Notice of Meeting
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI
BOARD OF REGENTS COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

Members: Regents Putnam (Chair), Wilson (Vice-Chair), Acoba, Bal, Higa, Portnoy, and Tagorda

Date: Wednesday, March 8, 2017
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Place: University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa
Information Technology Building
1st Floor Conference Room 105A/B
2520 Correa Road
Honolulu, Hawaiʻi 96822

AGENDA

I. Call Meeting to Order

II. Approval of Minutes of the January 12, 2017 Meeting

III. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items: All written testimony on agenda items received after posting of this agenda and up to 24 hours in advance of the meeting will be distributed to the board. Late testimony on agenda items will be distributed to the board within 24 hours of receipt. Registration for oral testimony on agenda items will be provided at the meeting location 15 minutes prior to the meeting and closed once the meeting begins. Written testimony may be submitted via US mail, email at bor@hawaii.edu, or facsimile at 956-5156. Oral testimony is limited to three (3) minutes.

IV. Agenda Items

A. Recommend Approval:
   1. Mission Statement Revisions: Kauaʻi Community College
   2. Mission Statement Revisions: Kapiʻolani Community College
   3. Mission Statement Revisions: Hawaiʻi Community College
   4. New Provisional Certificate, Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education PK-12 at Leeward Community College

B. For Information:
   1. Update on meetings with Student Caucus
   2. Briefing on the UHCC 2018 Institutional Self Evaluation Report and Board involvement in the process
   3. Update on System-wide Enrollment Management Plan, 2017-2021
   4. Update on UH Strategic Plan for Distance & Online Learning
   5. Update on New Program Proposals

V. Adjournment

Accommodation required by law for Persons with Disabilities requires at least (5) five days prior notice to the board office at 956-8213 or bor@hawaii.edu.
MEMORANDUM

February 13, 2017

TO: Jan Naoe Sullivan
    Chair, Board of Regents

VIA: David Lassner
     President

VIA: Risa Dickson
     Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy

VIA: John Morton
     Vice President for Community Colleges

FROM: Helen A. Cox
      Chancellor

SUBJECT: KAUA'I COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S REVISED MISSION STATEMENT

SPECIFIC ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of Kaua‘i Community College’s revised Mission Statement.

RECOMMENDED EFFECTIVE DATE:

Upon Board of Regents approval.

ADDITIONAL COST:

No costs are associated with this request.

PURPOSE:

To reflect the College’s commitment to being a place-based indigenous serving institution, Kaua‘i Community College revised its mission statement to provide a
statement that embraces our mission and can be remembered with ease while guiding our institution and complying with the requirements of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges' (ACCJC)/Western Association of Schools and Colleges' (WASC).

BACKGROUND:

Regents Policy RP 4.201, III.C.4.f Mission and Purpose of the University.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

Approval of Kaua’i Community College’s revised Mission Statement.

Attachments

c: Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board Quinn
Kaua‘i Community College

Process for Review and Revision of the College Mission

Current Mission Statement

Kaua‘i Community College provides open access education and training in an ethical and innovative student-centered and community-focused environment, nurturing life-long learners who appreciate diversity and lead responsible and fulfilling lives.

Proposed Mission:

*Kaua‘i Community College is a kahua that inspires, engages, and empowers learners and educators to enrich our community and our world.*

Ke kū nei ke Kulanui Kaiāulu ma Kaua‘i ma ke ‘ano he kahua e ho‘oulu, ho‘ā, a ho‘oikaika ‘ia ai ka ‘ike a me ka na’auao o nā kānoka o‘o aku a a‘o mai no ka ho‘owaiwai ‘ana i ke kaiāulu a me ka honua.

O ke kahua ma mua, ma hope ke kukulu.
First comes the foundation, then comes the building
(‘Olelo No‘eau, number 2459)

History/Steps Taken for Mission Review/Revision at Kaua‘i Community College

1. Meetings at community centers around the island Spring 2015
2. Future Scenarios Workshop August 2015
4. KCC Friends Group review on May 25, 2016
7. College Mission Task Force formed in Early September 2016 to consider input from college and community, look at our current mission statement and mission statements from other UHCCs, and make a recommendation. The Task Force met six times, and a draft mission statement created in October 2016.
8. Faculty Senate review on October 28, 2016
9. Student Focus Group on November 14, 2016
10. College Conversation on November 16, 2016
12. Approval of the proposed mission statement by College Council on January 18, 2017

Rationale

By college policy, we do a thorough review of the mission statement every five years. Our accrediting body also requires us to have a regular process of mission review. Fall 2016 was once again time to review the statement for accuracy.
Through discussions on campus with various constituent groups as well as conversations with community focus groups, we learned that although the current mission was perceived as accurate, it was not embraced because of its length, its lack of warmth, and the fact that it could be a mission statement for a community college anywhere rather than specifically for Kaua‘i Community College. Both college and community wanted a statement that was shorter, easy to remember and easily understood. They also wanted a statement that was inspiring, exciting, clear, true, and engaging. After gathering initial community and campus input, a Mission Task Force was created to review that input and come up with one or more draft mission statements for further review by both campus and community, culminating in campus approval of a new proposed mission statement.

The focus groups and college meetings identified one of the college’s greatest strengths as creating a close, supportive community that encourages and inspires students not only to be courageous and to personally excel but to also contribute to their communities. Participants described the college using words like “piko,” “conduit,” “pathway,” “stepping stone,” and “pipeline.” They also thought the college was, “innovative,” “inclusive,” and “enriching.” Lastly, they wanted the mission to be clear in its relation to place and its service to Hawaii’s indigenous people.

After incorporating the initial input from the campus and community, the Task Force came up with two draft mission statements and then narrowed down the recommendation to one new proposed mission statement. That proposed mission statement was then taken to additional groups for further input, including a review by the Faculty Senate, a campus-wide College Conversation and a student focus group. Many campus and community members believed that the new mission should be more heart-felt than the current one. Students in particular wanted the mission statement to not simply be an intellectual statement but also an emotional and/or spiritual statement. The student focus group noted that the proposed mission captured the spirit of what KCC is for them—a nurturing place that supports students and helps prepare them to move ahead to their goals.

We believe that the new mission statement is an authentic way of conveying the fundamental purpose and reason for the college to exist. It is an explanation of what we do and why, and informs our institutional planning. We want to be a place that works for our students, but that means we also need to be a place that works for us—hence the inclusion of “educators.” The use of the Hawaiian concept, kahua, as well as having the mission statement in both English and Hawaiian, keeps the college grounded where we are. The inclusion of the ‘olelo no’eau expands the meaning of kahua for those who are not immersed in Hawaiian language and culture. We will include this ‘olelo wherever we include the mission statement.

Aligning the College Mission to ACCJC/WASC Requirements

The proposed Mission statement will “guide the institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and inform institutional goals for student learning, engagement and achievement.” (ACCJC Standard I.A.3) It will be widely published after approval by the Board of regents and periodically reviewed and updated as necessary (ACCJC Standard I.A.4, Eligibility
Requirement 6).

In the process of revising the mission statement, the College discussions also reaffirmed our 2016-2021 goals that exemplify the mission. While not part of our mission statement, the Mission Task Force developed the following statement that demonstrates the alignment of the mission and goals to institutional planning and ACCJC requirements. This statement will be disseminated both internally and externally.

Kauai Community College fulfills its mission by incorporating the following practices. The College:

- Provides open access, affordable education;
- Welcomes and values diversity;
- Delivers educational opportunities on campus in small classes, in the community, internationally, and through distance learning;
- Provides programs that address workforce and community needs;
- Prepares and supports students individually and collectively to succeed in academic endeavors and engage in life-long learning;
- Encourages innovation and promotes sustainability while perpetuating the unique history and culture of Kaua‘i.
MEMORANDUM
November 25, 2016

TO: Jan Naoe Sullivan
Chair, Board of Regents

VIA: David Lassner
President

VIA: Risa Dickson
Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy

VIA: John Morton
Vice President for Community Colleges

FROM: Louise Pagotto
Interim Chancellor

SUBJECT: KAPI'OLANI COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S REVISED MISSION STATEMENT

SPECIFIC ACTION REQUESTED:
Approval of Kapi'olani Community College's revised Mission Statement.

RECOMMENDED EFFECTIVE DATE:
Upon Board of Regents approval.

ADDITIONAL COST:
No costs are associated with this request.

PURPOSE:
To reflect the College's focus on international students, the decision was made to add international students as our "intended population" to the mission statement to comply with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges'
(ACCJC)/Western Association of Schools and Colleges' (WASC) requirement that a mission statement identifies the institution’s “intended population.” Accreditation Standards attached.

BACKGROUND:


ACTION RECOMMENDED:

Approval of Kapi'olani Community College's revised Mission Statement.

Attachments

c: Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board Quinn
Kapi'olani Community College
University of Hawai‘i
Mission Statement

On April 25, 2016, Kapi'olani Community College requested approval for a new Mission Statement below:

Ala Nu‘ukia - Mission Statement (Current):


Kapi‘olani Community College provides students from Hawai‘i’s diverse communities open access to higher education opportunities in pursuit of academic, career, and lifelong learning goals. The College, guided by shared vision and values, and commitment to student success through engagement, learning, and achievement, offers high quality certificate, associate degree, and transfer programs that prepare students for productive futures.

Rationale for the Revised Mission Statement

Effective June 3, 2016, Louise Pagotto began serving Kapi‘olani Community College as Interim Chancellor. Although, the College’s Strategic Plan was scheduled to be finalized in the spring 2016, the change of leadership deferred the process. On August 4, 2016, the Chancellor’s Administrative Staff Council decided to review and revise the Strategic Plan and the Mission, Vision and Values Statements. In addition, to reflect the College’s intentional focus on international students, the decision was made to add international students as our “intended population” to the mission statement.

Proposed Mission Statement:

Ala Nu‘ukia – Mission


Kapi‘olani Community College provides [students from Hawai‘i’s diverse communities] open access to higher education opportunities in pursuit of academic, career, and lifelong learning goals[.] to the diverse communities of Hawai‘i. [The
College, guided by shared vision and values, and commitment] Committed to student success through engagement, learning, and achievement, [offers] we offer high quality certificates and associate degrees, and transfer [programs] pathways that prepare indigenous, local, national, and international students for their productive futures.

Table 1: Aligning ACCJC/WASC Directives with Phrases from the Proposed Mission Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCJC/WASC Directive</th>
<th>Mission Statement Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution’s broad educational purposes</td>
<td>... provides open access to higher education opportunities in pursuit of academic, career and lifelong learning goals... that prepare... students for their productive futures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its intended population</td>
<td>... indigenous, local, national, and international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of degrees and other credentials</td>
<td>... high quality certificates and associate degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to student learning and student achievement</td>
<td>Committed to student success through engagement, learning, and achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to strong alignment with ACCJC/WASC, the College has developed a data-rich institutional effectiveness framework called “KELA” aligned with our brand: Engage. Learn. Achieve. See attached.

This alignment meets the ACCJC/WASC Standard I.A.2:

The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.

The proposed Mission Statement will “guide the institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning, engagement and achievement” (ACCJC/WASC Standard I.A.3)

This mission will be widely published after approval by the Board of Regents and periodically reviewed and updated as necessary (ACCJC/WASC Standard I.A.4, Eligibility Requirement 6).
Kapi'olani Engagement, Learning, and Achievement Model
Integrating Institutional Effectiveness Measures (IEM) with Student Learning

1) Faculty-student interaction
2) Active-collaborative learning
3) Academic challenge
4) Student effort
5) Student support

Community College Student Engagement Measures

6) Course success rates
7) Fall-spring re-enrollment % completing
8) Fall-fall re-enrollment
9) Annual number of certificates and degrees
10) Annual number of transfers
11) % completing a certificate or degree in 3 years
12) % transferring in 3 years

Engagement

Student Success Pathway

Achievement Measures

Achievement

Learning

Learning Outcomes Assessment
Certification of Kapi'olani Community College's Revised Mission Statement

Date: November 3, 2016

To: University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents
John Morton, Vice-President for Community College, University of Hawai‘i

From: Interim Chancellor Louise Pagotto
Kapi'olani Community College
4303 Diamond Head Road, Honolulu, HI 96816

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

Ala Nuʻukia – Mission

He hale hāmama 'o Kapi'olani Kula Nui Kaiāulu no nā ‘ano kalāulu like 'ole, e hoʻolako i nā kānaka hoʻākea 'ike e hiki aku i ka pahuhupu 'imi na'auao, 'imi 'oihana, a hoʻolaulā 'ike. He loa a nā palapala a'o, nā kēkēlē mua puka, me nā polokalamu hoʻili kula he kilohana wale e hoʻomākaukau i nā haumāna maoli, kūloko, kaumoku‘āna, kauʻaina no ka mua he lako.

