



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
E. JAN KEHOE
Long Beach City College

Vice Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
DEBORAH G. BLUE

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

Business Officer
DEANNE WILBURN

ITAS
TOM LANE

Administrative Assistant
CLARE GOLDBERG

January 31, 2007

Corrected Letter

Dr. David McClain
President
University of Hawaii
2444 Dole Street Bachman Hall, Room 204
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear President McClain:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 10-12, 2007, reviewed the report of the evaluation team which visited the University of Hawai'i Community College System on Sunday, October 22-Saturday, October 28, 2006. The Commission received the report of the team that visited the system office on Sunday, October 22 and Friday, October 27, 2006, with a requirement that the system complete a Special Report. The report will be followed by a visit by Commission representatives.

The Commission asks that Special Report be submitted by **October 15, 2007**. The Special Report should focus on the system's resolution of the recommendation as noted below:

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the Office of the President and Vice President of the UH System and Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges conduct a systematic evaluation process to determine the effectiveness of the new community college organization and governance structure between—and among—the system and its community colleges in the areas concerning:

- a. Strategic planning processes (Standards I.B.3);
- b. Program review and assessment practices (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a,e,f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.B.4);
- c. The allocation of resources (Standards I.B.6, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.d, IV.B.3.c);
- d. Facilities management, including deferred maintenance (Standard III.B.1.a,b, and III.B.2.B); and
- e. Board and administrative leadership (Standard IV.B.3.a).

The system should implement the improvements/changes that result from the review and widely communicate those outcomes (Standards I.B.3.g, and IV.3.b,f).

I have previously sent you a copy of the evaluation team report. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the team report and this letter appropriate dissemination to the Chancellors of the individual campuses and the Board of Trustees.

Dr. David McClain
University of Hawaii
January 31, 2007
Page Two

The Commission also requires that the team report and the self study report be made available to students and the public. Placing copies in the college library can accomplish this. Should you want the report electronically to place on your web site or for some other purpose, please contact Commission staff.

The recommendations contained in the evaluation team report represent the observations of the evaluation team at the time of the visit. The Commission reminds you that while an institution or district/system may concur or disagree with any part of the team report, it is expected that the report will be used to improve the educational programs and services of the institutions and the system.

Finally, let me take this opportunity to remind you that federal legislation affecting accrediting agencies requires that accredited colleges conduct systematic assessment of educational outcomes (see especially Standards One and Two). A further requirement is that accrediting agencies pay close attention to student loan default rates.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the educational programs and services of the University of Hawaii Community Colleges. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/tl

cc: Dr. John Morton, Interim Vice President for Community Colleges
Mr. Michael Rota, Associate Vice President
Ms. Kitty Lagareta, Chair, Board of Regents, University of Hawaii
Dr. Marie Smith, Chair

EVALUATION REPORT UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI`I COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM REPORT

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community & Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team's visit to
The University of Hawai'i Community College System from October 22-28,
2006

Dr. Marie B. Smith, Chair

**University of Hawai'i Community Colleges
System Visit Team Roster
October 22-28, 2006**

Dr. Marie B. Smith (Chair)
Vice Chancellor, Education and
Technology
Los Rios Community College District

Dr. E. Jan Kehoe
Chair, Hawaii CC
Superintendent-President
Long Beach City College

Dr. Christopher O'Hearn
Chair, Honolulu CC
President/CEO
Mt. San Antonio College

Dr. Patricia Hsieh
Chair, Kauai CC
President
San Diego Miramar College

Dr. James Kossler
Chair, Leeward CC
Superintendent-President
Pasadena City College

Mr. Stan Arterberry
Chair, Maui CC
Chancellor
West Valley-Mission CCD

Dr. Maria Sheehan
Chair, Windward
Superintendent/President
College of the Desert

Summary of Evaluation Report

From October 22-28, 2006, peer evaluation teams visited the seven community colleges of the University of Hawai'i (UH) system. This visit marked the fourth evaluation done with seven simultaneous team visits and a coordinated visit to the system offices. In the past, the system prepared separate self study reports describing the system functions and their interactions with the colleges. In the case of the 2000 comprehensive visits, an eighth team was composed of the college team chairs for the purpose of responding to the system report. That team effort led to a separate system report, containing fourteen system recommendations.

For the 2006 visits, the system took a different approach by establishing a representative committee from all seven colleges which crafted common descriptions of system functions that were used in the Standard IV description portions of all the colleges' self studies. The committee also provided assistance and guidance throughout the self study processes at the colleges on system level matters.

As in previous evaluation visits, the team chairs formed an eighth team and visited the system prior to the college team visits. The team chairs met on Sunday, October 22 with Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) John Morton, Associate Vice Presidents Rota and Unebasami, system directors, the seven college chancellors, Vice President Linda Johnsrud, President David McClain, and eight of the eleven members of the Board of Regents (BOR). Following a thorough PowerPoint overview of system functions, UH representatives divided into four breakout groups based on system functions: 1) Governance; 2) Finance, Facilities, and Human Resources; 3) Distance Education and Information Technology; 4) Academic Planning, Assessment & Policy Analysis. The team chairs, their assistants, and other team members were able to move among the groups to ask questions and have discussions about these various system functions. With this background, the team chairs left the following day to conduct their college visits. During the team visits, a telecom conference was arranged for team members to interact with system personnel and several Regents. Most of the teams sent members to the teleconference where they were able to ask questions directly regarding system functions. On Thursday, October 25, the team chairs returned to Honolulu to finalize system recommendations and prepare for the system exit report. On Friday morning, October 26, the team chairs gave a synopsis of their college exit reports and the coordinating team chair provided the system level report, commendations, and recommendations.

