

UHCC OPERATIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

REPORT

October 17, 2002

Submitted by:

flo wiger, Acting Provost, MCC
Ramsey Pedersen, Provost, HCC
Peggy Cha, Provost, Kauai CC
Carol Hoshiko, Dean, KCC
Mike Leialoha, Administrative Officer, Hawaii CC
Red Griffiths, Student, HCC
Tiffany Dozier, Student, WCC
Mary Goya, Faculty, Hawaii CC
Neghin Modavi, Faculty, KCC
James Goodman, Faculty, LCC
Charles Whitten, Faculty, WCC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RATIONALE FOR SYSTEM CHANGE.....	1
BACKGROUND AND CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE	2
COMMITTEE PROCESS.....	2
COMMITTEE NARRATIVE.....	2
PRINCIPLES.....	6
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	7
POTENTIAL STRUCTURE.....	8
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	9
APPENDICES:.....	10
APPENDIX 1: Claremont College Submitted by Peggy Cha.....	11
APPENDIX 2: Report on Site Visits/Executive Summary Submitted by Neghin Modavi.....	12
APPENDIX 3: University of Colorado – Boulder Campus.....	15
APPENDIX 4: Penn State – University Park Campus.....	17
APPENDIX 5: University of Wisconsin – Madison Campus.....	19
APPENDIX 6: University of Alaska Submitted by Carol Hoshiko.....	20

UHCC OPERATIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

RATIONALE FOR SYSTEM CHANGE:

The Committee believes that we are at a critical juncture for the University of Hawaii. The changes being contemplated are perhaps among the greatest since the inception of the institution. Already within the Community Colleges significant development has occurred. Some of the Community Colleges are beginning to develop 4 year degrees and to expand upon the offerings of the University Centers. The CCs are working with other campuses throughout the UH system to develop new models and relationships for the offering of educational programs. Distributed learning has become an increasingly important modality for the offering of the curriculum throughout the entire UH system thereby allowing further collaboration between campuses.

It is important to affirm the central role that Community Colleges have played and will continue to play in the future as the University of Hawaii evolves to meet the changing needs in the upcoming years. Our strategies should acknowledge past progress while at the same time anticipate future challenges and opportunities. It is clear that the Community Colleges of the University of Hawaii have matured into vital and vibrant units. Their rise to prominence and prestige owes much to the tireless efforts and enlightened leadership of UHCC Chancellor and UH Senior Vice-President Joyce Tsunoda. It is because of this strong foundation that the individual campuses will continue to grow and develop as exemplary units within the University of Hawaii system.

With the successful implementation of these changes, it is envisioned that the University of Hawaii will become an institution that is more dynamic, innovative, and responsive to all its constituents. It will be better positioned to provide a greater breadth of opportunities for its students and communities. As an integrated system, it will more effectively utilize the many talents and skills of its faculty, staff, and administrators. The University of Hawaii will truly become greater than the sum of its parts.

BACKGROUND AND CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE

An ad hoc committee was appointed in Summer, 2002 by Chancellor Tsunoda to review the roles and functions of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges within the context of changes in the organizational and operational structure of the University of Hawaii. The committee membership consists of three Provosts from Honolulu CC, Kauai CC, and Maui CC, four academic Senate Chairs from the remaining campuses of Hawaii CC, Kapiolani CC, Leeward CC, and Windward CC, two students, one APT representative and a Director of OCET.

The task for the Committee was to review the various functions carried out currently by the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges (OCCC) and to determine which functions, if any, are required to support and serve the seven community colleges as the colleges negotiate the transition into a new organizational structure in which the college's "CEO or Chancellor" (currently titled "Provosts") report directly to the President of the University of Hawaii.

The four broad areas of functions currently carried out by the OCCC are:

- (1) Chancellor which includes Executive Leadership, Advocacy, Coordination and Supervision of the Provosts
- (2) Academic Affairs, including Student Support Services
- (3) Administrative Affairs
- (4) Community and Internal Relations (Marketing & Communications) and Business/Workforce Development

COMMITTEE PROCESS:

The Committee met early in the summer and developed a meeting schedule, budget, and had discussions regarding the role and scope of the committee. One of the issues discussed was the mission and structure of a system comprised of sub-systems. Members of the Committee were invited to be part of a team visiting other institutions which had been identified as having a structure comprised of a single system with component parts. In addition, two of the Committee members were to attend a leadership institute on a campus where they would spend some additional time meeting with institutional leadership. Upon completion of the above visits, Committee members met to debrief each other and begin the process of developing recommendations for consideration by each campus community, the Chancellor of the Community Colleges and other institutional leadership.