Kapi'olani Community College provides open access to higher education opportunities in pursuit of academic, career, and lifelong learning goals to the diverse communities of Hawai‘i. Committed to student success through engagement, learning, and achievement, we offer high quality certificates and associate degrees, and transfer pathways that prepare indigenous, local, national, and international students for their productive futures.

Signatures:

Louise Pagotto, Interim Chancellor, Kapi'olani Community College

Susan Inouye, Chair, Faculty Senate, Kapi'olani Community College

Keolani Noa, Chair, Kalāaulani, Kapi'olani Community College

Lee Ann Demello, Chair, Staff Council, Kapi'olani Community College

Tasi Yanger, President, Student Congress, Kapi'olani Community College
Introduction

The primary purpose of an ACCJC-accredited institution is to foster student learning and student achievement. An effective institution ensures that its resources, programs, and services, whenever, wherever, and however delivered, support student learning and achievement. The effective institution ensures academic quality and continuous improvement through ongoing assessment of learning and achievement and pursues institutional excellence and improvement through ongoing, integrated planning and evaluation.

There are four Standards that work together to define and promote student success, academic quality, institutional integrity, and excellence. The mission provides a framework for all institutional goals and activities. The institution provides the means for students to learn and achieve their goals, assesses how well learning is occurring, and strives to improve learning and achievement through ongoing, systematic, and integrated evaluation and planning (Standard I). Student learning programs and support services make possible the academic quality that supports student success (Standard II). Human, physical, technology, and financial resources enable these programs and services to function and improve (Standard III). Ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization guides the accomplishment of the mission and supports institutional effectiveness and improvement (Standard IV). Integrating the elements of the Standards gives institutions the means to develop a comprehensive assessment of academic quality, institutional integrity and effectiveness, and a path to continuous improvement.

Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution continuously and systematically evaluates, plans, implements, and improves the quality of its educational programs and services. The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in the performance of their duties.

A. Mission

1. The mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement. (ER 6)
2. The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.

3. The institution’s programs and services are aligned with its mission. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.

4. The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary. (ER 6)

B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

*Academic Quality*

1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

2. The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)

3. The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11)

4. The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

*Institutional Effectiveness*

5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

7. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.

8. The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
9. The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER19)

C. Institutional Integrity

1. The institution assures the clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information provided to students and prospective students, personnel, and all persons or organizations related to its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. The institution gives accurate information to students and the public about its accreditation status with all of its accreditors. (ER20)

2. The institution provides a print or online catalog for students and prospective students with precise, accurate, and current information on all facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the “Catalog Requirements” (see endnote). (ER20)

3. The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public. (ER19)

4. The institution describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes.

5. The institution regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and services.

6. The institution accurately informs current and prospective students regarding the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses, including textbooks, and other instructional materials.

7. In order to assure institutional and academic integrity, the institution uses and publishes governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and its support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists for all constituencies, including faculty and students. (ER13)

8. The institution establishes and publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility and academic integrity. These policies apply to all constituencies and include specifics relative to each, including student behavior, academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.

9. Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.
10. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty and student handbooks.

11. Institutions operating in foreign locations operate in conformity with the Standards and applicable Commission policies for all students. Institutions must have authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.

12. The institution agrees to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure, institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. When directed to act by the Commission, the institution responds to meet requirements within a time period set by the Commission. It discloses information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. (ER 21)

13. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies, including compliance with regulations and statutes. It describes itself in consistent terms to all of its accrediting agencies and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public. (ER 21)

14. The institution ensures that its commitments to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount to other objectives such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services

The institution offers instructional programs, library and learning support services, and student support services aligned with its mission. The institution's programs are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate for higher education. The institution assesses its educational quality through methods accepted in higher education, makes the results of its assessments available to the public, and uses the results to improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional programs and student and learning support services offered in the name of the institution.

A. Instructional Programs

1. All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs. (ER9 and ER11)

2. Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others responsible act to continuously improve instructional courses, programs and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success.

3. The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline.

4. If the institution offers pre-collegiate level curriculum, it distinguishes that curriculum from college level curriculum and directly supports students in learning the knowledge and skills necessary to advance to and succeed in college level curriculum.

5. The institution's degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The institution ensures that minimum degree requirements are 60 semester credits or equivalent at the associate level, and 120 credits or equivalent at the baccalaureate level. (ER12)

6. The institution schedules courses in a manner that allows students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time consistent with established expectations in higher education. (ER9)
7. The institution-effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students, in support of equity in success for all students.

8. The institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability.

9. The institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability.

10. The institution awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions. (ER 10)

11. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission. (ER 10)

12. The institution includes in all of its programs, student learning outcomes, appropriate to the program level, in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.

13. The institution requires of all of its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum, based upon student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level. The learning outcomes include a student's preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. (ER 12)

14. Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification.
15. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

16. The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.

B. Library and Learning Support Services

1. The institution supports student learning and achievement by providing library, and other learning support services to students and to personnel responsible for student learning and support. These services are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to support educational programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education. Learning support services include, but are not limited to, library collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, learning technology, and ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services. (ER17)

2. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians, and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission.

3. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services includes evidence that they contribute to the attainment of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

4. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible and utilized. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the security, maintenance, and reliability of services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement. The institution regularly evaluates these services to ensure their effectiveness. (ER17)

C. Student Support Services

1. The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution. (ER15)
2. The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services.

3. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method. (ER 15)

4. Co-curricular programs and athletics programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. If the institution offers co-curricular or athletic programs, they are conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The institution has responsibility for the control of these programs, including their finances.

5. The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. Counseling and advising programs orient students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

6. The institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. The institution defines and advises students on clear pathways to complete degrees, certificate and transfer goals. (ER 16)

7. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

8. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.
Standard III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its mission and to improve academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Accredited colleges in multi-college systems may be organized so that responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning rests with the district/system. In such cases, the district/system is responsible for meeting the Standards, and an evaluation of its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution(s).

A. Human Resources

1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty and staff who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated and address the needs of the institution in serving its student population. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.

2. Faculty qualifications include knowledge of the subject matter and requisite skills for the service to be performed. Factors of qualification include appropriate degrees, professional experience, discipline expertise, level of assignment, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Faculty job descriptions include development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning. (ER 14)

3. Administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality.

4. Required degrees held by faculty, administrators and other employees are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

5. 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.

6. The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.

7. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty, which includes full time faculty and may include part time and adjunct faculty, to assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities essential to the quality of educational programs and services to achieve institutional mission and purposes. (ER 14)
8. An institution with part time and adjunct faculty has employment policies and practices which provide for their orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development. The institution provides opportunities for integration of part time and adjunct faculty into the life of the institution.

9. The institution has a sufficient number of staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution. (ER 8)

10. The institution maintains a sufficient number of administrators with appropriate preparation and expertise to provide continuity and effective administrative leadership and services that support the institution's mission and purposes. (ER 8)

11. The institution establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are fair and equitably and consistently administered.

12. Through its policies and practices, the institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

13. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel, including consequences for violation.

14. The institution plans for and provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

15. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

B. Physical Resources

1. The institution assures safe and sufficient physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and learning support services. They are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

2. The institution plans, acquires or builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources, including facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services and achieve its mission.

3. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.
4. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

C. Technology Resources

1. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the institution's management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services.

2. The institution continuously plans for, updates and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services.

3. The institution assures that technology resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security.

4. The institution provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators, in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations.

5. The institution has policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes.

D. Financial Resources

Planning

1. Financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. (ER 18)

2. The institution's mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning, and financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner.

3. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

Fiscal Responsibility and Stability

4. Institutional planning reflects a realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.
5. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and uses the results to improve internal control systems.

6. Financial documents, including the budget, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

7. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

8. The institution's financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

9. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, and, when necessary, implement contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

10. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

Liabilities

11. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

12. The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards.

13. On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.

14. All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.

Standard III: Resources
15. The institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements, including Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and comes into compliance when the federal government identifies deficiencies.

Contractual Agreements

16. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and the quality of its programs, services, and operations.
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success, sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are defined in policy and are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief executive officer. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. In multi-college districts or systems, the roles within the district/system are clearly delineated. The multi-college district or system has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the colleges.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

1. Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for 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 planning and implementation.

2. The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.

3. Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

4. Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.

5. Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.

6. The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.

7. Leadership roles and the institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, 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: Leadership and Governance
B. Chief Executive Officer

1. The institutional chief executive officer (CEO) has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The CEO provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

2. The CEO plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. The CEO delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

3. Through established policies and procedures, the CEO guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by:
   • establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
   • ensuring the college sets institutional performance standards for student achievement;
   • ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal conditions;
   • ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and allocation to support student achievement and learning;
   • ensuring that the allocation of resources supports and improves learning and achievement; and
   • establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the institution.

4. The CEO has the primary leadership role for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times. Faculty, staff, and administrative leaders of the institution also have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements.

5. The CEO assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures.

6. The CEO works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

C. Governing Board

1. The institution has a governing board that has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. (ER 7)

2. The governing board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance
3. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the CEO of the college and/or the district/system.

4. The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution's educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure. (ER 7)

5. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the college/district/system mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability.

6. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

7. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly assesses its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the college/district/system mission and revises them as necessary.

8. To ensure the institution is accomplishing its goals for student success, the governing board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality.

9. The governing board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

10. Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the board's effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The governing board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.

11. The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. (ER 7)

12. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEO to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds the CEO accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance
13. The governing board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college's accredited status, and supports through policy the college's efforts to improve and excel. The board participates in evaluation of governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process.

D. Multi-College Districts or Systems

1. In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system CEO provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. Working with the colleges, the district/system CEO establishes clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system.

2. The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate district/system provided services to support the colleges in achieving their missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.

3. The district/system has a policy for allocation and reallocation of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations and sustainability of the colleges and district/system. The district/system CEO ensures effective control of expenditures.

4. The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO's accountable for the operation of the colleges.

5. District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.

6. Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.

7. The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.
Catalog Requirements
The following list of required information must be included in the college catalog.

1. General Information
   - Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s), and Website Address of the Institution
   - Educational Mission
   - Representation of accredited status with ACCJC, and with programmatic accreditors if any
   - Course, Program, and Degree Offerings
   - Student Learning Outcomes for Programs and Degrees
   - 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

2. Requirements
   - Admissions
   - Student Tuition, Fees, and Other Financial Obligations
   - Degrees, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer

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

4. Locations or Publications Where Other Policies may be Found
February 1, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jan N. Sullivan
Chair, Board of Regents

VIA: David Lassner
President

VIA: John Morton
Vice President for Community College

FROM: Rachel Solemsaas
Chancellor

SUBJECT: Revised Mission, Vision, And Institutional Learning Outcomes for Hawai'i Community College

SPECIFIC ACTION REQUESTED:

To comply with WASC Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges Standard I.A.4 and in accordance with Board of Regents Policy (BoRP) 4.201 III.C.4. f., approval is requested for the revised mission, vision, and institutional learning outcomes for Hawai'i Community College.

RECOMMENDED EFFECTIVE DATE:

The recommended effective date is upon the Board's approval.

ADDITIONAL COST:

There are no additional costs associated with this request.

PURPOSE:

Hawai'i Community College commits to the University of Hawai'i (UH) mission and purpose as set forth in the Board of Regent Policy (BoRP) 4.201. As part of this commitment, the College engages in a comprehensive planning process that regularly evaluates its mission, vision and institutional learning outcomes in order to ensure its alignment to the UH system.

This commitment assures the College's compliance with the WASC ACCJC Standard I.A.4 which states:
The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.

BACKGROUND:

Hawaii Community College is part of the University of Hawaii (UH) System and is one of the seven community colleges. From its start in 1941 as the Hawaii Vocational School, the college has provided access to higher education opportunities, trained a skilled workforce and supported the economic development of the County of Hawaii. As a comprehensive community college for the Hawaii Islands residents, it offers 26 degree and certificate programs that prepare students to succeed in the workforce right after graduation or continue their studies at a four-year college or university. It is located in Hilo with a new branch campus in Kona named Hawaii Community College – Pālamanui that opened in Fall 2015.

Hawaii Community College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), an institutional accrediting body recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education. In March 2013, ACCJC reaffirmed Hawaii Community College’s accreditation, which provides assurance to the public that the college meets the Standards; that the education earned at the institution is of value to the student who earned it; and that employers, trade or profession-related licensing agencies, as well as other colleges and universities, can accept a student’s credential as legitimate. Hawaii Community College is preparing for its next 6-year accreditation cycle with a comprehensive review using its 2018 Self Evaluation Report.

The College’s strategic planning and assessment process is the primary mechanism for: 1) reaffirming the College’s mission; 2) defining the College’s goals and objectives; 3) aligning resource allocation priorities with those goals and objectives; and 4) implementing assessment-based change over time. Within the framework of the University of Hawaii System strategic plan, the Hawaii CC strategic planning process seeks to integrate college planning, resource allocation, and assessment activities. The intent of the process is to incorporate program review recommendations and identify, analyze and project education and training needs, based on a variety of forecasts and other forms of college and community feedback, into a continuous, student learning outcomes driven decision-making process.