All of the system personnel were uniformly candid and obliging in providing additional information and assisting team members in accessing information through web resources. In addition, the assistance and candor continued throughout the comprehensive visits in responding to teams' questions as they arose. They were most helpful in assisting all the teams in understanding the complexity of the UH system, in particular the University of Hawai'i Community College (UHCC) system structure and functioning.

The visiting team wishes to offer the following commendations:

- a. The Board of Regents, President and Vice President for Community Colleges are commended for their responsiveness to Commission concerns regarding system organization and program review as well as the progress made on those issues over the past several years.
- b. The Board of Regents is commended for their support of the University of Hawaii Community Colleges as evidenced by the creation of the position of Vice President for Community Colleges and for the Regent's Committee on Community Colleges.
- c. The University of Hawai'i Community College System is commended for its leadership in the area of program review by
 - Securing additional funds for program review, staff development and improvement through advocacy of the issue at the state legislative level.
 - Providing system support and coordination to develop a useful common framework for comprehensive program review.

After reviewing all seven self studies, conducting comprehensive visits at each college, interviewing system and college staff and discussing the evidence in light of the Standards of Accreditation, the team offers the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that the Office of the President and Vice President of the Community Colleges conduct a systematic evaluation process to determine the effectiveness of the new community college organization and governance structure between--and among--the system and its community colleges in the areas concerning:

- a. Strategic planning processes (Standard I.B.3)
- b. Program review and assessment practices (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, and II.B.4)
- c. The allocation of resources (Standards I.B.6, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.d, IV.B.3.c)
- d. Facilities management, including deferred maintenance (Standards III.B.1.a and b, III.B.2.b)
- e. Board and administrative leadership (Standard IV.B.3.a)

The system should implement the improvements/changes that result from the review and widely communicate those outcomes. (Standards I.B.3.g, IV.3.b and f)



Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the University of Hawai'i Community College system ensure that the financial reporting system is integrated and transparent throughout the system.

(Standards III.D.2.a,b,g, III.D.3)

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that the Board of Regents adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

Introduction

The University of Hawai'i Community College system was created in 1964 within the University of Hawai'i. At that time there were five technical-vocational colleges that were part of the State Department of Education transferred into the university system. In 1968, Leeward Community College was made part of the system, followed by Windward Community College in 1972. The system of community colleges was headed by a CEO level position, with a dual title of Chancellor of the Community Colleges and Senior Vice President of the University.

Under the auspices of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, the seven community colleges in the system have produced coordinated self studies and hosted simultaneous visits since 1988. In past years the system itself has produced self-studies and hosted system level overview visits as well.

With a reorganization of the system in 2003, the "system within a system" structure of the community colleges was altered with the removal of the Chancellor position and the realignment of the campus CEOs reporting directly to the President of the University. The Accrediting Commission's concerns about the effect of this reorganization on ability of the community colleges to meet accreditation standards led to six progress reports in a period of three years, each with recommendations (continuing and/or new).

In order to provide a comprehensive history of these accreditation activities, this report includes all of those recommendations and actions in chronological order, ending with the 2006 team's system recommendations resulting from the most recent visit.

Responses to Previous Recommendations

B. Responses to previous recommendations from 2000 Comprehensive Visit

The comprehensive visit in 2000 to the system led to fourteen recommendations. The following is an analysis of the responses to those recommendations.

Recommendation 1. The System should identify ways to address the issue regarding centralization/decentralization with respect to the role and function at the system level and at the individual campus level in carrying out the mission of the Chancellor's Office. (Standards 1.1-4)

Since the last comprehensive evaluation the system has undergone major organizational change. The UH system proposed a reorganization in 2002 and it was approved by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (Commission) through its substantive change process. The Commission also required a series of reports on the reorganization based on its concern about the loss of focus on the community college system as well as the lack of progress on program review in the colleges. In 2004 these concerns, along with various levels of discussions within the system, led to the proposal of several alternative models of organization. These models were fully explored within the UHCC system as well as within the UH administration. As a result, in June 2005 the BOR approved a reorganization of the community colleges that included: the creation of a new position of Vice President for Community Colleges, re-consolidation of academic and administrative support under two Associate Vice Presidents of Community Colleges; continuation of the Chancellor positions that now report to the Vice President for Community Colleges for operational and governance matters and also to the President of the University for matters of system policy.

The recommendation has been met.

Recommendation 2. The Chancellor's Office should provide system-wide training on the decentralized institutional research model for all IR staff at the campus level. Training should also be provided for faculty, staff, and administrators on all campuses to ensure that research supports planning and decision-making. (Standard 3.A.2)

Prior to the 2000 visit, the system convened monthly meetings of the Institutional Research (IR) Cadre and later expanded the membership to include liaisons from both the Deans of Student Services and the Chief Academic Officers. The group meets monthly and serves to coordinate system wide efforts in research, discuss concerns, share best practices, and offer training and staff development. In order to address Commission and system concerns regarding program review, the IR Cadre has been active in defining quantitative indicators for program review to meet the requirement of comparable measures and consistency across the system. In addition, for the self study effort, the IR Cadre created a set of common data used by all the colleges.

The Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis (APAPA) office coordinates participation in system wide trainings and activities such as the CCSSEE survey, provides workshops on assessment and evaluation and sponsors presentations by external experts. Also the APAPA compiles key effectiveness indicators both annually for the UH Chancellors and for the UHCC strategic plan.

The teams found evidence that system-level training in institutional effectiveness and use of data are well documented and involve the colleges' personnel in training and attendance at presentations. The IR Cadre has provided the venue for valuable dialog in addressing the data requirements of consistent and comparable program review measures. The system (APAPA) has also addressed this recommendation by its active involvement in program review and strategic planning.

The 2006 teams found, however, some concerns in this area regarding clarifications of functions between the system and its colleges and also with communication about those functions. These concerns will be discussed in the body of the report.

The recommendation has been met.

Recommendation 3. The Chancellor's Office should work with the campuses to develop comprehensive research calendars and to provide adequate human and technical resources to support the growing needs related to research. These should include adequate research staff, programming staff, web master(s), computers, software, databases, and professional development (Standard 3.A.2)

Since 1998 the institutional research function has been a college responsibility. The system acts in a coordinating role with the regular convening of the IR Cadre which provides coordination across the system, including the formulation of the research agenda (calendar). With the budget declines that occurred between 2002-2005, the colleges struggled to provide research functions to improve college effectiveness. In the last several years, however, the budget picture has improved to the point that additional General Funds have been secured. Also, in the 2006 legislative session UH was successful in adding 8.25 positions and a half million dollars to support the program review process and establish a program improvement fund. Of these resources, 7.25 positions and \$240,827 have been allocated as additional support for institutional research purposes.

The recommendation has been met.

Recommendation 4. The system should develop a comprehensive program review model that is used systematically to evaluate all of the programs, credit and non-credit, on or off-campus, traditional or non-traditional delivery systems, and including continuing and community education, contract, education, general education, and other special programs. (Standards 4.D.1, 4.D.2, 4.D.6)

This recommendation noted the need for system attention to program review, assessment and improvement processes. In 2003 and 2004 there were a series of system reports that focused on the system reorganization and also put forward an additional recommendation to ensure regular and systematic program review and assessment of effectiveness. Since the full response to this recommendation did not occur until 2005, it will be addressed in the response to the April 2004 recommendation, later in this report.

Recommendation 5. The system should provide leadership in the identification and publication of expected learning outcomes and competencies for degree and certificate programs and should assist the colleges in developing ways to assess and demonstrate student achievement of those stated learning outcomes. (Standards 4.B.3, 4.B.5, 4.B.6, 4.C.4)

At the time of this recommendation, the system had in place a system framework for general education that served as a framework for developing specific associate degree requirements and required student competencies for both the A.S. and A.A. degrees. In response to the recommendation, the system invited Dr. Ruth Stiehl, a consultant on assessment and development of student learning outcomes, to work at both the system and college level. From 2003 through 2005, Dr. Stiehl provided assistance in train-the-trainer workshops at the system level, followed by workshops on developing effective and measurable student learning outcomes (SLOs) and one on developing assessment strategies for SLOs. The colleges are using the outcomes of these workshops as a common template for developing student learning outcomes.

The system has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 6. The system should assess and evaluate the different procedures that may provide barriers to students who attempt to concurrently enroll, transfer, or receive services at more than one UH community college. The Chancellor's Office should play a leading role in facilitating the development of common, consistent and streamlined policies and procedures, especially in the areas of application, financial aid, and establishment of fees (Standards 5.6, 5.10)

The system response included the description of the creation of a distance education committee that developed a more streamlined process for the offering of distance education programs across the system which included the identification and removal of a number of infrastructure and procedural barriers for students. In 2000, a barrier to successfully addressing this recommendation was the system's outdated and non-integrated student information system. In 2002, the UH system purchased and installed SCT-Banner for the community colleges and one year later it was adopted for all campuses of the university system. The new system has greatly improved student enrollment across the entire system. It has also provided more timely and accurate student enrollment data. What has not yet improved sufficiently is the streamlining of policies and procedures within student services. The system response attributes this lack of progress to the absence of common agreement about responsibilities and thus the ability to make changes. With the relatively recent resolution of the organizational structure, the system should be able to convene college personnel to make progress in designing common procedures and strategies to lessen these barriers and is urged to do so.

The system has partially addressed the recommendation and needs to continue its progress now that the new structure for decision-making is in place.

Recommendation 7. The Chancellor's Office should pursue development of a system-wide database for student information so that students who concurrently enroll or transfer between community colleges can be adequately counseled and served. (Standards 5.3, 5.6)

At the time of the 2000 visit, the ten UH campuses were each running a separate student information system. This recommendation was satisfied in 2002 with the installation of SCT Banner, as described above. With a common system, students are able to enroll, transfer and access their records for counseling with relative ease. Students are now able to transfer within all campuses of the university system with ease.

The system has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 8. The Chancellor's Office should review the changes in placement scores of students as a result of the implementations of the COMPASS assessment test and develop an appropriate system-wide response. Evaluation of the COMPAS test and its impact on students would be in keeping with the belief that placement practices should be regularly evaluated to assure effectiveness. (Standard 5.5)

The system responded to this recommendation by working with the college Chancellors to confirm their continued commitment to the COMPASS testing instrument, conducted a study of accuracy of cutoff scores in 2002-03, and provided that information to the Chief Academic Officers of the colleges for review and recommendation. The data was also reviewed with faculty, leading to further discussion at both the college and system levels. The Chief Academic Officers made a series of recommendations regarding placement scores which were accepted by the system in 2003 but not implemented until the spring of 2006. A new advisory group on placement was also established to advise the VPCC and the Council of Chancellors. The responsibility of the advisory group is to review placement practices, and recommend standard testing procedures as well as policy and practices regarding placement to the system.