COMMITTEE NARRATIVE:

As the committee began its discussions, it became clear that it was not sufficient to examine only the internal composition of the Chancellor's Office but rather the committee needed to explore how changes and adaptations for the CCs would fit into the overall structure of the University of Hawaii. One approach to the committee work could have been to take the functions performed by each individual in the Chancellor's office and make recommendations as to the placement of those functions within the UH system. In examining the various functions

however, the Committee decided that the ability to deliver effective services and support functions to the individual campuses was of greater importance, regardless of the new organizational functional structure within the University of Hawai'i. In doing so there was agreement that some of the service and support functions would be carried out at both the campus and system levels, requiring a high degree of coordination. In addition the Committee was aware that the individual campuses differ regarding their need for these services.

It is anticipated that discussions will occur among individual campus leadership, staff from the Chancellor's Office, and staff from the system level regarding how services can effectively be provided within the new structure. These discussions should include how to group and coordinate efforts to reduce overlap, how to maximize a cost effective and efficient utilization of staff, how to determine the appropriate fit for individual personnel, and how to simplify understanding of system structure and services. For example, what services must campuses continue to have in order to function? What decisions can be made at the campus level and what decisions will require monitoring? Obviously the President and the BOR have ultimate decision making responsibility but a review process may be helpful. The Committee thought it would be appropriate to examine how decisions are made at the other UH campuses.

It is important to note that the decision to reorganize the Community College Chancellor's Office is being done in the context of a larger reorganization within the University of Hawai'i. Most extensive university systems, that is those comprised of multiple campuses and levels of post-secondary education, have a "system" office that provides a range of functions for the various units. The value of most system offices lie in the role of facilitation and coordination, allowing the work of the individual campuses to proceed in an effective and efficient manner. It is possible that there could be fiscal benefits from such a structure. However, from the beginning, in committee discussion and subsequent conversations with President Dobelle, there was no expectation that this would be a cost saving initiative, but rather a mechanism to develop a more effective and efficient organizational structure based on the premise of an integrated University of Hawaii system.

There were numerous questions and concerns raised by committee members including:

- how would an advocacy role for the CC mission be maintained,
- how would integration, collaboration, and cooperation be promoted,
- how to minimize the potential for negative competition among various units within the UH system,
- the need to utilize resources efficiently to carry out the mission,
- how to meet the needs of the respective UH system campuses in a manner that creates a sense of fairness and inclusion,
- what services must campuses continue to have in order to function, what decisions can be made by the campuses and when does there need to be monitoring at a higher level,
- will there be a loss of the community college mission.

Not all the questions were answered and we acknowledge that this is a time of transition. Even though the Committee could have suggested answers to the above questions, it was felt that this was an opportunity to practice collaboration and communication. While all campuses were represented on the Committee, not all the campus leadership participated. As a result the Committee felt it was inappropriate to make all the recommendations prior to consultation with the individual campuses. There will need to be a broader dialogue across the CC campuses as well as with representatives within the UH system to address the concerns raised. The process of the reorganization has the goal of developing a new approach to relationships between and among the campuses where the individual campuses assume a more primary role.

Three themes began to emerge in the discussions: institutional culture, operational functions, and the structure of various components within the large UH system. There was general agreement within the Committee that the institutional culture of the CCs is one of concern for students, placing a high value on teaching and learning, and an emphasis on strong partnerships with the community. This culture is not dependent upon our structure but is rooted within our mission and values.

From operational and structural standpoints, institutions can be constructed in various ways as evidenced by our readings and our visits to other campuses. Members of the Committee were interested in knowing how system level operations work or don't work within a multi-campus system as well as examining the role of 2 year institutions in relationship to a larger system. How does a system comprised of campuses with differentiated missions work to meet the needs of both individual campuses and the larger overall system?

Members of the Committee visited the following campuses:

- Claremont College in California (Pedersen and Cha)
- Penn. State – University Park Campus (wiger and Modavi)
- the University of Wisconsin at Madison (wiger and Modavi)
- the University of Colorado, Boulder Campus (wiger and Modavi)
- the Auraria Higher Education Center at Denver (which provides a single campus infrastructure for three campuses, Colorado Community College, the University of Colorado of Denver, and Metropolitan State University) (wiger and Modavi)

In addition, one of the Committee members (Hoshiko) was familiar with the reorganization of the University of Alaska as it moved from a structure similar to the current UH model to a single system approach.