In support of this process, the Chancellor established a taskforce to review the College’s mission, vision, and institutional learning outcomes. The taskforce proposed changes to mission, vision and institutional learning outcomes which were shared campus wide during Fall 2016 convocation and various division and department meetings. Thereafter, the College undertook a secret ballot voting from July 20 to September 20, 2106, seeking acceptance of the proposed revisions. The result of the voting showed support for the new mission, vision and institutional learning outcomes as proposed below.
HAWAI'I COMMUNITY COLLEGE MISSION
To promote lifelong learning, Hawai'i Community College will emphasize the knowledge and experience necessary for Kauhale members to pursue academic achievement and workforce readiness. Aligned with the mission of the UH Community Colleges, we are committed to serving all segments of our Hawai'i Island community.

HAWAI'I COMMUNITY COLLEGE VISION
Our Kauhale of lifelong learners will be productive and engaged citizens capable of meeting the complex challenges of our island and global communities.

HAWAI'I COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES
Our Kauhale of lifelong learners will:

1. Communicate effectively in a variety of situations.
2. Utilize critical thinking to solve problems and make informed decisions.
3. Apply knowledge and skills to make contributions to community that are respectful of the indigenous people and culture of Hawai'i Island, as well as other cultures of the world.
4. Utilize quality comprehensive services and resources in the on-going pursuit of educational and career excellence.
5. Produce and perpetuate safe, healthy learning and professional environments that are respectful of social and individual diversity.
6. Contribute to sustainable environmental practices for personal and community well-being.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

It is recommended that the revised Hawai'i CC Mission, Vision, and Institutional Learning Outcomes be approved.

Attachment: Memorandum on the Results of Kauhale Voting on the Revised Mission, Vision and Institutional Learning Outcomes.

c: Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board Quinn
December 27, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jan Naoe Sullivan
Chair, Board of Regents

VIA: David Lassner
President

VIA: Risa E. Dickson
Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy

VIA: John Morton
Vice President for Community Colleges

FROM: Manuel J. Cabrál
Chancellor

SUBJECT: Request Approval of a New Provisional Certificate, Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education PK-12 at Leeward Community College.

SPECIFIC ACTION REQUESTED:

Request approval of a new provisional certificate, the Advanced Professional Certificate (APC) in Special Education PK-12 at Leeward Community College.

RECOMMENDED EFFECTIVE DATE:

Upon approval of the Board of Regents.

ADDITIONAL COSTS:

In August 2016, a full-time faculty position was institutionalized by Leeward Community College to serve as a primary instructor/coordinator for the special education certificate, so there will be no additional personnel cost.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In Fall 2012, Leeward Community College’s Teacher Education program was awarded a $2.5 million Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) grant to increase the program’s capacity to develop and deliver innovative teacher training in the areas of highest need in the state. This allowed the establishment of a 16 credit Certificate of Competence in Special/Inclusive Education (SPED), which was designed to provide professionals with a foundation in inclusive teaching practices, professional collaboration, and tools to work with culturally and linguistically diverse families.
By Fall 2016, over 200 students had been enrolled in Leeward Community College’s Certificate of Competence in SPED statewide, including paraprofessionals working with students with severe special needs and general education teachers working in inclusive classrooms with students with mild to moderate learning and/or behavioral exceptionalities. In Spring 2015, Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Board appealed to all the teacher education programs in Hawai‘i as well as other stakeholders in the Hawai‘i Department of Education to participate in an Alternative Pathway to Licensure Work Group to design an alternative route to SPED licensure—specifically targeting paraprofessionals and emergency hires working with students with special needs in federally identified Zones of School Innovation. A Spring 2016 survey of those enrolled in the SPED Certificate of Competence indicated that about 80% would continue with special education coursework offered by Leeward Community College for professional development or as a means to obtain special education teacher licensure. The overwhelming interest in special education coursework leading to licensure prompted our Teacher Education program to design and propose an Advanced Professional Certificate (APC) in SPED PK-12.

At the August 31, 2016 Council of Chief Academic Officers meeting, the authorization to plan the APC in Special Education PK-12 was approved. It was estimated that for the first two years the program could expect 25 students, then 40 students by the third year, and 50 students for the fourth and fifth years. With the success of the 16-credit Certificate of Competence in Special/Inclusive Education, there is already a running list of nearly 50 eligible prospective candidates who are interested in completing an APC leading to a teaching license in SPED.

Significance/Contribution of this Degree:

The Hawai‘i Department of Education hires about 1,500 new teachers annually, of which about 25% are for special education positions and 27% are for positions on the Leeward coast of O‘ahu. Furthermore, the Hawai‘i Department of Education’s New Teacher Retention Report found that 70 percent of non-licensed and/or Teach for America teachers leave the teaching profession within the first three years. The Hawai‘i Teachers Standards Board called upon the Teacher Education Programs of Hawai‘i to develop an alternative route to teacher licensure in SPED (the highest shortage area) that would offer locally sourced educators an affordable and accessible route to become SPED teachers in the communities with the highest teacher turnover rates. Leeward Community College’s APC in SPED PK-12 provides an efficient and affordable pathway to pursue teaching careers in special education, which has been highlighted as a critical shortage area by the state and nation for nearly three decades.

Key Statistics

- Out of the 1,240 new teacher hires, there were 167 emergency hires in special education. (Leeward District: 57; Central: 23).
- Out of the new teacher hires, 210 (16.9%) earned teaching degrees from UH Mānoa; 23 (1.9%) earned degrees from UH West O‘ahu; 5 (0.5%) earned degrees from Leeward CC.
- Overall, only 32.6% of new teachers completed in-state teacher preparation programs (this percentage is down 2% from 2014-15, and down 4% from 2013-14).
- Overall, 41% of new teachers completed out-of-state teacher preparation programs.
- Out of the new teacher hires, 26.4% were not qualified (this percentage is up 5% from 2014-15 and up 7% from 2013-14).
- The Leeward District has the highest number of substitute teachers with no degree (158 or 18.54%).
The APC in SPED PK-12 would alleviate the chronic shortage of special education teachers statewide by recruiting candidates rooted in communities serving large culturally and linguistically diverse populations who have demonstrated experience and commitment to working with students with special needs. Leeward Community College’s APC in SPED’s accessibility and affordability would attract a non-transient teacher workforce with job-related experience, thereby reducing the heavy dependency on continuous external recruitment of unqualified, inexperienced, and short-term teachers.

Candidates with an associate’s degree would be able to obtain special education teacher licensure by completing the 62 credit Associate in Arts in Teaching degree, 15 credits of approved electives, 15 credits of upper division level SPED coursework, and a final year of student teaching at a partner institution granting a bachelor’s degree. Official Memorandum of Agreements for a 3+1 pathway with Leeward Community College are in draft/revision phases with Chaminade University for a B.S. in SPED Mild/Moderate PK-12 and with the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa for a B.Ed in SPED Severe PK-12.

Those with a bachelor-level degree in any field would be able to complete the 30 credit APC in SPED PK-12 at Leeward Community College including coursework and clinical practice (student teaching) leading to teacher licensure.

Cost and resource allocation/reallocation implications:

There is no additional cost associated with the APC in SPED PK-12.

Demand projections:

We anticipate at least 25 students the first two years and expect a modest growth of approximately 10 more students per year for the next three years.

Accreditation impact (if any):

As our campus is currently accredited to offer 18-30 credit advanced professional certificates, there is no impact on accreditation with the approval of this program.

Examples (2-3) of similar models from peer institutions:

The APC in SPED PK-12 at Leeward Community College coursework has a similar model to the post baccalaureate degree in SPED Severe at UH Mānoa.

Similar programs at other UH campuses (if there is duplication, why is this program necessary):

Currently no UH campus offers a B.Ed in SPED Mild/Moderate or Severe. The bachelor-level degrees leading to teacher licensure are for dual general/special education degrees or general elementary/secondary education only.

Statement from campus administration of new program’s strategic value within the UH priorities:

Leeward Community College’s APC in SPED PK-12 fully aligns with the Hawai‘i Graduation Initiative by increasing the number of graduates and transfers. This certificate also specifically addresses University of Hawai‘i Community College system’s Strategic Plan Outcome for
enrollment of underserved populations by recruiting from federally identified Zones of School Innovation communities.

Impact of new program/program change request on campus budget allocations and mission priority:

There will be no impact on campus budget allocations.

**ACTION RECOMMENDED:**

Recommend approval of a new provisional certificate, the Advanced Professional Certificate (APC) in Special Education PK-12 at Leeward Community College.

c: Cynthia Quinn, Executive Administrator and Secretary, Board of Regents
Program Approval Request

Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education (PK-12)

Proposed date of implementation: Fall 2017
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1. **Program Purpose and Outcomes**

Leeward Community College’s Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education PK-12 seeks to address the chronic teacher shortage in hard-to-fill placements in Hawai‘i’s public schools. The accessibility and affordability of Leeward Community College’s APC in SPED would attract a locally sourced teacher workforce with job-related experience, reducing the heavy dependency on continuous recruitment of unqualified, inexperienced and transient teachers.

The Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education will provide an alternative pathway to teacher licensure focused on recruitment of current HDOE emergency hires and paraeducators with a demonstrated long-term commitment to working with culturally and linguistically diverse student populations with special needs in the State’s Zones of School Innovation (historically underserved and underperforming public schools). Candidates with an associate’s degree would be able to obtain special education teacher licensure by completing Leeward’s Associate in Arts in Teaching, 15 credits of approved electives, Advanced Professional Certificate coursework and a final year of student teaching at a partner institution granting a bachelor’s degree.

An official Memorandum of Agreement has been established with Chaminade University of Honolulu and discussions have been initiated with both UH Mānoa and UH West O‘ahu regarding a comparable 3+1 pathway. Those with a bachelor-level degree in any field would be able to complete a 24 credit Advanced Professional Certificate through Leeward Community College including coursework and clinical practice (student teaching) leading to teacher licensure. In November, 2012, Leeward Community College was approved by Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) as a State Approved Teacher Education Program (SATEP) for an Alternative Certification in CTE Licensure Program. Following the same procedure, a letter of intent to plan a teacher education program in SPED offering the Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education was approved by HTSB on February 26, 2016 and is moving forward.

**Advanced Professional Certificate in SPED Outcomes**

*aligned with Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Initial Level Special Educator Preparation Standards*

- Students will be able to understand and practice the special education policies, procedures and legal requirements regarding students with disabilities.
- Students will be able to understand the range and multiple manifestations of disabilities and their effects on social and emotional development, communication skills and oral language development, motor skills, functional and independent living skills, employment-related skills, and self-advocacy skills.
- Students will be able to design and implement individualized educational programs and will have a repertoire of instructional strategies, accommodations, assessment techniques and procedures that are appropriate for students with disabilities.
- Students will be able to collaborate with families and other professionals to further student learning.
- Students will be able to access resources and assistive technologies to support student learning, and to provide transition support to help students maintain continuous progress toward their educational goals.
Alignment

The proposed Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education is appropriate and is closely aligned with the Leeward Community College’s mission and the strategic objectives. Since we began offering the Special Education Certificate of Competence in Spring 2015, we have awarded 212 scholarships demonstrating huge interest in this field of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APC in SPED PK-12 Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Leeward CC’s Mission Core Values and Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>UHCC’s Strategic Plan Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to teaching for nontraditional and underrepresented students from local communities.</td>
<td><strong>Mission statement:</strong> to advance the educational goals of all students with a special commitment to Native Hawaiians.</td>
<td><strong>Hawai‘i Graduation Initiative</strong> - increase the number of graduates and transfers and on the momentum to get students through to graduation and transfer more quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to teaching by offering streamlined pathways leading to SPED teacher licensure through multiple modes of delivery.</td>
<td><strong>Core Value: Open access</strong> We seek to meet students’ needs, as well as those of the community, by offering a diversity of courses, degree and certificate programs, and training opportunities, through traditional and distance education modes of delivery.</td>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong> - the identification and goals for targeted currently underserved populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Modern Teaching and Learning Environments</strong> - ensure that students and faculty have the learning and teaching environments appropriate for the 21st century and the sustainability practices to maintain those environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Performance Mission-Driven System</strong> - practices and policies that capitalize on the University of Hawai‘i being a single system of higher education in the state that can provide students with smooth transitions from K-12 through the community colleges to the baccalaureate institutions in the most productive, cost-effective, and results-oriented manner possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC in SPED PK-12 Program Outcomes</td>
<td>Leeward CC's Mission Core Values and Institutional Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>UHCC's Strategic Plan Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and support students with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions as a prerequisite for teaching special education.</td>
<td>ILO: Values, Citizenship, and Community Graduates are able to interact responsibly and ethically through their respect for others using collaboration and leadership.</td>
<td>Hawaii‘i Innovation Initiative - workforce development linked to developing emerging sectors in Hawaii‘i’s economy while simultaneously providing a stable workforce for the traditional employment sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote inclusive and culturally responsive teaching practices as a means to address the critical special education teacher shortage in Hawaii‘i.</td>
<td>Core Value: Diversity and respect We value individual differences and the contributions they bring to the learning process. We believe that our students are enriched through a diverse intellectual and social environment, where learning occurs through exposure to world cultures, and through interaction with peoples of diverse experiences, beliefs, and perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create responsive community partnerships and partner with local schools to provide service-learning experience.</td>
<td>ILO: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Graduates are able to examine, integrate, and evaluate the quality and appropriateness of ideas and information sources to solve problems and make decisions in real world situations.</td>
<td>Implementing the Plan - the policy, practice, and communication models needed to ensure the overall success of this strategic plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Need**

The majority of emergency hire teaching positions and new vacancies continue to be for special education teachers in hard-to-staff rural and/or high poverty schools. In fact, for the 2015-2016 SY, 26.7% of all new hires were assigned to Leeward District schools. Of the newly employed teachers, 9.6% were hired for elementary special education positions and 11.9% were hired for special education inclusion positions.