The discussion regarding placement scores continues among the faculty and within the system. In 2005 and 2006 a series of meetings occurred with faculty, CAO, and the Council of Chancellors regarding reading and writing placement, cut-off scores, and the need to review curriculum in current reading courses. These discussions also resulted in the recognition throughout the system that a number of course prerequisites in courses that affected placement had not been validated. To rectify this situation, the Chancellors directed that a pilot study be conducted for course prerequisite validation, beginning with developmental transfer level writing courses. That study is currently being conducted by the system office with college participation.

The system has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 9. The system should seek ways to provide adequate funding and resources to support and sustain a viable system-wide distance education program. (Standards 6.1, 6.4, 6.5, 6.7)

The UH system has devoted considerable effort to develop distance education as a means of reaching its diverse and far-flung student population without duplicating program offerings. The system currently operates a statewide interactive TV network, and has

established University Centers which receive that programming on Maui, Kauai, and Hawai'i.

Distance education is part of the University's strategic plan and has specific action plans to fully develop the system, including internet capabilities. This plan specifically includes the seven community colleges of the system. Furthermore, the University has demonstrated its commitment to implementation of its plan by developing a system wide budget request to the state legislature in the 2004-06 budget cycle. Unfortunately, the legislature did not fund the request, leaving the University to reallocate funds within existing budgets to further the planning agenda. It is the intention of the system to maintain its focus on obtaining legislative funds as well as to seek grant funding to support the distance education programs throughout the system. The college teams observed this commitment to distance education as well as the growing demand for distance education offerings during their campus visits. This continued and escalating demand will put a strain on the University to meet its planning agenda and fund it appropriately.

The system has met this recommendation through its advocacy at the state legislature and by the seeking of public and private grant funding. The system has also demonstrated its commitment to distance education by reallocation of existing funds.

Recommendation 10. The system should streamline personnel procedures and expedite hiring processes so as not to cause any hardship on any employee or on programs and services. The system should seek ways to eliminate long delays in hiring and payment of wages. (Standard 7.D.3).

The system response reports that at the time of the 2000 evaluation, all faculty, administrative, professional and technical (APT) appointments and salary placements were recommended by the campuses and approved by the system. Beginning in 2002, when the system was reorganized, the Chancellors of each campus were delegated the responsibility of appointing faculty and APT employees. Selection of civil service employees is also done at the campuses, but background checks and other clearances are handled by the system office. The President of the UH continues to appoint management employees up to a certain level, with those upper level managers and executive appointments going to the Board of Regents for approval.

Some teams found that some slowness in personnel actions still occurs due to the lengthy processes required in policy, regulations or vacancies in college-level staffing. While this shift of responsibility is a partial answer to the recommendation, there still may be a need to analyze personnel procedures to make them more timely and efficient.

The system has met this recommendation by a functional reorganization, but the issue of expediting personnel actions is, in reality, is not completely resolved.

Recommendation 11. The Chancellor's Office should establish approaches to increase support of staff development. (Standard 7.C.1)

The system responded to this recommendation in three major ways:

- The establishment of the Wo Learning Champions initiative for faculty and staff development. Funded by a \$1,000,000 endowment, the funds are used to foster learning, renewal, and enrichment. The Champions, who represent all the colleges, design a staff development program that focuses on learning, serving the entire system, and allows for growth and expansion with the infusion of new funds.
- Tsunoda Community College Leadership Development Fund to provide leadership development for staff, faculty and administrators. The fund supports the identification of Champions who are supported for two-year terms. The participants attend leadership institutes (e.g. CCLDI) and have monthly meetings to learn about leadership within the UH System.
- The UHCC Strategic Plan contains goals to strengthen staff development and through union negotiations was able to accomplish two of them: to reduce faculty teaching load and increase salary, both of which were seen as commitments to developing human resources within the system.

The system has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 12. The system should develop and implement a budget and staffing plan for its new facilities. This plan should include the cost of utilities, maintenance and repair, equipment, new technology, and additional staffing costs. (Standards 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 9.A.a)

The system response to this recommendation details the budget and planning model for the coordination of maintenance in existing facilities and the development of new facilities for the entire community college system. This system includes the processing of the colleges' Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects. The Physical Facilities, Planning and Construction Office (PFPCO) works with the colleges to develop the projects including operating support elements, such as staffing, maintenance and repair and equipment needs.

Based on the existence of an established budget and staffing plan for new facilities, the system has met this recommendation made by the 2000 evaluation team. In 2006, however, the issue is not one of establishing a system for budget and facilities planning, but to ensure that adequate funding is available so that aging facilities do not deteriorate further and new facilities are actually funded for the full cost of operation. These matters are not entirely in the control of the university, yet there is sufficient lack of clarity about how these matters are handled to warrant a recommendation for improvement. (See System Recommendation 1d)

Recommendation 13. The system should consider and implement the infrastructure supporting the movement toward greater entrepreneurship including clarifying accounting procedures at the University, system, and college levels; reviewing the incentive structure for contract education and non-credit courses; and enhancing system and college level fund-raising efforts. (Standards 9.B.1-5)

The system responded to this recommendation by delegating authority to the colleges to execute affiliation agreements and “sheltered class” agreements in accordance with changed policy (UHCCP 8.101). It is expected that this delegation will support greater creativity and entrepreneurship within the colleges.