More detailed descriptions for each of the campus visits and a description of the reorganization of the University of Alaska may be found in the Appendices.

Among the systems visited there were similarities and differences. One major difference between all of the above systems and the current UH system was the absence of Community Colleges. All, however, have 2 year institutions except the Claremont system. In one system, the 2 year institutions were referred to as “de facto community colleges”. In all the visits issues of tenure and promotion, transfer and articulation, curriculum, and governance were discussed.

A significant finding from the campuses visited was the importance placed on the quality of leadership from all the constituencies within a system. A common conclusion from representatives among the campuses visited was that strong leadership is critical for the success of the enterprise. In describing leadership, people used words of respect, integrity, and fairness and stated that institutional leadership at all levels sets the standard and serves as the example.

Another finding was the increased involvement of external agencies such as legislative bodies in the operations of educational systems. In Colorado, for example, there is a “State-Wide Guaranteed Core Transfer” agreement among all the institutions which was developed as a result of a state mandate. Each institution/campus has autonomy over curriculum but they have agreed upon equivalent courses. They collaborated to develop common areas of competency and credit hours. Each campus can have a General Education core that is somewhat different and each institution sets its own curriculum. The advantage for students is that if they take General Education courses within the Guaranteed Transfer Agreement the courses will transfer to any of the institutions. Each campus had to have the General Education Course package reviewed and approved by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, which is a state-wide commission appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate. This Commission has approval authority on all degree programs offered in Colorado colleges.

Even though there were different operational and structural frameworks within the various systems, all of the institutions were able to carry out their educational mission. Depending on the mission and the degree of centralization or decentralization within the institution, responsibilities were located at different levels. In this time of change for the UH system, there is an opportunity and a need for both individual and group responsibility. The responsibility to set the direction for the UH system rests with the President and the Board of Regents with input from the stakeholders; the responsibility to deliver that direction for students in an effective and efficient manner rests with the campuses.

Certain services must be carried out for things to work and some of those services can be at the campus level and others at the system level. An important component for the delivery of such services is the integration and collaboration between and among the levels. There is always a possibility that service can become gate-keeping and facilitating can become oversight. Maintaining the decision-making process close to the locus of decision implementation will help to insure a positive outcome. It is the wish of the committee that we can function as a mature organizational structure in an effective manner to meet the needs of our constituencies both on an internal and external basis

For example, certain activities in which the UHCCs are already engaged might be used to assist UH in becoming a transformational organization that merges learning and life:

- credit/non-credit programs,
- customized training,
- certificates recognizing significant learning that may also have workforce value,
- competency measures merged with more traditional measures of learning,
- changes to meet the expectation for student outcomes by both junior and senior accrediting commissions, and,

- entrepreneurial efforts which have equal status with credit programs and with fundraising.

Administrators, faculty, and staff of the CCs have the opportunity to take proactive responsibility and model behaviors such as risk-taking, anticipating, connecting, seeking the view of others, and building a broad network of information and working relationships. Campuses within the UH system should be given the authority to carry out their responsibilities, services to assist them in meeting those responsibilities, and then be held accountable.

Through the Committee's discussions certain principles began to emerge as critical. These principles were then the basis for the development of a set of recommendations for consideration by the campuses within the Community Colleges and by members of the UH administration. There was agreement that whatever the Committee might recommend should not be considered in a vacuum but rather as components of interdependent yet distinct entities comprising the UH system.

PRINCIPLES:

- Open door access is critical.
- CCs must remain affordable.
- Partnerships, response to, and collaboration with the community, business, and industry are integral to the CCs,
- Students are the most important people on our campuses – they are the focus of the teaching mission of our institutions and are not an interruption of our work, but the focus of it.
- The importance of maintaining a strong faculty, staff and administration is critical to the health and vibrancy of a campus.
- All members of the campus community including students, faculty, staff, and administrators should be involved in campus governance.
- Differentiated mission and the recognition of individual campus identity should be affirmed.
- The campus CEO should report to the President of UH and other campus administrators should report to the campus CEO.
- All campuses in the UH system should receive levels of services and support necessary for the campuses to carry out their respective missions.
- Faculty representation from all units is needed in system articulation agreements and in all curricular issues (BOR policy) to facilitate student transfer while maintaining the locus of control regarding curriculum at the campus level.
- Facilitation, cooperation, and collaboration should exist between and among institutions to formulate system-wide policy and address system-wide issues.
- Orientation at all levels of the system should be one of service and facilitation.

