MINUTES OF THE REGENTS' COMMITTEE
ON COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Date: Thursday, March 18, 2004

Place & Time: Campus Center
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
4:31 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Regents Kawakami (presiding)
Bender
Haynes
Hong
Lagareta
Lee (ex-officio)

Other Regents Present: Regents Kakuda
Nunokawa
Tanaka
Tatibouet
Yamasato

Others Present: Evan S. Dobelle, President, University of Hawai‘i
Walter S. Kirimitsu, Vice President and University General Counsel
David McClain, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Michael T. Unebasami, Associate Vice President for Administration and Community Colleges Operations
Mark Silliman, Chancellor, Leeward Community College
David Iha, Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board
Carl Makino, Executive Assistant to the Board

Subjects:

1. Progress Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) from Leeward Community College

2. Recent Recommendations Made by Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Regarding the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges
Progress Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) from Leeward Community College (LCC)

Chancellor Silliman reported that by letter dated January 23, 2004, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) accepted Leeward Community College's October 2003 Focused Midterm Report but placed the College on warning and required the College to submit two progress reports, the first due by April 1, 2004, and the second by October 15, 2004. The ACCJC letter requires LCC to address four accreditation recommendations. The first recommendation must be reported on by April 1, 2004 and the remaining three by October 15, 2004.

The first progress report on the College's "N" grade as directed by the Commission, they recommended that the College either discontinue the use of the "N" grade or redefine it so that it is "to be clearly applied after instructor assessment of student learning, and assure that it reflects a unique amount of learning that is distinguishable from the "F" grade." After considerable dialogue and debate on this grading issue by the faculty and a faculty-wide plebiscite on the discontinuance of the N grade versus its retention with a clearer and pedagogically sounder definition, the Faculty Senate voted on February 18, 2004 to recommend the discontinuance of the N grade, effective Fall 2004, in accordance with the majority vote of the faculty.

After receiving the Faculty Senate's recommendation on February 19, 2004, Chancellor Silliman approved the Senate's policy recommendation on February 20, 2004. The discontinuance or abolition of the N grade will be reflected in the next College catalog for academic year 2004-2005. The College will thus have fully addressed the ACCJC recommendation.

Recommendation Made by Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Regarding the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges

Vice President McClain reported that in June 2000, the ACCJC reaffirmed the accreditation of each campus through the 2006-2007 Academic Year. This is the maximum time period allowed by ACCJC policy. In the third year following the evaluation team visit in 2000, all institutions were expected to submit a progress report cataloguing the institution's responses to the evaluation team recommendations. The Midterm Report for each community college addresses each of the recommendations made by the team by providing: a description of the response, an assessment of the progress made in fulfilling the team's recommendations, and a plan for the activities expected to be completed before the next comprehensive self study and evaluation visit.

Detailed campus progress reports were prepared and submitted to the ACCJC in October 2003 and two campuses were visited in November by teams representing the ACCJC. The Commission at its January 2004 meeting accepted the campus reports and separately requested that each campus respond to specific recommendations prior to its next scheduled visit in fall 2006.

All of the campuses had the same recommendation related to the Commission's systemwide concern on the lack of an active program review and integrated planning process. In December 2002, the Board of Regents approved a reorganization that eliminated the Chancellor for Community Colleges, changed the titles of the campus chief executive officer from Provost to
Chancellor, and reassigned the functions of community college staff to various system-level vice presidential offices. This change, because it was of a substantive nature, required the approval of the ACCJC.

As part of the action approving the reorganization, the ACCJC requested reports by August 1, 2003, November 1, 2003 and April 1, 2004 covering various aspects of the implementation of the reorganization. The November 1 report was followed by a visit from representatives from the Commission, who produced a report on the outcomes of the visit and the progress the University has made to date. In January 2004, the Commission formally accepted the August and November reports and requested that the community colleges respond to three additional recommendations.

The report will focus upon the issue of how the University system structure has been staffed and funded as originally requested by the Commission, as well as detailing the progress it has made on the three new recommendations. The April 1 report will be followed by a visit from the Commission staff.

Recommendation 1: The team recommends the University of Hawai‘i Community College system and the University of Hawai‘i give careful thought to what would be the most effective delegation of responsibility and authority in personnel functions to the individual campuses, provide clear delineation of same, and ensure the college staffs receive appropriate training and support to conduct personnel functions in a manner that is consistent with Commission standards and which protects the overall integrity of the University of Hawai‘i personnel system.

This recommendation is related to the final implementation issues on the system reorganization. The allocation of responsibilities between the community college campuses and the support services previously provided by the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges has been an on-going discussion among the CC Chancellors and the UH system Vice Presidents. It has been decided that the CC Human Resources Office will continue to coordinate and provide staff support services to the campuses in certain areas such as, but not limited to, the tenure and promotion process. In addition, the campuses were provided training in areas for which they have assumed the authority currently delegated responsibilities. Therefore, the CC Human Resources Office continues to provide staff support services to the campuses in various areas as needed on a campus-by-campus basis.

Recommendation 2: The Team recommends that the UH Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:
   a. that the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;
   b. that the community college system as well as each college sets priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in an analysis of research data;
   c. that the colleges and the UHCC system incorporates these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
   d. that the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and
that the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress.