While not directly addressed in the system response, any improvements in the financial reporting system will improve the financial aspects of college-fundraising.

Fundraising is conducted under the auspices of the UH Foundation for all ten campuses of the university. The Foundation partially funds a Fund Development Officer to coordinate fund-raising on each campus. Teams at the various campuses saw examples of very creative and successful fund-raising activities that support college programs.

The system has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 14. The Board of Regents should implement its written procedures and processes, which clearly define how the performance of the Board of Regents is to be assessed and evaluated, in order to enhance its won functioning. (Standard 10.A.5)

The Board of Regents responded to this recommendation by holding a self study workshop in 2004 with facilitation provided by the President of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. In that session they performed self-evaluative activities including performance of the Board. The Board agreed to have these workshops periodically. More recently, the Board adopted a new policy on Board self-evaluation which also addresses this recommendation.

The Board of Regents has met this recommendation.

Responses to Recommendations from Subsequent Progress Reports

In 2002, the UH recommended the reorganization of its administration, including the elimination of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges. This proposal was approved by the Board of Regents in December 2002 and approved by the Commission through a Substantive Change proposal in April 2003. In approving the reorganization, the Commission requested reports in August and November 2003; April and November of 2004; and April and October 2005 regarding various components of the reorganization and its resulting effects on the ability of the new system to meet accreditation standards, particularly in regard to assessment of institutional effectiveness and program review. In

addition, the Commission advised the system that it should engage in an independent financial audit and that two years of full audits should be in place by fall 2006.

The following four recommendations from the January 2004 Commission action letter were the following and were reported in an April 2004 Progress report:

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 individual campuses, provide clear delineation of same, and ensure that the college staffs receive appropriate training and support to conduct personnel functions in a manner that is consistent with Commission standards and which protects overall integrity of the University of Hawai'i personnel system. (Standards III.A.1 and 2)

In the period between the reorganization of 2002 and the 2004 Progress Report, the system was unable to clearly describe the functions in personnel nor communicate them effectively throughout the system. The 2004 report indicated more work needed to be done in clarifying roles and responsibilities of the Associate Vice President's office as well as reexamine the organizational structure. An additional issue was discovered in this visit that led to a new recommendation (5) that asked the system to review its salary and placement policies for personnel.

This recommendation became Recommendation 6 in the November 2004 report and was met at that time.

Recommendation 2:

The Team recommends that the UH Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:

- **That the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;**
- **That the community college system as well as each college sets priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;**
- **That the colleges and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;**
- **That the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and**
- **That the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress. (Standards I.B., II.A1 and 2, .IIIB.3.a, II.B.4, II.C.1.e and IIIC.2; III.A.g, III.B.2.b, III.C.1. and 2, III.D.1.a, IV.B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards.)**

The system office and all seven community colleges addressed this recommendation by establishing principals for program review contained in UHCC Policy #5.202. This policy delineates the program review format which includes: a statement of mission, review of external factors affecting the program, trend data on selected indicators, program health indicators, student surveys, job placement statistics, employer surveys, an analysis of outcomes over a span of time, and the requirement that the recommendations be incorporated into the college's planning processes. The process calls for use of data to assess effectiveness and recommend changes in curriculum and other matters affecting the program. Lastly, the process requires evaluation of any changes that may have been recommended and communication of the results.

It is intended that all programs and services will be evaluated through this program review model with the understanding that colleges may add data elements to the program and design additional assessments of program quality that would expand the basic system.

This recommendation has been met through the establishment of the program review model.

Recommendation 3.

The team recommends that the governing board review its responsibilities to serve as 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 chief administrator, the University President. (Standards IV.B.1.a)

The Board of Regents attended a workshop given by the Association of Governing Boards to explore and strengthen the Boards understanding of its responsibilities, including remaining at the policy level. The Board satisfied the requirement for presidential evaluation by initiating a third-year evaluation of the president which included broader input from those directly involved with the president.

This recommendation has been met.

Recommendation 4.

The team recommends that the University of Hawai'i Community Colleges submit a report on how the University of Hawai'i system structure has been finally staffed and funded.

This recommendation was met by the April 2005 report which chronicled the system's reorganization and how it would be staffed and funded.

Independent Audits

In response to Commission advice, the system began separate audited reports in FY 2005. FY 2006 audit will be complete before the ACCJC Accreditation Annual Fiscal Report due in 2007. The system has acted on the Commission's advice.

In June 2004, the Commission required a progress report and visit in November 2004 which resulted in the following recommendations:

Recommendation 5.

The team recommends that the University of Hawai'i review its salary placement policies and practices, assures that those policies are available for information and review by institutional employees, and assures that they are equitably administered to all employees, including all administrative staff. (Standards III.A.3 and 4)

This recommendation was addressed by the April 2005 report in which the system responded by providing evidence of its recent reorganization and the resulting revision of Board policies regarding a revised salary scale for administrators. The University posted its salary policy and communicated those changes and the intent to meet competitive benchmarks to administrative staff.

This recommendation was met.

Recommendation 6.