- There must be a climate of mutual respect and trust across and between the various stakeholders within the entire organization.
- The Liberal Arts are central in the educational transformation process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The Chancellor's staff should be involved in the discussions about their responsibilities and roles and how services can be effectively provided within the new structure.
- There should be discussions among representatives from the CC's at the campus level, representatives from the Operational Review Committee and representatives from the UH system offices regarding which services can be appropriately carried out at the campus level and at the system level.
- Personnel from all levels of the University community should be encouraged to apply for system leadership positions as they arise.
- Those in leadership roles within the UH system should actively recruit personnel from within the various campuses of the UH system to fill system level administrative positions.
- Community College leadership should continue to work collaboratively in terms of both transfer and career-technical missions and to respond to community education and workforce needs; to implement this, campus CEO's need a background indicative of the understanding of these concerns.
- Options should be explored to facilitate the implementation of workforce/economic development initiatives.
- Areas of workforce development and economic development initiatives should be located in such a way that they can work across the system and not in silos.
- Committees, councils, and leadership throughout the system should be reflective of all the stakeholders.
- A comprehensive curriculum articulation process within the UH system should be developed.
- Course outcomes and competencies should be considered in the development of the articulation process.
- Faculty governance structure and processes on individual campus should be maintained.
- As the campuses become redefined in the new operational structure, participation from all levels of the campus in the governance structure should be encouraged.
- Consultation among the individual campus leadership should be encouraged.
- Faculty personnel decisions involving such areas as MQs, hiring recommendations, promotion and tenure should be located at the campus level with appropriate Presidential approval.
- The role of the EEO/AA Director should be maintained to assist the individual campuses in the compliance of state and federal regulations regarding personnel matters.
- There should be a review of all Executive Policies, including BOR, UHPA, and CCCMs to reflect the change in organizational structure.

- The responsibilities of the Chancellor of the Community Colleges should be delegated to the leadership of the individual campuses.
- The Office of the State Director for Career and Technical Education, currently delegated to the Chancellor of the Community Colleges, should be delegated to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- The concept of “lead campuses” should be developed as needed.
- A faculty leadership program should be developed modeled after the ACE Fellows Leadership Program; it should be flexible to meet the needs of the individual Fellow and also the UH system.
- There should be a support function for governance activities for faculty, staff, and students.
- The President and system level administrators should be relocated off the Manoa campus.
- Access to system level administrators should be improved.

POTENTIAL STRUCTURE:

The Committee recognizes the necessity of maintaining the functions and services performed by the personnel in the Chancellor’s Office to support the individual campuses. Given the movement of the Chancellor to another position in January, 2003 the Committee recommends that initially the personnel in the Chancellor’s Office be reassigned to the appropriate Vice President in the UH system administration to provide for a smooth transition. As an example, the Vice Chancellor for Administration should be reassigned to the Vice President for Administration and Chief Fiscal Officer. The primary portfolio for the Vice Chancellors and their staff should be continued service and support to the individual Community Colleges. This will ensure continuity and support for the individual campuses. Discussions should continue as to which functions should be carried out at the system level and which should occur at the campus level. There should also be discussions regarding possible reassignment of staff within campus and system offices. Ultimately, the Committee would anticipate that the individual CC institutions would be subject only to the oversight and supervision accorded the other UH institutions.

The Committee was aware of the intention to reorganize the UH President’s Office and reporting relationships in which campus Chancellors/”CEO”s would be reporting directly to the UH President. Subsequently, meetings occurred between UH Senior Administrators and Committee representatives where the individual roles of campus leadership positions were discussed. The role of the campus Chancellor would have as part of their primary responsibility resource development and external relations on a local, national, and international basis. In addition, each campus would have a Chief Academic Officer who would have as their responsibility the day to day operations of the campus. The Committee recommends the establishment of a Senior Executive Council comprised of Chancellors and other senior officers reporting to the President. The Chancellors and senior officers have been described as being the “opposite sides of the same coin” and as such would need to work in a very collaborative and interdependent manner. This same description would apply to the relationship between the Chancellor and the Chief Academic Officer on the individual campuses.