There are several different factors that have contributed to the ACCJC making this specific recommendation at this time:

ACCJC Issues - Historically, the Commission has experienced difficulties in getting multi-campus districts to respond to their concerns about practices on separately accredited colleges within the district. Their new approach is to hold each individual campus responsible for adopting policies and procedures at the campus level that meet the ACCJC standards.

In June 2002, the ACCJC adopted a new set of standards that placed a greater emphasis on the issues of assessment, planning and institutional change in response to the issues that come out of the assessment of program and student outcomes. The new policies call for each campus to develop policies and procedures for program review and the integration of the outcomes of the assessment into the planning and budgeting process, and are quite similar to the current University of Hawai‘i system policies. These new requirements went into effect and will be used by all colleges seeking accreditation starting with the 2003-2004 academic year. Under the previous University of Hawai‘i system administrative configuration, these specific policies were promulgated by the Chancellor for Community Colleges for implementation at each campus. In the new system administrative configuration, these need to become campus-based policies. All of the campuses have yet to formally adopt comparable policies at the campus level.

For several campuses, the issue of developing a closer relationship between their assessment, planning, budget development, and resource allocation decisions has been the subject of recommendations from prior ACCJC campus visits. The inability of the Kaua‘i and Leeward campuses to move more quickly on prior recommendations has resulted in them being given a Warning by the Commission. While this action does not change their accredited status, or adversely effect students, it does require prompt attention to the issues by the faculty and staff of each campus or further sanctions could be applied.

The Commission has a policy that details the various sanctions it may impose in response to issues of concern that have been brought to its attention. The first level is that of Warning, the next level is Probation, and the highest level is Show Cause. This is a progressive series so that if the institution does not respond in a timely and appropriate manner to the Commission’s sanction, it can progress to the next level of sanction. Following the Show Cause level, the Commission may remove accreditation from the institution.

According to the Commission policy, Warning means:

The institution deviates from the Commission's eligibility criteria, standards, or policies to the degree that the institution's continued accreditation may become jeopardized. The Warning may require the institution to correct deficiencies,
refrain from certain activities, or initiate certain actions. Failure to respond
effectively to prior Commission actions may result in a warning. The action is not
reported as a public negative action. Institutional reports, visits, and resolution of
the concerns are required within two years.

Changing External Requirements - Each year, the UH community colleges receive
approximately $2.2 M annually through the federal Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act
for program improvement activities. When the Act was reauthorized in 1990, a new
provision was added that called for the evaluation of all career and technical programs
every year. Given the scope of the existing program review requirements detailed in
University Executive Policy and the Community Colleges policy, and the available
professional staff resources, it was not possible to use the existing University procedures
to evaluate every program every year. Therefore, it was necessary to develop a new
program assessment process if the CC's were to continue receiving the federal Perkins Act
funds. The Community Colleges designed a new approach that had become known as the
Program Health Indicators assessment.

The Program Health Indicators Model provides a relatively comprehensive, yet succinct,
review of the activities of academic programs, incorporating extant information, including
empirical data, which is comparable across programs and campuses. Major sections of the
report provide descriptive information about the development and history of a program,
program goals, faculty and advisory committee of the program, admission and degree
requirements, courses offered in the most recent academic year and course enrollments,
and program health indicators, including graphic representation of standing of the program
on several of the indicators and, finally, and analysis of the program outcomes. Three major
clusters of program health indicators are collected, reflecting program demand, program
efficiency and program outcomes. For each program an annual report is prepared that
contains: Program Description; Program Goals; Program Health Indicators; Graphic
Representation of Selected Program Health Indicator Values; Program Outcomes Analysis,
Program History; Program Admission Requirements; Program Degree Requirements;
Program Courses and Enrollment; Program Faculty; Program Advisory Committee.

The Program Health indicators model was presented to the University system administration
and the Board of Regents and deemed appropriate as a substitute for existing policies and
procedures. However, with the ACCJC adoption of new standards requiring a five year
historical analysis of each program, our existing annual assessment process was
determined to be inconsistent with the Commission's requirements. One approach to
resolving this apparent dilemma is to develop a policy and practice that would roll-up a
series of annual assessments into an in-depth multi-year assessment that would meet
ACCJC expectations.

On January 6 and 7, the community colleges convened approximately 140 faculty, staff and
administrators in a workshop to develop a better understanding of the new ACCJC standards, to
assess existing policies and practices, and to develop an action plan to make the changes
necessary to meet the expectations at each campus. The ACCJC has requested a progress report
on these issues and will schedule a return visit to selected campuses in the fall. The University is
on-track to demonstrate significant progress on these issues by the time of that report and visit.
Recommendation 3: The Team recommends that the governing board review its responsibilities to serve a policy making board and to assume its role in evaluating the University President. The Board of Regents should develop appropriate policies to guide administrative hiring processes and then allow the University President to implement and administer policies. The Board should refrain from making operational decisions more appropriately delegated to the system chief administrator, the University President.

The administration and the Board are in discussion about the development of a procedure related to the administrative hiring process.

Regent Yamasato inquired about the probability of having to do separate campus audits for each of the Community College campuses. Associate Vice President Unebasami commented that ACCJC would probably not require separate campus audits.

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Iha, Secretary

Dated: April 14, 2004
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Members, Committee on Community Colleges
President Evan S. Dobelle
Vice President David McClain