The State’s largest teacher education program at UH Mānoa produces 20.1% of newly hired teachers. According to the Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Boards 2014 Annual Report on Educator Preparation Programs, 54% of candidates who complete teacher education
programs in Hawai‘i come from UH campuses with the next largest educator preparation program, Chaminade University, producing 12% of program completers.

**UH Graduates Who Become HTSB Candidates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leeward Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Mānoa</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Hilo</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH West O‘ahu</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Hawai‘i Teachers Standards Board’s Executive Summary, for at least the past seven years, vacancies of special education teaching positions have been largely filled by teachers who were new, unqualified or inexperienced. Evaluators from a five-year special education teacher retention review concluded: “The filling of SpEd vacancies by unqualified and inexperienced teachers has certainly had a dramatic effect on those students in their charge, and whether these teachers would continue their teaching careers in SpEd.” (HSTA Executive Summary SPED Survey, August 2015).

The Hawai‘i Department of Education hires about 1,500 new teachers annually. Out of the newly hired HDOE teachers, 68% have absolutely no previous teaching experience. According to the Hawai‘i Public Schools Employment Report (2013-2014), 43.1% of newly hired teachers hold out-of-state SATEP College Degrees and 19.3% of new teachers are hired without a SATEP Degree. Furthermore, non-SATEP and TFA teachers represent about 25% of new hires, and 70% of them leave the teaching profession within the first three years (HDOE New Teacher Retention Report, November 2015; Hawai‘i Public Schools Employment Report, 2013-2014). As a result, the HDOE has recently released solicitation for alternate route certification of teachers with priority for candidates employed in the Zones of School Innovation (identified as high poverty, low-performing schools). Despite the $1,500-$6,000 retention bonuses used as relocation incentives to recruit and retain teachers in hard-to-fill placements (particularly special education positions in high poverty schools) a study of the State’s compensation system conducted by Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA) noted that “retention of licensed SPED teacher’s bonuses were received by so few people—fewer than 10 teachers per year.”

Based on the November 2015 Hawai‘i Department of Education Teacher Retention Report, the cost of teacher turnover is between $6,233,981 and $13,569,084 based on 1,428 teachers leaving the profession in Hawai‘i at an estimated cost of between $4,366 and $9,502 per teacher (includes costs of terminations, recruitment, hiring, substitutes, learning losses and training). Offering the state’s most affordable and accessible SATEP pathway to earn an APC in SPED PK-12 would enable Hawai‘i state residents to pursue a teaching career in a community they are deeply committed to and, in many cases, have already dedicated years serving in the local education system. Student enrollment in Leeward Community College’s Teacher Education Program would increase significantly by allowing AAT graduates to seamlessly transition into one additional year of SPED coursework and a final year of clinical practice at one of our partner institutions. Furthermore, working professionals or those with family commitments would be able to earn the APC through the state’s distance learning
courses. As a program focused on experiential learning and flexible delivery, the APC in SPED would be accessible to students statewide, thereby meeting critical special education teacher shortages in historically underserved rural communities across Hawai‘i. Since the APC in SPED will target locally sourced paraeducators, emergency hires, and substitute teachers, the program can help reduce the state’s significant financial investment in new teacher mentoring, introductory cultural orientations, and increased funds allocated to out-of-state travel for administrators to recruit SPED teachers to work in Zones of School Innovation. The APC in SPED alleviates the chronic shortage of special education teachers statewide by recruiting candidates rooted in communities serving large culturally and linguistically diverse populations who have demonstrated experience and commitment to working with students with special needs. Leeward’s APC in SPED’s accessibility and affordability would attract a non-transient teacher workforce with job-related experience, thereby reducing the heavy dependency on continuous external recruitment of unqualified, inexperienced, and short-lived teachers.

2. Program Organization

The Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education will be coordinated by the Leeward Community College Teacher Education Program. The program is directly aligned with the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)’s Special Educator Preparation Standards. The APC in SPED’s course learning outcomes, assessments, and rubrics use precise language from each of the seven CEC Initial Preparation Standards. Course offerings were also developed based on the coursework and clinical practice (student teaching) components of the third and fourth years of the teacher education programs from the following universities with similar target candidates offering four-year degrees leading to special education teacher licensure.

Western Governors University B.A. in SPED (K-12): The first exclusively online university to receive NCATE accreditation for its degree programs that lead to teacher licensure.

University of Nevada Las Vegas B.S. in Special Education (K-12): The state’s primary teacher preparation program has tailored their degree leading to special education licensure with a focus on addressing hard-to-fill placements in communities (i.e., Clark County) where one-fifth of the students lack proficiency in English and 59.6% are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. The hard-to-fill placements in Hawai‘i mirror these demographic characteristics, and designing coursework to meet the unique needs of the student population in Hawai‘i is imperative to effectively equipping our teacher workforce. In Hawai‘i, about 51% of the students attending public schools come from families who qualify for free or reduced-price meals and 11% are identified as English language learners (ELL). While Hawai‘i state percentages of ELL students is expected to increase steadily, schools on the Leeward Coast such as Waipahu Elementary School already serve a population comprised of 33% students with limited English proficiency. Furthermore, Native Hawaiian/OPI students make up more than 50% of students identified with learning disabilities in Hawai‘i public schools.

The APC in SPED education courses will be taught by a current full-time faculty member and lecturers who will instruct SPED content specific courses in which they have expertise.

Admission requirements for the APC in SPED is an Associate’s Degree or higher from an accredited post-secondary institution in any content area.

The APC in SPED certificate is designed to be completed in two years. Students can complete the certificate at their own pace depending on how many courses they are able to commit to due to their work/family/personal schedule. The course of study is organized by two tracks:

**Track I: Students with an associate-level degree**  
**Track II: Students with a bachelor-level degree**

**Track I: 3+1 Sample Academic Plan**  
* (Bachelor degree leading to licensure is granted by partner institution)*

| Year 1 | Leeward CC Associate in Arts in Teaching (31 cr) |
| Year 2 | Leeward CC Associate in Arts in Teaching (31 cr) |
| Year 3 | **Fall Semester:** (15 cr elective coursework)  
Recommended electives from LEE that can be included as part of the required 15 credits of electives are ED 100, 279, 282, 283, 284, 289, 296.  
**Spring Semester:** Leeward CC APC courses (15 cr) upper div credits  
SPED Law and IEP Development (3 cr)  
SPED Assessment (3 cr)  
ELA Interventions (3 cr)  
ED Tech for Students with Exceptionalities (3 cr)  
Participating in a Professional Community (3 cr) |
| Year 4 | Bachelor-degree granting university (30 cr) upper div credits  
Student teaching (9 cr)  
Seminar/portfolio (3 cr)  
Coursework (PK-3, K-6, 6-12) (18 cr.) |
| Total | 122 cr. |

Meetings to plan official Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) for a 3+1 pathway between Leeward Community College and a bachelor’s degree granting institutions were held with Chaminade University (7/13/16, 10/19/16, 12/7/16) and UH Mānoa (11/2/16, 12/6/16). See links below:

[MOA for 3+1 Pathway Leading to a B.S. in SPED Mild/Moderate PK-12 with Chaminade University](#)
MOA for 3+1 Pathway Leading to a B.Ed in SPED Moderate/Severe with UH Manoa

Track II: Sample Academic Plan

Alternative route to licensure for those with a bachelor-level degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Fall Semester: (6 cr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED Law and IEP Development (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED Assessment (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring Semester: (6 cr)**

ELA Interventions (3 cr)

Participating in a Professional Community (3 cr)

**Summer Semester (3 cr)**

ED Tech for Students with Exceptionalities (3 cr)

110 hours of observation and participation are met by completing 22 hours of field experience in each of the 5 courses at the grade level of license being pursued with a special focus on the specific InTASC/CEC standard(s) addressed in each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Clinical Practice: 420 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fall Semester: (9 cr)**

Student Teaching (3 cr)

*Full-time student teaching-15 weeks*

Student Teaching Seminar (3 cr)

Portfolio (3 cr)

**Total** 24 cr.

To earn an Advanced Professional Certificate, candidates must achieve a GPA of 2.0 or higher for all courses applicable to the certificate.

3. **Student Demand**

Candidates will come from a pool of AAT graduates, in-service HDOE para-educators, emergency hire, substitute teachers, general education teachers, or anyone with a minimum of an associate’s degree who has a strong commitment to work with culturally and linguistically diverse student populations in the State’s Zones of School Innovation (historically underserved and underperforming public schools).

In fall 2012, Leeward’s Teacher Education Program was awarded a $2.5M Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) grant to increase capacity to develop and deliver innovative teacher training in the areas of highest need in the state. Through the grant, we were able to establish a 16 credit Certificate of Competence in
Special/Inclusive Education (SPED), which was designed to provide professionals with a foundation in inclusive teaching practices, professional collaboration, and tools to work with culturally and linguistically diverse families.

As of fall 2016, over 200 students have enrolled in the Certificate of Competence in SPED statewide including paraprofessionals working with students with severe special needs and general education teachers working in inclusive classrooms with students with mild/moderate learning and/or behavioral exceptionalities. In spring 2015, Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Board appealed to all the teacher education programs in Hawai‘i as well as other stakeholders in the Hawai‘i Department of Education to participate in an Alternative Pathway to Licensure Work Group to design an alternative route to SPED licensure specifically targeting paraprofessionals and emergency hires working with students with special needs in federally identified Zones of School Innovation. A spring 2016 survey of those enrolled in the SPED Certificate of Competence indicated about 80% would continue with special education coursework offered by Leeward for professional development or as a means to obtain special education teacher licensure. The overwhelming interest in special education coursework leading to licensure prompted our teacher education program to design and propose an Advanced Professional Certificate in SPED PK-12. Based on current demand for the Certificate of Competence in SPED, we anticipate 25 candidates for the APC for Fall 2017.

4. Program Resources and Efficiency

Leeward Community College has already institutionalized the Certificate of Competence in SPED with the hiring of a full-time instructor in SPED. If the program grows, then additional instruction will be provided by hiring lecturers. The Teacher Education Program receives funding for supplies, and the SPED program will utilize this same budget. As this program will require 300-level classes, Leeward will charge the higher tuition rate for the APC in SPED program. The additional revenue will support any additional costs of travel needed for a statewide implementation.

Revenues for this program of 300-level courses are based on current tuition schedules for University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2017 - Spring 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no similar programs in the UHCC system.
5. Program Effectiveness

The education faculty meets weekly and ongoing assessment of our program continues to direct our decisions regarding program and course modifications. To ensure that the program is providing content and instruction to meet the needs of preparing effective special education teachers, existing faculty with expertise in SPED and additional casual hires with specific content area expertise will design the six new courses to include content and assessments that are specific to special education.

All programs at Leeward Community College are evaluated annually, a process which includes an analysis of data on program demand, efficiency, and effectiveness through the
Annual Review of Program Data (ARPD). All programs and certificates also complete three-year comprehensive reviews therefore, in addition to three years of annual program data, an assessment of program learning outcomes will be analyzed. Through the analysis of the ARPD and assessment of program learning outcomes, program modifications and improvements will be made. Program effectiveness will also be measured through an internal data system, which has been developed to track course completion rates, certificate completers, and employment information. The APC in SPED data will be collected as part of the Teacher Education program for the ARPD.