An evaluation process should be incorporated into the development of this new organizational structure. Benchmarks and goals should be established and an assessment should be conducted at the conclusion of the first year of operation to ascertain effectiveness and modifications and adjustments should be made as necessary.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The committee wishes to acknowledge the information and assistance made available by members of the Chancellor's staff. They provided the committee with organizational charts, position descriptions, and staffing information. They also assisted with clerical support. In addition, the committee wishes to acknowledge the staff of Ramsey Pedersen at Honolulu CC for all their assistance and aloha. In addition, numerous people from throughout the University of Hawaii system contributed ideas, input, and narrative to the Committee and we are grateful for all their kokua.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Claremont College Submitted by Peggy Cha

The Claremont Colleges are a consortium of five undergraduate and two graduate institutions, collocated in Claremont, California. Pomona is the oldest and largest, Scripps is a women's college, Claremont-Mckenna, Harvey Mudd, Pitzer, Claremont Graduate University, Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences make up the consortium.

“Major functions of Claremont University Consortium (CUC) as delineated in the Constitution of The Claremont Colleges are: to advance and promote the group; to found and promote new educational institutions; to perform common services and hold the title to central facilities and lands; to encourage and promote new central facilities as needed; and to improve efficiencies and economics through central activities and academic cooperation.”

The CUC is a separate entity, which provides shared services to all of the colleges, such as library, bookstore, payroll, facilities maintenance and repair, on-line registration and others. The Consortium is funded by assessments against the Colleges, which are determined by a variety of formulae taking into account number of students, FTE faculty, average usage, etc. A governing board is made up of the CEOs of the various campuses, the Consortium President and community representatives.

Each College is separately accredited and prides itself on a unique identity. Yet they also freely call themselves the Claremont Colleges and have incorporated the consortium into their identities. Their collaboration enhances the educational opportunities of each of them. For example, all ethnic programs are offered jointly. A particular college may take the lead in developing a program based upon the interest of faculty and students, and other colleges will contribute courses as they desire and allow students to pursue the program for credit. The shared services allow these very small (their combined enrollment is smaller than Kapiolani CC) to achieved economies of scale in vital areas such as the library.

APPENDIX 2

Report on the Site Visits Submitted by Neghin Modavi – October 2002

In the summer of 2002, Neghin Modavi (Faculty Senate Chair of Kapi‘olani Community College), Deane Neubauer (University of Hawaii’s Vice President for Academic Affairs), Mike Rota (Vice Chancellor for University of Hawaii Community Colleges), and Flo Wiger (Provost of Maui Community College) visited the system offices of the University of Colorado (Boulder and Denver), Penn State (University Park), and University of Wisconsin (Madison).

Given the pending restructuring of the UH Community Colleges, the purpose of this visit was to learn how system-level operations worked or did not work in multi-campus universities. We were particularly interested in the role of 2-year institutions in relation to the system and how multi-campus institutions with differentiated missions knitted together.

The following narrative is based on my observations regarding the site visits. These observations do not represent the views of my companions on the trip nor do they reflect the position of the Operational Review Committee tasked with examining the structure of the Community Colleges and the Chancellor’s Office within the UH system.

Executive Summary

Clustering of smaller campuses as systems within a system

Two of the three institutions, Penn State and the University of Wisconsin (UW), had over a dozen smaller 2 and 4-year campuses. In both these institutions the smaller campuses were clustered as a system within a system with single Dean or Chancellor and respective system offices and services. It is also important to note that this model is not a lingering antiquated structure. Rather, it is result of relatively recent restructurings, Penn State within the last five years and UW within the past 10 years. According to the Dean of Commonwealth colleges (the cluster of smaller campuses) of Penn State and the Chancellor of the 2-year colleges at UW, the system within a system model provided a counterweight and was deemed essential to establishing some degree of equity in relation to their large and more powerful research campuses.

Open-door policy

The UW shows that a multi-campus university can incorporate 2-year institutions with an open-door mission. Yet an open-door policy does not equal “community-college”. The 2-year open door campuses are described as colleges and not community colleges. The UW’s 2-year institutions retain this “college culture” by having the same hiring MQs and tenure and promotion standards for faculty at the 2-year institutions as those in their research campuses.

Faculty Issues

There are some significant issues for faculty to consider. In UW, the faculty at the 2-year open-door colleges are hired and evaluated for tenure and promotion with the same standards as their counterparts at the elite research campus at Madison. They are required to have doctoral degrees, research and publish. Yet their teaching load is higher and their pay lower.