The team recommends that the U.H. Community Colleges and the University of Hawai'i system identify should identify more clearly the community college system functions and authority assigned to the two Associate Vice President offices and staff, and communicate those to the colleges and University System-wide Support. Both organizations must then design workflow and decision-making processes that allow the Community College System-wide Support staff to provide support and delegated authority in areas of academic planning, administrative (including personnel) and fiscal operations (Standard IV A.f, Standard III.A.3, Standard I.B).

The reorganization of 2002 deconstructed the community colleges organizational structure and melded it within the larger university system. One result of the reorganization was the loss of the UHCC CEO position and the creation of the Council of Chancellors, reporting directly to the President. As part of this structure, authority and responsibilities of the two Associate Vice Presidents became unclear. The Associate Vice Presidents did not have line authority over the Chancellors, nor did they directly report to the President. Instead, they reported to the university system vice president. As a result, their ability to assist or coordinate the colleges was compromised. The visiting team in April 2005 found that the structure was an impediment to decisive decision-making and suggested further review.

In June of 2004 the university president who proposed the reorganization was gone. The Interim President proposed a new structure that better aligned responsibilities and available funding. The number of vice presidents was reduced from eight to five, but still left the president with fifteen direct reports. The Commission continued to express concerns about the large span of control of the president and also the apparent indecisiveness of the new Council of Chancellors. The president indicated that the system was considering a further reorganization which would re-establish the community college CEO role.

By October of 2005, the system had, in fact, created a new position of Vice President for Community Colleges with the responsibilities of system governance and advocacy for the community colleges. The Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and for Administrative Affairs were realigned to report to the new Vice President for Community Colleges. The Chancellors retained their titles and the authority for all campus operations. The Chancellors continue to meet as part of the Council of Chancellors (reporting to the President) on system matters and the Community College Council of Chancellors (reporting to the Vice President for Community Colleges) for community college matters.

With these actions, the recommendation has been met.

Recommendation 7.

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

At the time of this comprehensive visit, this recommendation was still incomplete and thus was a focus of attention for the 2006 team. With the progress made in providing coordination and leadership to define program review elements and the support given the colleges in their student learning outcome activities, the system has made substantial progress in addressing this recommendation.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

General Observations

The responsibilities of the University of Hawai'i Community College (UHCC) system regarding mission (I.A) are to recommend the UHCC mission statements for the system and all its colleges. The system also advises the Board of Regents on the purposes of the community colleges and on matters of organization. In the portion of the Standard on Improving Institutional Effectiveness (I.B) the system approves policies and procedures

regarding planning and assessment of effectiveness at the system level and consults with the colleges on those matters.

Since the last comprehensive visit, the UHCC system has undergone several reorganizations that affected its ability to provide coordination and leadership, particularly in the areas of assessment of effectiveness and program review. With the latest reorganization (2005), however, the system has put in place a structure which should stabilize the system and provide the structure to coordinate and provide system support and oversight.

Findings and Evidence

The University reorganization in 2003 essentially deconstructed the community college system within the University. With the elimination of the Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges, the ability to advocate for the community colleges was diminished and the operations of the UHCC system were diffused into multiple reporting lines for the Associate Vice Chancellors for Education and Administration. As a result, the system and its colleges were “set adrift” in regard to responding to accreditation concerns and generally making strides in institutional effectiveness. With these concerns, and resulting Commission sanctions, the University responded with a 2005 reorganization that reinstituted the system CEO, now titled the Vice President for Community Colleges, and reconsolidated the academic and administrative functions under two Associate Vice Presidents, reporting to the Vice President for Community Colleges. The Chancellors remain as college CEOs and have a dual reporting structure to the Vice President of the UHCC system and the University President.

Interviews with system personnel yielded clear evidence that this new structure was beginning well and had promise to fully meet accreditation standards. Team interviews with college personnel yielded similar reviews, albeit with some concerns and confusion expressed about certain aspects of the reorganization. Some examples of areas where clarification is needed are in certain research functions such as responsibility for reporting (IPEDS, Carl Perkins), CCSSE and graduate survey coordination, validation of placement tests, and program review and SLO reporting.

The system has developed a Strategic Plan and will evaluate its progress on that plan. Interviews with system staff revealed that there is an expectation that college strategic plans are, and will be, developed to align with the system plan. The teams saw some evidence that this expectation was not clearly understood or at least not reflected in some college planning efforts. There needs to be feedback to the colleges that planning at the institutional level is integral to the system planning process.

Conclusions

The system has successfully responded to previous recommendations by addressing its organizational issues and also by providing a full and robust model of program review to assess effectiveness of programs and services. Now that the organization is in place, it

must itself be assessed for its effectiveness in supporting the UHCC system. The system has plans to evaluate the system and the team supports that effort with a recommendation that calls for evaluation particularly focused on the relationship of the system and its colleges in certain functions. These particular functions were identified by the system team as elements which are unclear or still in flux and must be clarified for the system to be fully effective. Also, communication of these results is fundamental to the success of this structure.

The recommendation that follows addresses multiple standards and is provided here in its entirety and will also be referenced in the context of the other Standard sections below.