Accreditation
This program does not have a program accreditation. Leeward Community College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The Advanced Professional Certificate in Special Education PK-12 has no impact on the college’s accreditation status.
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Accreditation Process

• Community Colleges individually accredited by Accrediting Association for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) except UH Maui College
• All colleges are currently fully accredited through 2018
• Next visit will be in Fall 2018
• Colleges are preparing institutional self-evaluation reports in preparation for that visit
Accreditation Standards

• Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness and Integrity
  A. Mission
  B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness
  C. Institutional Integrity
Accreditation Standards

- Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services
  A. Instructional Programs
  B. Library and Learning Support Services
  C. Student Support Services
Accreditation Standards

• Standard III: Resources
  A. Human Resources
  B. Physical Resources
  C. Technology Resources
  D. Financial Resources
Accreditation Standards

• Standard IV: Leadership and Governance
  A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes
  B. Chief Executive Officer
  C. Governing Board
  D. Multi-College Districts or Systems
Accreditation Policies and Federal Requirements

- Public Notification and 3rd Party Comments
- Student Achievement Standards
- Credits, Program Length, and Tuition
- Transfer Policies
- Distance Education and Correspondence Education
- Student Complaints
- Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials
- Title IV Compliance
Institutional Self-Evaluation Process

Teams of faculty and staff examine each substandard and policy to:

• Describe evidence related to how the standard is being met

• Provide an analysis of whether the standard is currently met. This may also include planned improvements related to the standard

• Provide links to the documentation

• Prepare a quality focus essay on key improvements to be undertaken over the next six years
Accreditation Timetable

• Fall 2016 – Campuses organized and began the evidence gathering
• Spring 2017 – Preliminary findings discussed with opportunity to address deficiencies in the 2017-2018 year
• Spring 2018 – Final editing
• May/June 2018 – Approval by campus, system, and BOR
• August 2018 – Submittal to ACCJC
Board of Regents Standards

• Thirteen Board of Regents standards (see attached handout)

• Team of faculty/staff from each campus will work with the Vice President and the Board task group to describe, evaluate, and document compliance with the standards

• Primary work will be done in March and April 2017 with periodic updates to reflect changes

• Final analysis will be incorporated into all campus reports
Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution continuously and systematically evaluates, plans, implements, and improves the quality of its educational programs and services. The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in the performance of their duties.

I.A.4 The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.

I.C.7 In order to assure institutional and academic integrity, the institution uses and publishes governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and its support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists for all constituencies, including faculty and students.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success, sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are defined in policy and are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief executive officer. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. In multi-college districts or systems, the roles within the district/system are clearly delineated. The multi-college district or system has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the colleges.

IV.B.5 The CEO assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures.

C. Governing Board

1. The institution has a governing board that has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution
2. The governing board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision.

3. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the CEO of the college and/or the district/system.

4. The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution’s educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure.

5. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the college/district/system mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability.

6. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

7. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly assesses its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the college/district/system mission and revises them as necessary.

8. To ensure the institution is accomplishing its goals for student success, the governing board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality.

9. The governing board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

10. Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the board’s effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The governing board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.

11. The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body
members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

12. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds the CEO accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

13. The governing board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college’s accredited status, and supports through policy the college’s efforts to improve and excel. The board participates in evaluation of governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process.
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Introduction

The Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards is designed for use by college governing board members as an introduction to regional accreditation and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC) and as a guide to their roles and responsibilities in accreditation. Governing boards have leadership responsibilities for the college mission, institutional quality and improvement, institutional integrity, and, ultimately, student success. Accreditation Standards recognize the important role of governing boards in student success, holding them accountable for their leadership role. Governing boards carry out their responsibilities primarily through policy development and delegation of responsibility for institutional operations to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), holding the CEO accountable for implementing governing board (Board) policies. Defining the policy role of governing boards and distinguishing that role from the delegated role of institutional operations is a fundamental principle that informs Accreditation Standards. This Guide is both supplement and companion to other guides and manuals published by ACCJC, all of which are cited in the last section.

Section one of this Guide begins with general information on regional accreditation, including history, purpose, and organizational structure. It describes the goals of accreditation. This section also introduces the purposes and structure of ACCJC.

Section two introduces Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies (together Commission’s Standards), as well as an overview of ACCJC procedures and processes.

Section three focuses on the roles and responsibilities of governing boards in accreditation. This section looks at ACCJC Accreditation Standards and processes through the lens of governing boards and their distinct roles in college governance and leadership. The section emphasizes the leadership role governing boards play in defining college mission and policy, as well as their leadership roles in quality assurance, student success and governance.

Section four provides questions and answers (Q&A) on effective practices for governing boards.

Section five presents a list of ACCJC guides, manuals, and other resources that are important to accreditation, and offers governing board members comprehensive information on all aspects of regional accreditation and ACCJC.

The Appendices include the ACCJC NEWS publication entitled Twelve Common Questions and Answers about Regional Accreditation (Appendix A), the complete Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation (Appendix B) and Accreditation Standards (Appendix C).
1 Regional Accreditation and ACCJC

1.1 Regional Accreditation: History, Purpose and Structure

In the United States, accreditation is the primary process for assuring and improving the quality of institutions of higher education. Accreditation of approximately 3,000 colleges and universities is carried out through a process known as “regional accreditation”: seven commissions operate in six geographic regions of the country through nongovernmental, nonprofit voluntary associations. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) chose to have two higher education accrediting commissions, one for institutions primarily awarding associate degrees, and one for colleges and universities that award primarily the bachelor’s degree or graduate degrees. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC/WASC) is one of the seven regional accrediting agencies and one of the two higher education accrediting agencies in the Western Region. The Senior College and University Commission (WASC SCUC) is the other higher education accreditor in the WASC region, and accredits baccalaureate and graduate degree-granting institutions.

Accreditation in the United States is based on a peer review process in which professional educators and persons representing the public interest evaluate an institution using rigorous standards for institutional good practice. These standards are developed with input from the higher education institutions affiliated with that commission. While each regional accrediting commission develops its own standards and policies, the ideas and content of standards are broadly shared across the national higher education community, and lead to general acceptance of institutional credits and degrees across the country. Colleges are evaluated within the context of their institutional mission, and accreditation standards are written to be broadly applicable to a variety of institutional missions. Following a review by a team of peers, accrediting commissions determine the accreditation status of the institution and use may require follow up reports on institutional compliance, as needed. Colleges seek reaffirmation every seven years, and are also required to undertake a more limited review when they seek approval for substantive changes to the institution’s mission, programs, location, mode of delivery or population served.

All regional accrediting agencies are recognized by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) and undergo a federal recognition review every five years. The USDE also sets regulations for institutional quality; some of these are incorporated in the accreditation standards of all recognized accrediting agencies, while others are enforced on institutions through the federal financial aid process.

Regional accreditation, which can trace its roots to 1885, is the proven method for assuring the public that a higher education institution meets established standards of quality and awards degrees, certificates or credits that students and the public can trust. The granting of accreditation by any regional accrediting commission enables an institution to qualify for federal grants, contracts, and to distribute federal financial aid.

Accreditation is a voluntary system for the regulation of higher education quality. Institutions agree to join an association and to uphold the accrediting association’s standards of quality and its policies. Regional accreditors conduct a comprehensive
evaluation of an accredited institution on a regular basis, which varies from seven to ten years among regional accrediting associations.

While the standards of each regional accreditor might be organized differently or use different wording, the seven regional accrediting commissions follow very similar processes and have very similar standards of quality. Today’s accreditation enterprise is based on decades of experience and refinement, both leading and reflecting the evolution of American higher education. Today’s accreditation standards go beyond the historical emphasis on inputs and processes. There is growing emphasis on student outcomes as a measure of quality. Over the past decade, regional accrediting commissions have been leaders in assisting colleges and universities to develop valid and useful ways to measure what and how students are learning, as well as the rate at which students complete programs and degrees. Accreditors are also helping institutions to develop ways to use such information on student outcomes improve institutional effectiveness.

1.2 Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

The purposes of the ACCJC are to evaluate educational quality and institutional effectiveness and integrity and to promote institutional improvement. The ACCJC accreditation process assures the public that member accredited institutions meet the Commission’s Standards which include the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies. These ensure that the credentials earned at the institutions are of value to the students who earned them; of value to employers and trade or profession related licensing entities; and of value to other colleges and universities.

The ACCJC accredits public, private non-profit, and private for-profit associate degree granting institutions in California, Hawai‘i, the Territories of Guam and American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Federated State of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

The 19 Commissioners of the ACCJC make decisions on the accredited status of institutions and set policies and Accreditation Standards. Commissioners represent the interests of the public and the Commission’s member institutions. Commissioners are elected by the membership for three-year terms and generally serve two terms. The Commission is led by a Chair who serves for two years. If elected to an officer position, a Commissioner may serve the time necessary to complete the officer role(s). The work of the Commissioners is part-time and voluntary.

The ACCJC staff manage and support the accreditation activities mandated by federal regulations, ERs, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies. The President of the ACCJC is an employee of the Commission, and is responsible for the administrative and support staff who serve the Commission and its institutional members. The President and the Chair of the Commission are the spokespersons for the Commission to institutions and the public.
2 Eligibility Requirements (ERs), Accreditation Standards and Commission Policies and Processes

2.1 ERs, Accreditation Standards and Commission Policies

The Accreditation Standards form the core of the accreditation process. The Commission’s Standards, including the Eligibility Requirements (ERs), Accreditation Standards and Commission policies are developed, adopted, evaluated and revised by the Commission, with input from member institutions and outside experts in higher education. They are informed by effective practices derived from years of experience of member colleges, as well as sound educational research and practices across the nation. The Standards and Commission policies are also informed by federal regulations. All member institutions must maintain compliance with all the Commission’s Standards at all times.

The four Accreditation Standards for ACCJC are:

1. Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity
   - focus on mission and purposes of each institution and institutional effectiveness achieving the mission
   - focus on data-driven assessment and continuous quality improvement and student achievement and learning
   - focus on the clarity, accuracy and integrity of institutional information and processes

2. Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services
   - focus on quality and rigor of instruction, student support, learning services

3. Standard III: Resources
   - focus on capacity of human, physical, technological and financial resources to support achievement of mission and maintain institutional integrity

4. Standard IV: Leadership and Governance
   - focus on decision making roles and responsibilities and the capacity of leadership to support and achieve mission and student success
   - focus on the effectiveness of the governance structure, the CEO and the governing board, including leadership roles and responsibilities in multi-college districts or systems

In addition to the Accreditation Standards, ACCJC member institutions must also comply with the ERs and Commission policies at all times. The ERs are required by the USDE of all regional accreditors. The 21 ERs, which are largely derived from the Standards, are a prerequisite to eligibility for accreditation. Ongoing compliance with ERs is validated as part of the seven year institutional reaffirmation process. Assurance of the continued compliance with the ERs must be included in the Institutional Self Evaluation Report.

Commission policies can be found in the Accreditation Reference Handbook. Policies describe additional ACCJC requirements and procedures related to the Standards,
federal regulation, Commission actions and Commission operations. The Commission reviews and if necessary or revises its policies regularly in response to federal regulation, judicial action, or other Commission actions or findings. It is important to note that member institutions are held accountable for compliance with all Commission policies. Of particular note for governing boards in multi-college districts is the “Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems,” which is relevant to many member institutions.

Discussion of the Standards specifically related to the roles and responsibilities of governing boards is found in Section 3.

2.2 Accreditation Processes

2.2.1 Obtaining Initial Accreditation

The process to obtain Initial accreditation begins with an eligibility review to establish compliance with the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements. If the institution meets the ERs, it will be declared eligible to prepare an Institutional Self Evaluation Report for application for Candidacy status. If the institution meets the Commission’s Standards, it will be granted Candidacy status for at least two years and for no more than four years. During that time, the institution will prepare a second Institutional Self Evaluation Report in application for Initial Accreditation. Initial Accreditation is granted after a comprehensive institutional evaluation that demonstrates that the institution is in compliance with the ERs, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies. When granted an Initial accreditation, the institution is subject to ACCJC monitoring and reporting requirements and must be fully evaluated again within a maximum seven year accreditation cycle. Once accredited, an institution is eligible for federal student financial aid and well as federal grants and contracts.

2.2.2 Comprehensive Review

ACCJC member institutions undergo a comprehensive evaluation every seven years to determine whether they meet the Commission’s Standards. In addition, the review process validates that institutions are engaged in sustainable efforts to improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. The review process has four steps: self evaluation, external evaluation, Commission review and accreditation action, and institutional continuous quality improvement.

For accredited institutions, the review begins when the institution conducts a self evaluation using the Commission’s Standards. The outcome of the institutional self evaluation process is the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER), which is submitted to the ACCJC. The Institutional Self Evaluation Report provides analysis and evaluation, supported by evidence, that the institution meets the accreditation Standards. The Report also includes Actionable Improvement Plans for future actions to meet requirements or improve and a Quality Focus Essay that discusses two or three areas the institution identified, during the self evaluation process, for study and improvement to enhance academic quality, institutional effectiveness and student outcomes.

The Commission appoints a team of trained peer evaluators which can include members of governing boards. All members of an evaluation team are selected on
the basis of their professional expertise in higher education, areas of specialization and willingness to apply standards objectively to the institution they’ll evaluate.