Serious consequences also befell the faculty of smaller campuses at Penn State when these campuses became members of the Penn State system. The hiring MQs and tenure and promotion standards were then patterned after those at the University Park research campus. Many of the “older” faculty members hired under a different set of criteria were no longer eligible for promotion because they did not have PhDs. Those who did have doctoral degrees were not able to secure promotion if they did not conduct research and publish. It must also be noted that, similar to UW, the faculty at these smaller institutions have a higher teaching load and lower pay as compared to their colleagues while they are evaluated and promoted by the same standards.

Elements of successful system governance

- a) Recruitment of top officials from non-elite campuses - It is important to recruit and staff top-level system administrative positions by individuals from the smaller campuses within the system. This model discourages the common practice of recruiting and staffing almost all top administrative positions from the elite research campus of an institution. The experience of the University of Colorado (CU) shows that system trust, buy-in and overall sensitivity increases when individuals from the smaller campuses staff top administrative positions.
- b) Presence of and access to the President and top administrators - According to CU representatives, system integration and trust requires that the University President and other top administrators be accessible to all members of the system and not only the elite campus. One way to do this is to have the President and other Chief Executive Officers of the system maintain a high degree of visibility and presence among all campuses.
- c) Strong leadership – Representatives from all three institutions strongly underscored the importance of strong leadership in creating and maintaining a seamless system in which member institutions are treated equitably and fairly. The President of the University and top administrators need to define the goals of system integration and set the tone that not working as system is no longer an option. The administration must be able to withstand heat and criticism from some sectors and forge ahead in making policies and establishing procedures that are fair and that create an even playing field for all the units in the system.

General Education Core, Articulation, and Transfer Agreements

A seamless system needs to have an efficient and predictable general education core transfer and articulation policy that treats students in an equitable and fair manner. The experience of the University of Colorado shows that inequitable and chaotic Gen Ed transfer and articulation practices and policies based on lack of trust among institutions may lead to legislative mandates.

If we within the University of Hawaii system do not or cannot collaborate and come to agreements that balance campus autonomy and system engagement on Gen Ed and related transfer and articulation policies, we may face not only legislative pressure but dictated policies that do not reflect our preferences and sensitivities as an educational institution.

APPENDIX 3

University of Colorado – Boulder Campus

University of Colorado (CU) has 4 campuses with its system offices at its elite campus in Boulder. There are no community or 2-year colleges in the CU system.

In addition to the CU system, the State of Colorado has several other institutions of higher education. They are:

- Colorado Mountain College (multi-campus)
- State Colleges of Colorado (3 small Liberal Arts colleges)
- Metro State College
- University of Northern Colorado
- Colorado State University (3 campuses)
- Colorado School of Mines
- Community Colleges of Colorado – 13 campuses constitute a single institution with a centralized governing board and a common core.

CCHE - Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) exerts a great deal of power on the all the higher education institution in Colorado. CCHE is a statewide commission appointed by the Colorado Governor (confirmed by its State Senate) and has approval authority on all degree programs offered in all Colorado colleges. It has been described as a highly politicized entity exerting control on budget allocation, academic programs, and governing boards.

Our hosts at Boulder indicated that CCHE has favored the break up of governing boards and institutional systemness – i.e., their independence – because it increases its power. Large and powerful institutions, because of size and legislative support, benefit from break up. However, smaller institutions suffer by fragmentation.

The CU System Structure – The system offices of the CU are located in Boulder, the elite research campus. According to the CU’s Vice President of Academic Affairs, the system officers are now behaving more as a system advocates since deliberate efforts were made to recruit top administrators from all CU campuses not simply from the elite Boulder campus. Moreover, the CU President and top official maintain high visibility on all campuses. These strategies have created more sensitivity and buy-in by other campuses.

Gen Ed Transfer and Articulation – Colorado has a “Statewide Guaranteed Core Transfer” agreement on General Education Core curriculum among all the higher education institutions. This agreement was ushered by legislation in 2000 that mandated a common core and guaranteed transfer.

The State mandate initially called for a McDonalized approach to a common core by establishing the same exact courses (alpha, number, and content) on each campus. After a great deal of opposition and negotiations, the institutions were able to negotiate a compromise that allowed for campus autonomy in design of curriculum.

The Colorado Common Gen Ed Core is not a set of exact courses. Rather, each institution/campus has autonomy over curriculum. All institutions and respective campuses have had to collaborate to develop common areas of competency and credit hours. Given that, each campus can have a Gen Ed Core that is somewhat different. Each institution sets own curriculum working within those areas of agreed upon competencies.

Each campus/institution had to have its Gen Ed course package reviewed and approved by the CCHE. Once the Gen Ed Core package is approved by the CCHE, all campuses and institution of higher Ed in Colorado must accept it and guarantee its transfer.