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that the Office of the President and Vice President of the Community Colleges conduct a systematic evaluation process to determine the effectiveness of the new community college organization and governance structure between and among the system and its community colleges in the areas concerning:

- b. Strategic planning processes (Standard I.B.3)
- c. Program review and assessment practices (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.4)
- f. The allocation of resources (Standards I.B.6, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.d, IV.B.3.c)
- g. Facilities management, including deferred maintenance (Standards III.B.1.a and b, III.B.2.b)
- h. Board and administrative leadership (Standard IV.B.3.a)

The system should implement the improvements/changes that result from the review and widely communicate those outcomes. (Standards I.B.3.g, IV.3.b and f)

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

General Observations

The UHCC system is responsible for approving policies and procedures for establishing new degrees, program review for educational programs, student services, and library and learning support services and also assisting the colleges with these functions. The system also is responsible to report to the community colleges, the university system and the Board of Regents on these assessment functions and their results in improving effectiveness.

The system report of 2000 contained a recommendation to institute a comprehensive program review model. In 2003 the University submitted and AACJC accepted a Substantive Change request for reorganization of the University, one element of which was to eliminate the CEO (Vice Chancellor) position for the community colleges. As a result of on-going concerns regarding the affect of this reorganization, the Commission required a series of visits to the system over a three year period. During those visits, the

teams found that the colleges were out of compliance with Standards in the area of institutional effectiveness. In addition, the organization and practices of the UHCC system were found to contribute to the inability of the colleges to fulfill accreditation standards. The colleges were in differing situations regarding their ability to design a program review and improvement processes. Some colleges had no process and others had processes which did not communicate in any meaningful way to the system so that those decisions could be part of the system's planning. In fall 2004, the team visiting the system made a comprehensive recommendation regarding program review, assessment of effectiveness, using results in resource allocation, priority setting, and regular reporting of outcomes.

Findings and Evidence

As reported earlier in this report under Responses to Previous Recommendations, the system has fully responded to this recommendation and now has a fully developed program review process in place, system-wide (UHCC Policy #5.202).

The UHCC program review format includes appropriate elements which will provide appropriate data and provides a timeline for annual data collection as well as a full review of programs every five years. The format also calls upon staff to not only make curricular changes as revealed by the process but also requires them to examine how the program aligns with college mission. There is also a requirement for periodic evaluation of the process itself. The program review system is complete and will provide the needed data for college and system assessment of effectiveness. The UHCC system also has provided additional resources for program review and assessment with the successful advocacy of over a half-million dollars of new resources to support college activities in program review. With these new resources in place, there are several next steps. One is to do the evaluation of the process after an appropriate period of use and to further refine the system based on that evaluation. In addition, system representatives have discussed the need for further refinements such as benchmarking and simplifying the process. A part of the plan is to communicate the findings of program review in an aggregated fashion to the colleges. Clear communication of those findings is important for the colleges' and will demonstrate system commitment to institutional and system improvement.

Also, the use of program review data to influence resource allocations at the system and University level is still largely untested. It will be important that this last element be activated to fully satisfy the 2004 recommendation.

In regard to lessening barriers for students accessing student services in multiple locations, the system began to identify and remove barriers by establishing a Deans of Student Services committee that met with the Distance learning Committee. That group specifically addressed these issues for distance education students. There are still, however, varying practices in the colleges which hinder the development of common

procedures. In light of the new organization, the system should now use its program review process to address these student services procedures to improve and streamline them.

Conclusions

The UHCC system has addressed the previous recommendations and meets accreditation standards in program review. In order to improve the new system, it is now necessary to utilize it, evaluate the model, implement outcomes of the evaluation and communicate those results to the entire system. In particular, there is opportunity to use the program review processes to identify those practices in student services that act as barriers for intra campus students and improve them.

Recommendations

See Recommendation 1b: program review and assessment practices. (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1, II.A.2.a, e, f, II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.4)

Standard III: Resources

General Observations

For Standard III.A, Human Resources, the system has the responsibility to approve policies and procedures for personnel, equity and diversity. The system is responsible for the evaluations for the Vice President's direct reports, campus chancellors, and the UHCC managers. UHCC Human Resources also approves the appointment of faculty as well as tenure and promotion actions. The system consults and advises on matters regarding procedures and classification decisions of executives, managerial and APT positions.

In Standard III.B, the UHCC system is responsible for policy and procedures for facilities and approval of minor capital improvements. The UHCC system recommends to the University system on campus facilities master plans and major capital improvements

For Technology Resources, Standard III.C, the UHCC system has a consultation and assistance role with the colleges in the areas of campus policies and procedures, as well as the design, installation and operation of UH network services, and UH administrative software.

In the area of Financial Resources, Standard III.D, the system is responsible for approving UHCC financial policies and procedures as well as the annual budget allocation for each campus. The UHCC system consults with the colleges and the University regarding UH system finance policies and procedures, setting of tuition, and the general fund budget appropriation. The system recommends the setting of tuition and all student fees to the Board of Regents.

Generally, the team found that the resource functions of the UHCC system meet accreditation standards in human, physical, fiscal and technology resources. The team found several areas in which improvements can be made to further strengthen the existing systems, or devise new approaches that would either improve communication, increase effectiveness, or both.

Findings and Evidence

Recommendation 10 from the 2000 visit recommended streamlining personnel practices and expediting hiring practices. The system response was to delegate most hiring responsibilities to the colleges. Some of the colleges continue to report unduly long delays in hiring, citing lengthy and complex policies and procedures. Some of these regulations are in the control of the colleges and some are system-wide. Because the teams did not find sufficient evidence across the system this issue did not rise to a system recommendation. In the spirit of supporting improved effectiveness, however, it is suggested that the system facilitate a review of personnel practices in the colleges and the system with the intent of improving timeliness of personnel actions.

