

August 27, 2002

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

UHCC OPERATIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

RATIONAL FOR SYSTEM CHANGE:

The UHCC Operational Review Committee believes that we are at a critical juncture for the University of Hawaii. The changes being contemplated are perhaps among the greatest since 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 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 offering 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 changing needs in 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. The system 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:

The ad hoc UHCC Operational Review Committee was appointed by Chancellor Tsunoda in Summer 2002. The Committee membership consists of the three Provosts from Honolulu CC, Kauai CC, and Maui CC, the 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 roles and functions carried out currently by the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges (OCCC) within the context of changes in the organizational and operational structure of the University of Hawaii and to determine which functions, if any, are required to support and serve the seven community colleges as they negotiate the transition into a new organizational structure whereby the college “CEO” or “Chancellor” (currently titled Provosts) report directly to the President of the University of Hawaii.

The four broad 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 discussions regarding the role and scope of the Committee. One issue 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 that had been identified as having a structure comprised of a single system with component parts. In addition, two Committee members attended a leadership institute on a campus where they spent additional time meeting with the institutional leadership. Upon completion of the visits, Committee members met to debrief each other and to begin the process of developing recommendations for consideration by each campus community, the Chancellor for the Community Colleges, and other institutional leadership.

COMMITTEE NARRATIVE:

As discussions began, it became clear that it was not sufficient for the Committee to examine simply the internal composition of the Chancellor’s Office but rather to explore how changes and adaptations to the CCs would fit into the overall external structure of the University of Hawaii. One approach could have been to take the functions performed by each individual within the Chancellor’s Office and make recommendations as to the placement of those functions in the UH

system. But in examining the various functions, the Committee decided that the ability to deliver effective services to individual campuses was of greater importance, regardless of the new organization's functional structure. In doing so there was agreement that some of the services would be carried out at both the campus and system levels, requiring a high degree of coordination. In addition the Committee was aware that individual campuses differ regarding their need for these services.

It is anticipated that further discussions will occur among individual campus leaders, 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 enable more cost effective use of staff, 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 or at the system level, and which decisions will require monitoring? The Committee thought it would be appropriate to examine how decisions are made currently at the other UH campuses. From the beginning in Committee discussion and subsequent conversations with President Dobbelle, there was no expectation that restructuring 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.

Committee members raised numerous questions and concerns, including:

- How would an advocacy role for the CC mission be maintained.
- How would integration, collaboration, and cooperation be promoted.
- How would the potential for negative competition among various units within the UH system be minimized.
- The need to utilize resources efficiently to carry out the mission.
- How to meet the needs of 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 is monitoring needed at a higher level.
- Will there be a loss of the Community College mission.

Not all questions were answered. 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 they pose an opportunity to practice collaboration and communication. While all campuses were represented on the Committee, not all of the campus leadership participated. As a result the Committee felt it was inappropriate to make all the recommendations prior to consultation with broader campus leadership. There is need for wider dialogue across the CC campuses as well as with representatives within the UH system to address the concerns raised. The process of 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 larger UH system.

There was general agreement within the Committee that the institutional culture of the CCs is one that expresses primary concern for students, places high value on teaching and learning, and emphasizes strong partnerships with the community. This culture is not dependent upon our organizational 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 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)
- University of Wisconsin at Madison. (wiger and Modavi)
- University of Colorado — Boulder Campus. (wiger and Modavi)
- Auraria Higher Education Center at Denver — provides a single campus infrastructure for three campuses: Colorado Community College, University of Colorado of Denver, and Metropolitan State University. (wiger and Modavi)

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

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

A significant finding from visiting campuses was the importance placed on the quality of leadership from all constituencies within the system. A common reflection from representatives of the visited campuses was that strong leadership is critical for success of the enterprise. In describing leadership, people used words like respect, integrity, and fairness. 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 “Statewide Guaranteed Core Transfer” agreement among all 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 statewide 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 visited 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 direct 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 with others at the system level. Perhaps a more important component 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. 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.
- Entrepreneurial efforts that have equal status with credit programs and with fundraising.

Administrators, faculty, and staff of the CCs have the opportunity to take proactive responsibility and to 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, the services that assist them to meet those responsibilities, and then be held accountable.

Through the Committee's deliberations certain principles began to emerge as critical. These principles were then followed by a set of recommendations. 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.
- Cost of CC education must remain affordable.
- Partnerships among, response to, and collaboration with community, business, and industry are integral to the CCs.
- Students are the most important persons on our campuses — they are the focus of the teaching mission of our institutions. They are not an interruption of our work, but the purpose for it.
- Differentiated missions and recognition of individual campus identities should be affirmed.
- The campus CEO should report to the UH President and other campus administrators should report to the campus CEO.
- All campuses in the UH system should receive the level of services and support necessary 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 systemwide policy and address systemwide issues.
- Orientation from 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 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 CCs at the campus level, from the Operational Review Committee, and from the UH system office 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; and campus CEOs need a background indicative of the understanding of these concerns.
- Committees, councils, and leadership throughout the system should be reflective of all the stakeholders.

- 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.
- Options should be explored to facilitate the implementation of workforce/economic development initiatives.
- Faculty personnel decisions should be located at the campus level with appropriate Presidential approval.
- The President and system level administrators should not reside on only one campus.
- Access to system level administrators should be improved.
- 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.

Respectfully submitted:

flo wiger, Acting Provost, Maui CC (Convener)
 Ramsey Pedersen, Provost, Honolulu CC
 Peggy Cha, Provost, Kauai CC
 Red Griffiths, Student, Honolulu CC
 Tiffany Dozier, Student, Windward CC
 Mary Goya, Faculty Senate Chair, Hawaii CC
 Neghin Modavi, Faculty Senate Chair, Kapiolani CC
 James Goodman, Faculty Senate Chair, Leeward CC
 Charles Whitten, Faculty Senate Chair, Windward CC
 Mike Leialoha, APT, Hawaii CC
 Carol Hoshiko, OCET, Kapiolani CC

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 have contributed ideas, input, and narrative to the Committee and we are grateful for all the contributions.