The team examines the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, visits the institution to examine educational quality, and writes an evaluation team report that evaluates the institution’s compliance with the Commission’s Standards. The evaluation team report may also make recommendations to come into compliance with Standards or for improvement, and provide commendations for excellent practice when appropriate. The team makes a confidential recommendation to the Commission on the institution’s accredited status based on its evaluation of the institution. After the institution has had an opportunity to correct any errors of fact that it finds in the draft report, the chair of the evaluation team submits the evaluation team report to the Commission. The Commission evaluates the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the evaluation team report and the institution’s historical performance in accreditation reviews, and makes a decision on the accredited status of the institution. The Commission may also give the institution additional recommendations and direction for improvement. The Commission may impose a sanction and define deadlines for the institution to resolve any noted deficiencies. (See the “Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions” in the Accreditation Reference Handbook.)

The Commission communicates its decisions on the status of accreditation via an action letter to the institution and public announcements from the Commission within 30 days following the Commission’s January or June meetings. Member institutions are required to share the evaluation team report, the Institutional Self Evaluation Report and the Commission action letter with the college community and the public by posting these documents on the institution’s website.

The final and ongoing step in the comprehensive review process is continuous quality improvement. The Commission requires the institution to resolve any deficiencies cited by the recommendations in the evaluation team report within a maximum of two years. The Commission’s standards also require institutions to implement processes for Internal Quality Assurance by practicing ongoing, evidence-based assessments of institutional effectiveness, and making improvements to quality as needed.

2.2.3 Other Reports and Evaluation Visits

The ACCJC requires institutions to submit a Midterm Report in the fourth year after the comprehensive evaluation team visit. The Midterm report includes an update on the status of the institution’s action projects described in the Quality Focus Essay and an institutional analysis of the data trends from the Annual Reports and the Annual Financial Reports. The report also reports on the progress, including timelines for completion and responsible parties, that the institution has made on the self-identified Improvement Plans from the Institutional Self Evaluation Report.

Institutions are required to remain in compliance with the Commission’s Standards at all times. If an institution is out of compliance with any of the Commission’s Standards, the Commission may require a Follow-Up Report and/or another evaluation team visit, at intervals determined by the Commission.
may impose a sanction and deadlines for the institution to resolve noted deficiencies.

Federal regulations require institutions to submit applications and receive approvals for substantive changes if they wish to make changes to mission, scope of programs, nature of student constituency, location (or geographical area serves), control of the institution, content of courses or programs (when changes are significant departure from current status), credit awarded for program or course completion or any other change the Commission deems substantive. A Substantive Change Proposal is submitted in accordance with the Commission’s “Policy on Substantive Change.” (See Substantive Change Manual.)
3 Roles and Responsibilities of Governing Boards in Accreditation

3.1 Governing Boards and ACCJC Standards

As noted in the first section of this Guide, the purpose of regional accreditation is to assure and improve the quality of higher education to support student success. Governing boards have a primary leadership role and responsibility for guiding institutions to achieve the mission of student success and to assure academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness. Governing boards fulfill this responsibility through institutional policies and by delegating responsibility for implementation of policies and pursuit of mission. Governing boards hold the CEO accountable for policy implementation and for fulfillment of the college mission. By extension, governing boards set policies that hold all constituencies of the institution accountable for performance relating to implementation of policies and pursuit of mission. While the governance role of the Board is centered on policy and delegation to the CEO and other institutional leaders and constituencies, the Board has responsibilities beyond governance—responsibilities for the mission and, ultimately, for the success of students.

The four Accreditation Standards describe the educational and institutional practices, organizational structures, resources, and institutional decision-making processes that are necessary conditions for a high quality institution and for student success. Standards I and IV describe some of the specific roles of governing boards in assuring that the institution produces high quality educational services and works to achieve and improve student success. However, the Board’s responsibility for institutional effectiveness is exercised through its policy making role and the delegation of policy implementation to college staff through the CEO. The governing board is responsible for adopting policy language that directs the institutional employees to good practice, and for examining how well the institution is meeting its goals for educational effectiveness and for student achievement and learning.

The governing board is also responsible for the fiscal integrity of the institution. The Board exercises its responsibility in fiscal matters through policy and by its review of the annual external audit and approval of the institution’s annual spending plans. The governing board is responsible for developing the expertise needed to make sound budgetary decisions that support educational quality, including an understanding of an institution’s current and projected revenues and expenditures, and the institution’s long term obligations created through contractual agreements, borrowing or plans for institutional expansion.

The governing board should set policies that hold all leaders and constituencies accountable for performance. For example, such accountability would include faculty for work on data driven program review, faculty and others responsible for SLOs and assessment, the chief financial officer for sound fiscal management, and the Board itself for avoiding fiscal or policy commitments that could jeopardize institutional effectiveness, integrity or stability. The governing board is expected to engage in professional development activities to improve its capacity for high performance in the conduct of its own work.
Accreditation Standard IV.C defines expectations for the roles and responsibilities of governing boards. The governing board has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The primary role of the governing board is policy leadership, and the primary responsibility of the Board is to create the policy environment that supports educational effectiveness. The governing board assures itself of strong institutional performance through its review of reports demonstrating how well the institution is achieving its mission. The Board holds the CEO and, as appropriate, other leaders and constituencies responsible for organizing and implementing the processes that accomplish mission. That accountability is manifested through Board policies that request information and data on institutional performance. Through policies, the Board should ask the institution to establish key metrics, or measures, by which the institution can assess and demonstrate - to the Board and to the public - achievement of its mission.

Setting standards of excellence and measuring performance tied to the mission of the institution connect the governing board with all four Accreditation Standards. For example, the Board is responsible for the mission of the institution, and the Standards require regular review of the institutional mission (Standard I.A). The Board is not concerned just with the review of the wording of the mission; it should be concerned with the institution’s achievement of the mission. That assessment requires data on the outcomes achieved by the students defined in the mission. Similarly, the mission broadly defines the scope of programs and services offered by the institution, and the Standards require institutions to conduct regular program reviews of all programs and services to assess their effectiveness (Standard I.B). The governing board should have a policy on program review and require regular institutional reports on assessment results and on decisions for improvement based on program review and integrated planning.

By focusing on the what - mission, quality, outcomes, and improvement - and not the how - operations and means to outcomes - effective governing boards demonstrate their policy-and mission-directed leadership role and responsibility for institutional effectiveness and student success. The ACCJC promotes the use of common measures of institutional effectiveness, including course completion, persistence, completion of certificates and degrees, transfer and job placement, and mastery of learning outcomes. In addition, the Commission requires colleges to set of Institution-Set Standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, and assesses how well the college is achieving them in pursuit of continuous those standards. Focusing on the what, governing boards should expect information and data that allow them to assess institutional effectiveness and achievement of mission. Thus, governing boards have roles and responsibilities related to the four Standards realized through policy and monitoring of policy implementation, and holding the CEO and, through the CEO, other college leaders and constituencies accountable for institutional quality, improvement, integrity, stability, and student success.

3.2 Governing Boards and ACCJC Processes

Standard IV. C stipulates that “the governing board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation
processes, and the college’s accredited status.” Governing boards should receive training about the accreditation process and the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies. In addition, the Board participates in the evaluation of governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process. The Board should receive regular reports on the progress of the review process and development of the Report and the Board should give direct input on those areas of the Standards affecting the Board directly, e.g., Standard IV.C.

The governing board should be informed of institutional reports submitted to the Commission and of communication from the Commission to institutions, including recommendations given to their institutions. With knowledge of the Accreditation Standards, governing boards should act to demonstrate commitment to supporting and improving student outcomes through planning and resource allocation, as reflected in the Standards. In the end, Board action should indicate a commitment to implementing institutional improvement that has been planned as part of the institutional self evaluation and accreditation processes. Those improvement plans should take their place among important institutional priorities that the Board ensures are addressed and adequately resourced.

In multi-college/multi-unit districts or systems, the governing board has responsibility for institutional mission(s) and for policy, just as the governing board has in a single-college district/system. In a multi-college/multi-unit district or system, the CEO of the district or system is directly responsible to the governing board, while CEO’s of the colleges/units within the district or system are responsible to the district/system CEO. In addition, the district/system has clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges/units and district/system, and the district/system acts as liaison between the colleges/units and the governing board. In a multi-college/multi-unit district or system, the governing board should maintain and review policies that clearly articulate the delineation and distribution of responsibilities and authorities between the district/system and the colleges/units.

It is important to note that the Commission evaluates based on the Commission’s Standards regardless of organizational structure. All governing boards are required to meet Accreditation Standards, and to support the quality of the institutions they govern; all institutions are evaluated on the basis of their governing board’s compliance with Accreditation Standards.

3.3 Governing Boards and Effective Leadership and Governance

The Standards delineate the roles and responsibilities of governing boards and the following principles summarize the expectations defined by the Commission for effective Board leadership and governance:

- **Governing Boards Act as a collective entity** - The Board is a corporate body. It governs as a unit with one voice. This principle means that individual Board members have authority only when they are acting as a Board. They have no power as individuals to act on their own or to direct college employees or operations.

- **Governing Boards Represent the Common Good** - The Board exists to represent the public or, in the case of private institutions, its owners. The Board is responsible for balancing and integrating a wide variety of interests and needs
into policies that benefit the common good and the future of its constituencies.

- **Governing Boards Set Policy Direction** - The Board establishes policies that give direction and guidance to the CEO and staff of the institution. A major Board responsibility is to define and uphold an institutional vision and mission that clearly reflect student and community expectations, as well as a realistic assessment of institutional resources necessary to accomplish the mission and related goals.

- **Governing Boards Employ, Evaluate and Support the CEO** - The successful Board fosters a good relationship between the Board and the CEO.

- **Governing Boards Set Policy Standards for Institutional and Board Operations** - The successful Board adopts policies that set standards for quality, ethics, and prudence in institutional operations and in the operation of the Board itself. Once institutional policy standards are established, the Board delegates authority to the CEO, allowing the CEO and college staff the flexibility they need to exercise professional judgment.

- **Governing Boards use Resources to Achieve Mission** - The successful Board assures that the institution’s mission is periodically evaluated and adequately funded. The successful Board also assures that its policies and resource allocations are linked and align with the educational priorities defined through the institutional mission and plans.

- **Governing Boards have Responsibility for Financial Integrity** - The successful Board regularly monitors financial performance and policy. The Board should require institutional leadership to maintain adequate reserves and to quickly address any issues discovered through external audits and reviews.

- **Governing Boards Monitor Performance** - The successful Board holds institutions accountable for student success and institutional effectiveness. The Board adopts the institution’s direction and broad goals as policy and then monitors the progress achieving those goals. Board policy should set expectations for the use of sound student outcome data in program and institutional reviews and planning. For example, if the Board adopts a policy goal that the institution will train workers for a particular industry, the Board should receive regular reports on progress toward that goal.

- **Governing Boards Create a Positive Climate** - The successful Board sets the tone for the entire institution. Through the behavior of Board members and the Board’s policies, the successful Board establishes a climate in which learning is valued, including learning by Board members, assessment and evaluation are embraced, and student success is the most important goal. Effective Boards are ethical and act with integrity, which also promotes a positive climate. The Board must have a code of ethics and a policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.
4 Q&A on Effective Governing Board Practices

4.1 Questions and Answers on Issues of Specific Interest to Governing Boards

As noted in earlier sections of this Guide, governing boards have roles and responsibilities that relate to all aspects of accreditation, and yet the Accreditation Standards specify both the scope and limits of those roles and responsibilities. Board members often pose questions to the Commission about appropriate roles and responsibilities, and the following question and answer section of this Guide features answers to some of the commonly asked questions.

1. What is the appropriate scope of policy responsibilities for governing boards?
   The governing board has responsibility for institutional outcomes and for limits on the means by which staff pursues outcomes. In addition, the governing board uses policy to define its relationship with the CEO and to define its own governance processes. The Board’s most important policy role is to create a mission for the institution that defines the constituencies served, the programs and services offered to them, and the desired outcomes for them. Thus, the governing board uses policy to define the ends, or outcomes, for the institution. However, the Board also sets limits through policy on the means by which the institution operates. The limits are manifested through policies on principles of prudence and ethics that form a boundary of staff practices, activities, circumstances and methods. The Board also sets policies about how it relates to staff, which link the Board to the CEO. The CEO is the Board’s link to staff, and the Board-CEO relationship is defined through policies on the CEO’s role, delegation and accountability. Finally, the Board uses policy to define its own operations - its structure, its meeting protocols and the standards by which it operates, reflecting the Board’s responsibilities for providing vision and ethical leadership.

2. How does a governing board act on its policies?
   The governing board holds itself, CEO and, as applicable and appropriate, other institutional leaders and constituencies accountable for Board policies. Recognizing that the Board is responsible for the ‘what’ of ends and outcomes and not the ‘how’ of means and operations, the Board asks for regular institutional reports and data on the status of achieving the institution’s outcomes. In addition, the Board evaluates and revises its policies on a scheduled basis. By acting on its policies in this manner, the Board fulfills its leadership responsibilities.