In the team's review of system functions within this Standard, two areas of concern did arise, one in physical resource planning and another in financial reporting.

The UHCC system has in place facilities master plans and policies and procedures that support that planning through its Community College Budget and Planning Office. The community college system operates within the larger university system and in the political context of the State of Hawai'i. This political context often affects the operations of the university as a whole and the community colleges in particular in how they are able to plan and fully support their facilities. All expenditures must be approved by the Legislature and often facilities items, while well documented as crucial, are often incompletely funded, or not funded at all. A specific example is deferred maintenance which is put forth by the University in its biennium budget at one level and funded at a third of that level. Also, new buildings may be funded without consideration of the staffing needed to run them. In addition, the priorities for facilities funding developed by the University may not be funded in that order, thus creating an unpredictable planning environment.

The 2000 recommendation asked the system to develop a budget and staffing plan for new facilities, which it did. Still at issue, however, is that even with a well-crafted facilities plan, the amount of money awarded to the university is in the hands of government. While the team fully understands and appreciates this external context, it is nonetheless obligated to observe that the accreditation standards in facilities management are compromised by this situation. This is especially true in two specific areas: obtaining the full funding for new facilities (including requisite staffing) and in deferred maintenance for existing facilities. The team saw several examples of facilities that were funded but not staffed, leaving the college to decide how or if to open the building. The team also saw examples of strain on most campuses as they attempted to deal with aging facilities and insufficient funds for maintenance. In some cases, a deferred maintenance

item turned into a health and safety issue as the facilities continued to deteriorate. Interviews with system personnel provided the viewpoint that college budgets could be redirected to this area as a solution. While repurposing college funds may be a partial solution, a system-wide approach also is needed to address this issue.

The other issue identified by the team regards the financial reporting system and its use by the colleges. The financial reporting system has been in use since 1996 and is used for monitoring college and system expenditures and revenues. It is not integrated with either the student information system or the personnel system. The team heard in interviews that finding a more integrated solution would improve efficiency and communication throughout the system. In 2003, the system formed a Business Process Council to review the system and recommend a future direction. As a result, in 2005, the University became a member of the Kauli project, along with other colleges and universities, to design an integrated new financial reporting system. This project is still in progress and moving slowly. In the meantime, three of the seven colleges report difficulty in using the system, particularly at the program level and below. This situation may be more a factor of college expertise and thus a staff development issue. While the other colleges do not express concern about the utility of the current system, it would be an overall improvement in effectiveness if the system were transparent in its use so that all colleges were using it in the same fashion to provide accurate and timely data throughout the system.

Conclusions

While the system is in compliance with accreditation standards, improvements can be gained by addressing the issues of facilities management, particularly deferred maintenance, and improving the financial reporting system. Recognizing the constraints resulting from being part of a larger system and being state funded, the system is urged to explore all avenues to regularize facilities deferred maintenance before it becomes a crisis.

The system is also urged to recognize the differential use of its current financial reporting system and take steps to see that all colleges have the same level of use. In addition, the system is urged to take the steps necessary to move to a more integrated management information system that would more strongly support system and college functions.

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the University of Hawai'i Community College system ensure that the financial reporting system is integrated and transparent throughout the system. (Standards III.D.2.a, b, g, III.D.3)

Also see Recommendation 1d, facilities management, including deferred maintenance. (Standards III.B.1.a and b, III.B.2.b)

Standard IV. Leadership and Governance

General Observations

The UHCC system approves policies and procedures on community college administration and organization. The UHCC system recommends both its own and the colleges' organizational structure and functions to the Board of Regents for approval. The system was reorganized in 2005, as outlined in the Standard I narrative above, resulting in an appropriate governance structure to provide leadership at the community college level.

Findings and Evidence

Since the last comprehensive visit, due to the several reorganizations, the system has been challenged to meet fully accreditation requirements. The university, led by its president, has been responsive to Commission concerns and took decisive action to reorganize in a fashion that has now met accreditation standards. It should be noted that the Board of Regents was fully responsive to these changes and included a new committee on community colleges to assure continued attention to these issues.

In interviews with system administrators, the President, and the Regents, the dual reporting responsibilities of the college Chancellors was explored. No college, system or university, or regent interviewees expressed any concern about the structure, based upon the high level of confidence placed in the Vice President of Community Colleges and the President to make this structure successful. Given the reality that occupants of positions may change in the future, the system is urged to make the dual reporting structure an aspect of the evaluation of the administrative structural evaluation called for in Recommendation 1f.

In review of team self-studies and interviews with staff and regents, the team determined that the Board of Regents does not regularly evaluate all of its policies. Although personnel policies are reviewed every two years, other policies are only reviewed sporadically, on an "as-needed" basis.

Conclusions

The University of Hawai'i Community College System is now aligned with accreditation standards and is in place to provide system coordination and leadership. The system plans to evaluate the system and the team concurs that an evaluation of the system should occur before the next progress report so that data is available on its effectiveness. An assessment of the effectiveness of the Chancellors' dual reporting structure should be part of that assessment.

In order to improve current practice and fully satisfy the accreditation standard, the Board of Regents should adopt a regular policy evaluation schedule.

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that the Board of Regents adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

Also see Recommendation 1f on Board and administrative leadership. (Standard IV.B.3.a)