The research universities were initially not friendly to transfer from what they considered to be “lower” level institutions such as community colleges and did raise a great deal of objections and resistance to accepting the community colleges’ Gen Ed courses. The faculty from the research universities were very upset even though evidence showed that Community College transfers did just as well as other students after transfer. Also, fight over curricular autonomy was very significant.

Community Colleges were and still are very anxious that some of their Gen Ed Core courses (as well as degree programs) may not get approved by CCHE. Understandably approval of Gen Ed Core is more Community Colleges since they are feeder campuses. However, since the Community Colleges already had a common core, they are able to speak with one voice and increase their power when proposing to the CCHE.

Denver’s Auraria Campus -- A Quick Note

In Denver, we visited the Auraria Higher Education Center. The Auraria campus houses three separate and independent institutions: The Denver campus of the Colorado Community Colleges, the Denver campus of the CU system, and the Metro State College. These institutions are entirely autonomous in their academic affairs. However they share a single campus infrastructure administered by the Auraria Group (a state institution), which successfully sees to, and maintenance of services such as parking, buildings, utilities, communication, bookstore and cafeteria.

APPENDIX 4

Penn State – University Park Campus

Penn State has 24 campuses. The main campus of Penn State is located in University Park. Like CU, the Penn State system does not have any community colleges as part of its system.

Many campuses in the Penn State system were independently born and become part of Penn State over the years. In 1950s, Penn State made all campuses (at the time 18, mostly 2-year colleges) all part of a single system with branch campuses with a common curriculum, a unified faculty hiring MQs and tenure and promotion criteria, and is singly accredited. University Park campus has served as the academic center of Penn State.

Over the years, a very sharp divided focus had emerged between the main University Park research campus and other smaller teaching institutions within the system. Many faculty members at smaller 2 and 4-year colleges had complained their teaching efforts were undervalued since promotion and tenure evaluation were conducted at a distance by their colleagues at the elite University Park campus. Their teaching load was higher and the pay lower. It was also felt University Park faculty got the lion's share of resources and favorably treated in the curriculum review processes.

Reorganization – 5 years ago 12 of the smaller 2 and 4-year campuses of Penn State consolidated and became a system within a system called the Commonwealth Colleges.

Governance of Penn State – the system has one president. Each campus has a Dean who is the Campus Executive Officer and reports to the president. However, the 12 Commonwealth Colleges have a single Dean. Hiring, tenure, and promotion for the Commonwealth colleges are rested within its own system.

According to the Dean of the Commonwealth Colleges, without such consolidation, the Commonwealth campuses would not be able to compete with larger campuses for funds, exercise of autonomy in hiring, tenure and promotion, and the development of new courses and programs.

Curriculum Issues – Penn State still has a very unified curriculum, but campuses no longer mimic curriculum and degrees. Smaller campuses do not feel as hamstrung by their main campus. Curriculum still must get approval of the system curricular faculty governance body with veto power. However, it was indicated that the veto power is not exercised unless issues are highly contentious.

New curriculum gets approval at campus level from faculty curriculum and governance entities and then from system level faculty senate curriculum affairs. The Commonwealth colleges have an extra level of approval at their system level. There is a Commonwealth faculty senate curriculum affairs body.

Once a course or degree program is approved at top system level, it then becomes a common curriculum for the entire Penn State system and any campus can adopt it without processing approval.

Transfer and articulation – Since curriculum is approved at the system level for the system, it transfer and articulation is guaranteed.

Tenure and promotion – At present the process is fractured. Most of the 2 and 4-year institutions had hired non-PhDs prior to their becoming members of the Penn State system. However, after their joining and along with development of 4 yr degrees, the new hires are PhDs who are subjected to similar tenure and promotion standards. The older faculty who do not have doctoral degrees were frozen in track for promotion. Also the faculty members with appropriate degrees who did not conduct research and publish also are unable to obtain promotion.

Overall the teaching load for the Commonwealth colleges is higher and the pay is lower.

APPENDIX 5

University of Wisconsin – Madison Campus

The University of Wisconsin (UW) is comprised of 26 campuses – 2 doctoral campuses (Madison and Milwaukee), 11 four-year colleges, and 13 two-year colleges. There are no community colleges in the UW system, even though; technically the 2-year campuses are open-door colleges.

Governance - Like Penn State, the 2-year institutions at the UW are a system within a system. They have a Chancellor who indicated that without the clustering they would be disempowered and economically would not be able to compete and survive.