3. How does a governing board demonstrate integrity in its operations?
   The governing board has responsibility for institutional outcomes and for limits on the means by which staff pursues outcomes. In addition, the governing board uses policy to define its relationship with the CEO and to define its own governance processes. The Board’s most important policy role is to create a mission for the institution that defines the constituencies served, the programs and services offered to them, and the desired outcomes for them. Thus, the governing board uses policy to define the ends, or outcomes, for the institution. However, the Board also sets limits through policy on the means by which the
institution operates. The limits are manifested through policies on principles of prudence and ethics that form a boundary of staff practices, activities, circumstances and methods. The Board also sets policies about how it relates to staff, which link the Board to the CEO. The CEO is the Board’s link to staff, and the Board-CEO relationship is defined through policies on the CEO’s role, delegation and accountability. The Board uses policy to define its own operations - its structure, its meeting protocols and the standards by which it operates, reflecting the Board’s responsibilities for providing vision and ethical leadership. Finally, the Board evaluates its processes to ensure quality and effectiveness.

4. How does the governing board monitor institutional mission, goals, and plans?

The governing board is responsible for the institutional mission, and, as required by the Standards, the institution must review its mission on a regular basis. It is important to note that review of the institutional mission is not simply a matter of reviewing and revising the mission statement. Regular review of the institutional mission involves monitoring of institutional outcomes to determine whether or not the institution is fulfilling its mission. Such monitoring includes regular reporting to the Board on outcomes relating to institutional goals and measures of student success, including institution-set standards, and to implementation and evaluation of institutional plans. Again, the Board is responsible for the ‘what’ of institutional performance, not the ‘how’ of operations. Through regular monitoring of the status and outcomes relating to mission, goals, and plans, the Board appropriately fulfills its primary responsibility for the institutional mission and student success.

5. Are roles and responsibilities of the governing board different in multi-college/multi-unit districts or systems?

ACCJC Standard IV.D and ACCJC “Policy on the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems” define accreditation requirements and expectations for multi-college/multi-unit districts or systems. In such districts or systems, the governing board has responsibility for institutional mission(s) and for policy, just as the governing board has in a single college district/system. In a multi-college/multi-unit district or system, the CEO of the district or system is directly responsible to the governing board, while CEO’s of the colleges/units within the district or system are responsible to the district/system CEO. In addition, the district/system has clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges/units and district/system, and the district/system acts as liaison between the colleges/units and the governing board. In a multi-college/multi-unit district or system, the governing board should maintain and review policies that clearly articulate the delineation and distribution of responsibilities and authorities between the district/system and the colleges/units. It is important to note that the Commission evaluates based on the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission polices (together Commission’s Standards) regardless of organizational structure.

6. What is a ‘conflict of interest’ policy for a governing board?

The governing board should have a policy on ‘conflict of interest’ that ensures the Board’s personal and professional interests are disclosed and that those interests do not conflict or interfere with the impartiality of governing board
members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic quality and fiscal integrity of the institution. The policy should reflect the Board members’ commitment to resist temptation and outside pressure to use their position to benefit themselves or any other individual or agency apart from the interests of the institution.

7. How does the governing board execute its responsibilities for fiscal integrity of the institution?

ACCJC Standard III.D defines expectations for maintaining the fiscal integrity of institutions, including adequacy and use of resources and the policies and processes employed to manage those resources with commitment to mission and integrity. The governing board adopts policy on institutional budgeting and it adopts institutional budgets that are balanced and focused on student success, reflecting institutional goals and priorities. The Board receives and reviews regular financial performance reports, and it validates fiscal accountability through review of annual financial audits.

8. How does the governing board build a sense of teamwork?

Governing boards are corporate boards - individual Board members do not have individual authority for governance or policy. As a corporate entity, the governing board is most effective when its members work together. Critical to Board members becoming an effective team is maintaining a climate of trust and respect. The institutional CEO is also a part of the team, and the effective Board team adheres to its role so that the CEO and staff can perform their roles. Board member professional development is needed to hone skills and knowledge, and to develop and maintain Board relationships that lead to effective Board performance.

9. How does the governing board grow from good to great?

A good Board assures that the institution’s core mission is periodically re-evaluated and is adequately funded. A good Board protects its core mission by not creating unfunded liabilities for the institution. A great Board assures that its policies and budget allocations are linked and correspond to the educational priorities in the institutional mission and plans.

4.2 Twelve Common Questions and Answers about Regional Accreditation

Although this Guide covers many aspects of regional accreditation, the ACCJC has developed a publication entitled Twelve Common Questions and Answers about Regional Accreditation to provide basic information about regional accreditation purposes, principles, and practices. This information first appeared in the Special Edition February 2011 ACCJC Newsletter and is also available at the “New on the Website” section of the ACCJC homepage at: http://www.accjc.org.

(See Appendix A.)
5 ACCJC Resources on the Website

5.1 ACCJC Website

The ACCJC maintains a website at: [www.accjc.org](http://www.accjc.org). The website contains all important reference documents and resources listed below. It also provides a calendar of upcoming accreditation related training events and copies of presentations made at some prior events. Board members are encouraged to explore the website as the best source of up to date reference documents.

Accreditation Basics is an online course available on the ACCJC website through the “Accreditation Basics” link in the “New on the Website” section of the home page. The 90-minute course focuses on the purposes of accreditation, the process used to accredit institutions, and the particular Standards used by the ACCJC to measure the educational quality and institutional effectiveness of member institutions. First-time evaluation team members are required to complete the Accreditation Basics course. However, it is also a useful resource for individuals involved in accreditation at their institutions wishing to learn more about the process, and those wanting to increase their understanding of the basic principles of accreditation. The online course can be paused at any time and resumed to fit the scheduling needs of users. Quizzes assess the user’s progress at regular intervals throughout the course, and an end-of-course exam must be completed at 90% mastery to be considered successful in the course. A certificate will be issued to all who qualify.

This Guide frequently cites the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies (together Commission's Standards), which form the foundation of regional accreditation. (See Appendix B and C.)

ACCJC also publishes a number of manuals, guides and other resources, all of which are available online through the ACCJC website at: [www.accjc.org](http://www.accjc.org). Current ACCJC publications are listed below.

5.2 Eligibility Requirements (ERs) and Accreditation Standards

The ERs and Accreditation Standards are found on the ACCJC website on the Eligibility Requirements & Standards page at: [www.accjc.org/eligibility-requirements-standards](http://www.accjc.org/eligibility-requirements-standards). The ERs, Accreditation Standards and all Commission policies can also be found in a single publication, the *Accreditation Reference Handbook*, which is found on the ACCJC website on the Publications & Policies page at: [www.accjc.org/publications-policies](http://www.accjc.org/publications-policies).

The ACCJC publishes several manuals that are used by institutions preparing the Institutional Self Evaluation Report and by the peer evaluation teams that visit an institution. The manuals listed below can be found on the ACCJC website on the Publications & Policies page at: [www.accjc.org/publications-policies](http://www.accjc.org/publications-policies).

5.3 Guides and Manuals

- *Accreditation Reference Handbook*
- *Eligibility, Candidacy, and Initial Accreditation Manual*
- *Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions*
• Guide to Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission
• Manual for Follow-Up and Special Visits
• Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation
• Substantive Change Manual
• Team Evaluator Manual

5.4 Other Resources
The ACCJC has published some supplementary materials used in institutional evaluations that are also found on the Publications & Policies page on the ACCJC website including:
• Institutional Financial Review and Resources
  ▪ Required Evidentiary Documents for Financial Review
  ▪ Explanatory Matrix of Auditor’s Opinions
  ▪ Sample Schedule of Financial Trends Analysis
• Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

5.5 ACCJC Newsletter
The ACCJC also publishes a newsletter, ACCJC NEWS, which provides important current information about institutional quality issues. All issues of ACCJC NEWS can be found on the ACCJC website on Newsletter page at: www.accjc.org/newsletter. Please see the cover article from ACCJC NEWS Summer 2012 for important information regarding accreditation and governing board roles and responsibilities.
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UH Systemwide EM Action Plan, 2017-21

- This integrated plan is an intentional, comprehensive, and collective process dependent on annual predictive updates and modifications strategically targeted to manage the enrollment cycle across the system

- Establishes the role of the system

- Establishes the role of the campuses/units
UH System EM Plan
Goals

- Strategically align resources and opportunities
- Increase numbers of target populations
  - E.g., Native Hawaiians, Pell, graduate and non-resident students, returning adults
- Provide opportunities to strategically align fiscal planning with enrollment and retention
- Use technology and innovation for planning and decision making
UH System EM Plan Outline

- System Role
- Campus/Unit Role
- Campus/Unit Targets and Strategies
System Role
Centralized System Level Support

- Data analytics, reporting, and monitoring
- Coordination, facilitation, and leadership around articulation, policies, and current initiatives
- Creation of new strategies and initiatives
- Monitor campus/unit strategies to ensure coordination across the system
System Role
Centralized System Level Support

- Data analytics, reporting, and monitoring
  - Provide analytics and predictive modeling to identify potential target populations
  - Provide data on admissions, enrollment and projections, and retention
  - Provide interactive modeling spreadsheets
  - Continue to monitor reports on all performance metrics
System Role
Centralized System Level Support

- Coordination, facilitation, and leadership
  - Monitor articulation agreements and curricular pathways
  - Create, review, and revise system policies, as needed
  - Create and maintain system level initiatives
  - Provide system level coordination of distance and online learning
System Role
Centralized System Level Support

- New initiatives and strategies
  - Recently established EM Oversight Committee
  - Systemwide focus on retention and persistence initiatives
  - Use of financial aid to positively impact enrollment
  - Initiatives targeting transfer, returning, and adult students
  - Research best practices and maintain national engagement in enrollment management
Campus/Unit Role

- Create a campus/unit plan focused on targeted goals, strategies, and metrics
- Identify target groups
- Set enrollment targets and projections
- Articulate strategies
- Monitor and adjust strategies, as needed
Campus/Unit Targets & Strategies
# Enrollment Targets by Campus/Unit, 2017-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017-18 Targets</th>
<th>2018-19 Targets</th>
<th>2019-20 Targets</th>
<th>2020-21 Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Total</strong></td>
<td>53,418</td>
<td>57,487</td>
<td>59,656</td>
<td>61,639</td>
<td>63,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Mānoa</td>
<td>18,056</td>
<td>18,056</td>
<td>18,688</td>
<td>19,342</td>
<td>20,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Hilo</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>3,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH West O‘ahu</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>3,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCC</td>
<td>28,757</td>
<td>32,754</td>
<td>33,999</td>
<td>34,942</td>
<td>35,797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UH Mānoa Targets

- Undergraduate
  - First-Time freshmen admits
  - Transfer students
  - Retention
  - Persistence
- Graduate
UH Mānoa Strategies

- Strategic use of financial aid and scholarships for optimal enrollment
- Create a strategic marketing and communications plan for recruitment
- Implement a Customer Relationship Management (CRM) tool to enhance communication with prospective students
- Expand the First-Year LC Program to all incoming freshmen
- Implement Early Alert measures
- Revise student orientation and first-year programs to increase student engagement
UH Hilo Targets

- First-time freshmen, especially from Hawai‘i Island
- Transfer students from UH Community Colleges
- New undergraduates from International and Pacific
- New undergraduates from U.S. Mainland
- Retention of continuing students
UH Hilo Strategies

- Intensify recruitment efforts with Hawaiʻi Island high schools
- Strengthen transfer pipeline with UH Community Colleges
- Evaluate and refine rebranding efforts across the state
- Enhance summer-bridge and living learning community offerings
- Establish peer tutoring programs in key gateway courses
- Expand pilot programs of integrated advising for specific majors
- Establish transfer support center
- Develop new sources of students
- Continue emphasis on retention of students as a priority
UH West O‘ahu Targets

- Academic majors
- Freshmen retention
- 6-year graduation rate
- Freshmen entering class
- Transfer entering class
UH West O‘ahu Strategies

- Offer more evening and weekend courses
- Increase FAFSA applications
- Use predictive analytics for admission and retention activities
- Implement a marketing and outreach strategy to get more accepted students to enroll
UHCC Targets

- High School Graduates Direct Entry
- GED Recipients
- Pacific Islanders
- Working Age (25-44) Adults
- International Students
UHCC Strategies

- Focus on addressing the DOE’s stated goal to increase the going rate
- Target working adults
- Commitment to eliminate the enrollment gap for Pacific Island students
- Build on successful international programs
- Work on retention challenges and transfer efforts
- Commitment to the Hawaiʻi Graduation Initiative and the Hawaiʻi Innovation Initiative
EM Plan Overview

- The EM action plan provides an alignment of planning and actions consistent with both system and campus level strategic priorities.

