strategic Planning Committee, and then posted on the web for review by the entire campus prior to the end of the Spring 2008 semester.

3. These outcomes were revised based on discussions with the Achieving the Dream campus leaders, the Strategic Planning Committee, the ETC, and other constituencies involved in achieving Windward’s Strategic Plan Outcomes.

4. The revised outcomes were placed up on the WCC web site before the end of the Spring semester, and were available for Campus comment until the middle of September.

5. The Strategic Planning Committee reviews the expected outcomes with the actual outcomes based on census and end-of-term data beginning in September 2008 and continuing through the end of the Spring 2009 semester.

6. If in reviewing the expected outcomes with the actual outcomes, it is found that the College has matched or exceeded the expected outcome, then the College has met expectations. If the College has not matched the expected outcome or the outcome was lower than the expected outcome, then the College did not meet expectations.

7. The organizational structures, i.e. Financial Aid, Service Learning, Student Services, responsible for meeting the various outcomes have been requested to report the procedures and processes used to try to reach the expected outcome by the end of the Spring 2009 semester.

8. The Strategic Planning Committee will provide feedback on the meeting/non-meeting of expectations at the Convocation at the beginning of the Fall 2009 semester.
9. The feedback and procedures and policies instituted to meet the performance expectation will be addressed in the organizational structures Annual Assessment or 5-Year Program Review due on November 1, 2009.

10. The Strategic Planning Committee will use the information provided in the Annual Assessment/5-Year Program Review to modify the Strategic Plan and the outcome measures during the Fall 2009 semester.

11. The modified Strategic Plan will be put on the WCC website for campus-wide review and comment before the end of the Spring 2010 semester through September 2010.

12. The next revised Strategic Plan and performance measures will be presented to the Graphics Department in October 2010.

13. The revised Strategic Plan and performance objectives will be presented to the Faculty Senate in November 2010.

14. The revised Strategic Plan and performance objectives will be presented to the Campus and UH System Offices in December 2010.

15. The entire process continues throughout the life of the current Strategic Plan, and is used in the development of the new Strategic Plan and Performance Measures from 2016 onward.

Analysis

As the descriptive summary illustrates, through a collaborative process, WCC has developed strategic institutional goals which are aligned with the UH and UHCC Systems. It has also developed measurable performance indicators to determine if these goals have been met. The Director of Planning and Program Evaluation will monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan modifications necessary to meet strategic outcomes. It is also the Director’s responsibility to keep abreast of any changes made to the System and Community College
Strategic Plans and to ensure that the College’s Strategic Plan remains aligned with them.

**Action Steps**

Carry out the process displayed above for measuring Strategic Plan outcomes at Windward Community College.

---

**RECOMMENDATION 5: Governance Structure Policy**

The team recommends, to ensure appropriate participation and input, that the college refine its current governance structure policies by including written definitions of roles and responsibilities for all constituent groups and formalize processes and structures for clear, effective and reporting relationships. In addition, the college should implement an annual evaluation process to access the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making which leads to institutional improvements. (Standard IV.A.1, A.2, A.3, and A.5)

As mentioned in the Background Section of this Follow-Up Report, the first part of Recommendation 5 was completed before the Team Visit in November 2008. In the Spring 2008 semester, Instructor Kathleen French wrote an in depth analysis on second part of Recommendation 5. (Appendix 6). In that report she stressed that this part of Recommendation 5 needed to be understood as three equally important parts. First, Windward had to develop an evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of its leadership and decision-making structures. Second, the College had to identify one group as the monitor of the evaluation process, with the responsibility of widely communicating the results of the study to the campus
community, and then using the results to make suggestions for improvements. Finally, the College had to act on these suggestions to implement needed institutional improvements.

Ms. French also researched what other colleges did in order to satisfy the Standard IV.A.5 requirement. She found that most conducted some form of perception survey (pg.). The difference between what these colleges did compared to what WCC had previously done to evaluate governance was that the questions on the surveys done by the other colleges were better aligned with Standard IV.A. Some even measured leadership and governance at the level of individual units, departments, and committees. In addition, these other colleges also utilized their survey results to help them make changes in their governance structures and processes.

Therefore, in order for WCC to develop a valid survey, the questions needed to align with Standard IV.A’s four themes: (a) encouraging initiatives; (b) systematic participative processes; (c) assessment/evaluation; and, (d) institutional improvement. Indeed, the Recommendation states “…the college should implement an annual evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making which leads to institutional improvements” (ACCJC, 2008, p. 1). In order to measure WCC’s effectiveness of its governance structures and processes as described in Standard IV.A, a survey had to be created that was directly aligned with each of the four themes.