The 13 open-door 2-year colleges of UW are liberal arts and Gen Ed feeder/transfer schools to the other branches of the UW. The open door policy exists because the State of Wisconsin has mandated that UW shall turn down no Wisconsin resident. According to the Madison Provost, they are really community colleges. However, the Chancellor of the 2-year campuses strongly disagrees and underscores that the campuses have a college “culture” since the faculty at these colleges have the same hiring MQs and tenure and promotion standards (research and publication). The faculty at these college teach more and get paid less. These 13 campuses are singly accredited and in fact are considered a single institution with one dept chair for all 13-campus departments.

Curriculum – Madison appears to set curriculum, and others follow. UW campuses all have one Gen Ed package even though courses do not all have same number and name. The 2-year institutions have a single curriculum mostly developed based on the Madison offerings. New course/degree must get approval at campus and system level curricular bodies and chancellors (for the 13, this also includes its own system level faculty body and Chancellor). Once approved by the system it becomes UW guarantee acceptance and transfer.

Other campuses do complain that Madison does not consult regarding academic programs.

Transfer and Articulation – Transfer occurs smoothly – Madison encourages transfer. Madison and other campuses set their own Gen Ed requirements; in that way each campus is autonomous. However, the 2-year campuses must meet Madison requirements in order to have their courses accepted for transfer. In this way, they come to mirror Madison curriculum.

There is also dual admission program between Madison and 2 year campuses. Students have all the Madison privileges but take courses at 2-year college. If they perform up to standard, they get automatic transfer/admission without having to apply. There were Madison faculty objections to this program that questioned the quality of 2-year campuses. The Madison administration responded by showing evidence of solid student performance after transfer.

APPENDIX 6

Overview of University of Alaska Submitted by Carol Hoshiko, Dean

(Former employee of the University of Alaska)

University of Alaska

The University of Alaska (UA) is a statewide system of public higher education that was once similar to the University of Hawai'i statewide system. There was a Board of Regents, statewide administration, community college administration, and four major administrative units that included the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), University of Alaska Juneau (UAJ), University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA), and a fourth major administrative unit called CCREE that included 11 Community Colleges, 12 Rural Education Centers, and Cooperative Extension Service offices. CCREE was also responsible for statewide programs such as the Community Health Aide Program, Petroleum Technology Program, Gerontology Program, and the University's Learn Alaska Network for distance education.

Reorganization:

In 1986 and 1987 the University of Alaska was restructured as follows: there is a Board of Regents, statewide administration and three major administrative units that include the University of Alaska Fairbanks, University of Alaska Anchorage, and University of Alaska Southeast. The community college administration office was eliminated, all but one of the community colleges were renamed "colleges" and are clustered with the University in their service region. Clustered with the University of Alaska Anchorage are Kodiak College, Kenai College, Mat-su College, and one community college, Prince William Sound Community College. The former Anchorage Community College merged with the University with some of its functions reorganized under the Community and Technical College. University of Alaska Fairbanks has a slightly different arrangement with a College of Rural Alaska that includes Chukchi College, Nome College and Tanana Valley College. The University of Alaska Southeast has Ketchikan College, Sitka College and Juneau College. The Rural Education Centers were similarly realigned.

University of Alaska Anchorage, University of Alaska Fairbanks, University of Alaska Southeast, and Prince William Sound Community College each have a Chancellor who reports to the President of the University of Alaska. Each MAU also has a Provost who reports to the Chancellor and the Directors of the colleges report to the Provost except for the College of Rural Alaska of the University of Alaska Fairbanks that has an Executive Dean who reports directly to the Chancellor.

Accreditation

The major administrative units, University of Alaska Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Southeast are separately accredited as well as Prince William Sound Community College.

Open Enrollment

The campuses have open enrollment but not open admission. Students must be admitted into different degree programs.

Tuition

There is a dual tuition structure with upper and lower division tuition rates.

Curriculum

Campuses develop curriculum that is submitted to either an undergraduate or graduate academic board at the major administrative unit level. The curriculum is then submitted to the system and the Statewide Academic Council. The Board of Regents approves new programs.

Faculty

There are bi-partite and tri-partite faculties who are represented either by the ACCFT (community college union) or United Academics (university faculty union formed after restructuring). Another union was formed later for Adjunct faculty.

Governance

Each MAU has APT, Classified, Faculty, and Student Assemblies. Statewide alliances exist for staff and faculty.