- The document is a dynamic framework that is intended to be updated annually based on new predictive analyses, new developments, and updated information.
Appendix
## Enrollment Targets, 2017–20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Past 3-Year Average Growth</th>
<th>Targeted Enrollment Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>28,757</td>
<td>30,029</td>
<td>35,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total enrollment of targeted group</td>
<td>14,067</td>
<td>15,058</td>
<td>22,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High School Graduates Direct Entry</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>4,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GED Recipients</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>2,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Working Age (25-44) Adults</td>
<td>8,245</td>
<td>8,652</td>
<td>13,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>% Change from Previous Year</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>% Change from Previous Year</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>% Change from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>32,754</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>33,999</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>34,942</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment of targeted group</td>
<td>19,162</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>20,247</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>21,350</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,989</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4,133</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11,466</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>12,467</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>13,171</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Update on UH Strategic Plan for Distance and Online Learning

Dr. Risa E. Dickson
Vice President, Academic Planning and Policy
March 2017
Distance and Online Learning

Extend and expand education and training opportunities beyond traditional campus settings through a variety of technologies (online, cable TV, interactive TV, or hybrid methods) to be flexible and responsive in order to increase access and address state needs.
History of Distance Learning in the UH

- 1986 - Public access cable television
- 1988 – 1 way video: Skybridge (Maui County)
- 1990 – 2 way video: HITS (Hawai‘i Interactive Television System (statewide))
- 1994 – the Internet – First online courses offered
- 1996 – University Centers established
Current Distance Learning Offerings Across System

- 58 credentials
  - 14 certificates
  - 3 AA degrees
  - 18 bachelor’s degrees
  - 16 graduate / post-baccalaureate certificates
  - 15 master’s degrees
  - 2 doctoral degrees
- 1,251 courses per year
- 26,128 course registrations per year

Note: Many of the degrees are supported by our University Centers
Opportunities

- Meet statewide workforce needs by providing programs targeted at critical needs
- Offer in-demand degree programs to non-traditional populations to increase college attainment
  - e.g., adult students, students in rural areas
- Establish short term workforce based certifications
- Identify key transfer and major courses and schedule them to ensure access in a timely manner
- Develop targeted degree programs that can compete beyond the state
Meeting State Workforce Needs

- Ongoing Industry Sector Partnership convenings leading to modifying or creating new need-based program areas and aligning them across the UH system
- Use of Sector Mapping website to identify areas of demand
- Identification of programs and certifications needed in rural areas, among employed populations, etc.
- Delivery of degree programs at a distance to ensure students statewide have access to career opportunities and associated benefits of those degrees
Vision for a Systemwide Integrated Distance and Online Learning Plan

- Systemwide coordination to create access for strategically selected degrees, certificates, courses, and training
- Flexible and coordinated course/program development and delivery
- DL Portal with wraparound student and academic support services
- Face-to-face student and faculty support
- DL Portal marketing and outreach
Systemwide Coordination: Associate Degrees and Lower Division Pathways

- Coordinate fully online associate degrees leveraging existing course offerings
  - Ensure consistency of core course offerings through multi-year scheduling
  - Ensure availability of online General Education pathways
- Improve program alignment across system
- Target 2-year programs to meet state workforce needs
  - e.g., IT, business management
Systemwide Coordination: Bachelor’s and Graduate Degrees

- Ensure integrated pathways from 2- to 4-year degrees
- Develop a multi-year course schedule guaranteeing consistency of course availability
- Create a completion degree for adult students who cannot attend a campus
- Offer programs for current UHCC students transferring to non-UH online institutions
- Create professional master’s degrees programs
Flexible and Coordinated Course/Program Development & Delivery

- Explore the use of competency based education, prior learning assessment & badging
- Explore the use of adaptive learning and alternative delivery
- Maximize the use of open educational resources
- Create alternatively structured courses in 4, 5, 6 week formats
- Offer cohort programs with alternative scheduling
- Re-examine the role, purposes, and configuration of University and Education Centers to support a more complete statewide framework for the delivery of distinctive programs
DL Portal with Wraparound Student and Academic Support Services

Upgrade student support services to ensure success of DL students

- **Student Support Services**
  - Offers admissions, financial aid, registration, mentoring, job placement

- **Academic Support Services**
  - Provides academic advising, tutoring, test centers
Face-to-Face Student and Faculty Support

- **University and Education Support Centers**
  - Offers face-to-face advising, counseling, tutoring, testing, job placement

- **Training and Development**
  - Provide faculty training and certification for quality distance delivered courses
  - Conduct on-going R&D and professional development
DL Portal Marketing and Outreach

- Create a recognizable brand that distinguishes UH online programs
- Develop a marketing and communication approach to reach residents of all islands who can benefit from the opportunity
- Aggressively market UH degrees that are competitive with for-profit online programs such as the University of Phoenix or Argosy University
Outcomes/Goals

- Seamless coordination of DL program/course offerings across the UH system
- Clear pathways for students who need distance delivered degrees/courses
- Coordinated and predictable DL offerings
- Increased enrollment, retention, and graduation of DL students
Next Steps

- Develop an implementation plan that addresses
  - Organizational structure
  - Business model
- Resources
  - Central staff support
  - Faculty time to develop alternative course structures
  - Quality Matters Licensing software
  - Student support services
  - Portal development
Update on New Program Proposal Process

Dr. Risa E. Dickson
Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy
March 8, 2017
BOR Role Involving New Program Proposals
Regents Policy 5.201

- BOR approves the establishment of all new instructional programs granting academic credit leading to a degree or credential upon the President’s recommendation

Includes new doctorate, master’s, bachelor’s or associate degrees, and certificates of achievement that are not part of an associate degree
Authorization to plan

New program proposal for provisional status

Proposal to request for established status

BOR Approves

CCAO Endorses

CCAO Endorses

CCAO Endorses

Current New Program Proposal Process
Current Changes to the Process

1. Modified the Authorization to Plan (ATP) process to add an executive level review by the UH Officers group

2. Created a new program resource template to replace the current program cost/revenue template

Revised New Program Proposal Process

Authorization to plan (ATP1) → UH Officers Reviews → Authorization to plan (ATP2) → CCAO Endorses

New program proposal for provisional status → CCAO Endorses → BOR Approves

Proposal to request for established status → CCAO Endorses → BOR Approves
Information Required at ATP1
(UH Officers Review)

- Alignment with campus and system mission, academic plan or strategic directions
  - Is the program being offered at the appropriate campus
- Collaboration between campuses
- Demonstrated justification of need
- Demonstrated demand for program
- Analysis to determine non duplication of program
- Identification of costs and new resources needed
Information Required at ATP2
(CCAO Review)

ATP1 plus...

- Consultation with other campuses to ensure coordination
- Issues that may impact accreditation
- Anticipated timeline for submission to CCAO, BOR ASA, and Board of Regents
New Program Resource Template
(Revised from Cost/Revenue Template)

- Places the new program in context of department/division
- Anticipates need for
  - Additional academic resources
  - Other program costs such as accreditation costs, equipment, vendor contracts, etc.
- Identifies new facilities needed
- Specifies how new resources will be funded
- Identifies significant resources needed beyond 5 years
- Approves at department and college levels, and by campus CAO and CFO
Template Sample

NEW PROGRAM RESOURCE TEMPLATE
This template identifies new resources needed to implement the proposed program and its relationship to the existing departmental/division resources. Please include an explanation of this analysis in your program proposal narrative.

Part I: Program Overview
Campus: XXX
Proposed degree/certificate: BS in XXX
Expected first term to offer new program: Fall 2016
College/Department/Division: College/Department/Division XXX
Programs currently offered by the College/Division: BA in XXX, BA in XXX, MA in XXX, PhD in XXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Projected Year 1</th>
<th>Projected Year 2</th>
<th>Projected Year 3</th>
<th>Projected Year 4</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. ENROLLMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected: BS in XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Modest increase anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. COMPLETION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected: BS in XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Anticipate several BA students will switch major to BS (upon BOR approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. COURSES, SECTIONS, SSH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1 section of ABC 212 needed from 2018-19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Course SSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Courses Offered</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Sections Offered</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Annual SSH</td>
<td>14,104</td>
<td>14,350</td>
<td>14,573</td>
<td>15,156</td>
<td>15,762</td>
<td>15,762</td>
<td>15,762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part II: Program Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. CURRENT RESOURCES/FUNDING</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition/Special Fund Allocation</td>
<td>$39,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Allocation</td>
<td>$1,761,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Allocation</td>
<td>$355,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Course Fee Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. CURRENT ACADEMIC PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Faculty FTE</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Faculty Salaries ($)</td>
<td>$1,585,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Lecturers ($)</td>
<td>$54,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Graduate TAs</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. PROJECTED ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (1-Faculty)</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Projected Years</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Faculty FTE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Faculty Salaries ($)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Lecturers ($)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,358</td>
<td>$5,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Graduate TAs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. TOTAL NEW PROGRAM RESOURCES (e.g., new positions, lecturers, equipment or software for labs, accreditation fees, insurance, compliance costs, reporting, vendor contracts, etc.)</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Projected Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional lecturer from 2016-19</td>
<td>$5,358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation application</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total New Resources Needed                                      $5,000       $5,358       $5,358       $5,358       TOTAL: $21,074

| H. Indicate if new facilities are needed to support the proposed program (include any off-campus facilities) | none |

| I. Explain how new program resources will be funded (e.g., reallocation, grants, contracts) | Reallocation of one lecturer from X. Will reduce lecturer from X due to increase in class size. Accreditation application will be funded from operating budget. |

| J. Indicate if there are other significant resources anticipated beyond the projected years | none |

| K. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: | |
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Part III: Approvals
By signing below, I have reviewed and approve the New Program Resource Template. (printed name, signature and date)

Department/Division Chair:

College/Department Administrative Officer:

Dean:

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:

Vice Chancellor for Administration:

New Program Resource Template Details
A. Headcount Enrollment. Headcount enrollment of majors each Fall semester. Located at URL:
   https://www.hawaii.edu/institutionalresearch/enrReport.action?reportId=ENRT00 Campus data may be used when majors are a subset of enrollment reported in IRAO reports.

B. Completion. Provide counts of the number of degrees/certificates awarded annual (fall, spring, summer). Located at URL:

C. Courses, Sections, SSH. Provide annual count (fall, spring, summer) or courses offered, number of sections offered and SSH. https://www.hawaii.edu/irodrilogin.do?

D. Current Resources/Funding. Data should come from the College/Department's Administrative Officer using the most current information available.
E. Current Academic Personnel. Instructional costs without fringe. Direct salary cost for all current faculty and lecturers teaching in the program.
F. Projected Academic Personnel. Instructional costs without fringe. Projected direct salary cost for all new faculty and lecturers teaching in the program.

G. Total New Program Resources. Summarize new cost that will be incurred due to the new program and provide a grand total. Should include additional instructional cost, special equipment/software, fees, etc.
H. Facilities. Indicate if any new facilities (classrooms, labs, buildings, etc.), including off-campus facilities, are needed to support the proposed program.

I. Funding for New Program Resources. Explain how the department will fund the new program cost. If reallocating resources, indicate the source and impact of the reallocation.

J. Additional Anticipated Cost. Indicate if there are other significant resources anticipated beyond the years listed in the New Program Resource Template.

Reviewed by: Vice Chancellor of Administration: 1/25/17
Reviewed by: Vice Chancellors of Academic Affairs: 2/14/17
Updated Guidelines for New Program Proposal
(EP5.201, Appendix B)

- Revised guidelines from 1989 executive policy
  - Renamed program objectives to program outcomes
  - Calls for a market analysis to justify need for the program
  - Adds an academic map of the curriculum
  - Emphasizes the need to address transfer/completion pathways
  - Requires justification if degree requires >30 credits for associate degree or >120 credits for bachelor’s degree
  - Calls for evidence of student learning under program effectiveness section

- Added new area on risk assessment
Impact of Revisions

Authorization to Plan

- Added an executive level review (UH Officers) that offers a critical system lens
- Focused proposal on questions pertaining to current concerns
- Reduced material requested in the proposals (set page limits)

New Program Resource Template

- Places program within the larger context of the department/program
- Provides a more realistic prediction of facilities, cost/resource needs

EP5.201, Appendix B

- Updated guidelines and added area on risk assessment
Next Steps

- Revision of the provisional to established process
  - Describe changes to the program since it was approved as provisional
  - Compare the projected and actual numbers of majors and degrees conferred
  - Report actual new expenses during provisional period and how funded
  - Project additional resources needed over next 5 years
  - Revise cost revenue template to compare projected resources to actual resources
Next Steps (cont’d)

- Update EP5.201 for consistency with revised process
  - Insert ATP1 and ATP2
  - Add Appendix B revision
  - Replace cost/revenue template with new program resources template
  - Include provisional to established revisions (forthcoming)
- Send out for consultation
Desired Goal

- For BOR to have confidence that the program approval process is sound and to delegate program actions to the President
- BOR to monitor through annual Academic Program Actions Report