In addition to aligning the questions with the Standard, the survey needed to allow people to respond based on different contexts—i.e., a faculty member who teaches political science would take a survey for the Social Science department, as well as for the various committees to which they belong—same questions, different context (pg.). Moreover, in measuring constituent satisfaction of governance structures and processes, all people’s views are important. Therefore, it is not only essential to ask committee members about whether they feel encouraged to bring forth ideas to the group, but non-committee members need to feel encouraged as well (pg.). The process of measuring the particular parts of the College, along with the various viewpoints, not only provides data that is more meaningful, but also provides a more thorough understanding of the entire governance structure, allowing the College to better utilize the results for institutional improvements.
The October 2006 Evaluation Report states: “To evaluate the effectiveness of its governance structure and processes, the college needs to focus on the outcomes of its institutional goals achieved versus relying on perception of effectiveness and then make the appropriate changes for improvement” (Sheehan, 2006, p. 42). The Strategic Plan’s Action Outcomes, Appendix 1 of this report, clearly specify what the College intends to do from now through 2015, and are directly connected to larger System goals. In order to assess each of the Action Outcomes, the Strategic Planning Committee needed to be clear about which particular groups were responsible for each of the outcomes. Therefore, the College will revisit these goals each year and take note of what has and has not been satisfactorily accomplished. The extent to which the College meets these goals provides preliminary information on the effectiveness of the college’s governance structures and processes.

However, as mentioned in the November 2007 Progress Report Visit document, “The college needs to determine whether the structures and policies developed and implemented are effective and lead to institutional improvement over time. Also, one group needs to be identified as the monitor of the evaluation process which has the responsibility to make recommendations based on what is learned from that evaluation” (Amador & Perri, 2007, p.9). Indeed, institutional assessment of the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making requires a team of people whose job it is to refine and properly administer the survey instruments each year, gather and analyze the data, and put the data into some meaningful format to facilitate communication and suggestions for improvement.

Based on the recommendations in Ms. French’s report, The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) formed a Survey Subcommittee that reviewed the member and non-member survey instruments included in Ms. French’s report and made modifications (Appendix 7) to them. Simultaneously, Jeff Hunt, Director of Institutional Research presented his Proposal on Recommendation 5 (Appendix 8) with a flow chart showing the process (Appendix 9) and timeline (Appendix 10) of when each governance structure and the leader of that structure would be evaluated to the Faculty Senate Chairs, the Administrators, and the IEC. The first series of surveys were taken by the campus as a whole in November 2008. These surveys assessed the Chancellor’s Office, the Instructional Services Office, the Administrative Services Office, the Student Services Office, the Vocational Education Office, and the Faculty Senate. The office as a whole and
the leader of the office were assessed. For example, in the case of the Faculty Senate, all three Faculty Senate chairs were assessed, and in the case of Instructional Services, the Vice Chancellor for Instruction, and the Dean of Division 1 and Dean of Division 2 were assessed. Overall results of the constituents taking the survey were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Non Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Member Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Senate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 1 - Windward Faculty Senate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 2 - System Faculty Senate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 3 - Recording Faculty Senate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Organization</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancellor Office</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice Chancellor Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Unit One</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Unit Two</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor Office</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VocEd and Community Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>48.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, in accordance with the Proposal on Recommendation 5 and Ms. French’s report, the IEC has established the Governance Sub-committee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (GSIEC) to refine and properly administer the survey instruments each year, gather and analyze the data, and put the data in a meaningful format to facilitate institutional improvement. This group is convened by the Director of Institutional Research (ex-officio, non-voting) and is comprised of five senior faculty and staff. The committee is responsible for gathering and tabulating and presenting the data from the all governance perception surveys. It
has also established policies and procedures that will specify the governance improvement process.

The results of the surveys are used by the governance entities to perform a self-evaluation and with the assistance of the GSIC, as needed, to develop improvement outcome statements. These statements are the basis for the governance improvement for the next year. The results of the surveys and the outcome statements will be included in the Annual Assessment/Program Reviews and posted on the College web site and be available in the library.

**ANALYSIS**

As the descriptive summary illustrates, the College has created and implemented a process for effectively evaluating its governance.

The following was accomplished in the Fall 2008 semester.

**January 2008 – May 2008**

- Instructor Kathleen French is tasked to research and report on Recommendation 5. She submits her report to Chancellor Meixell at the end of the Spring 2008 semester.

**May 2008 – August 2008**

- The report is circulated and discussed with Administrators.

**August 2008**

- The report is posted on the WCC web site and discussion begins amongst faculty, staff, and administrators regarding its content.

**September 2008**

- A draft of the survey was developed by the IEC based on the timeline seen in Appendix 10.

**October 2008**

- The survey were revised and finalized.
November-December 2008

- The member and non-member surveys for the first group of governance entities were administered.
- The data was summarized and provided to the governance entity for their self-evaluation.
- The composition of the GSIC was determined and policies and procedures established.

The following will be accomplished in Spring 2009:

January – March 2009

- The evaluation process for the next series of surveys will be conducted.

April-May 2009

- The process will be repeated for the third time.
- The GSIEC and IEC will assess the governance evaluation process and revise the process as needed.

Action Steps

Carry out the process displayed above for assessing governance structures at Windward Community College.