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BACKGROUND

The University of Hawai`i Community Colleges (UHCC) is a statewide system of seven separately accredited institutions embedded within a larger ten-institution statewide University of Hawai`i (UH) system. This organizational approach has resulted in a number of concerns being expressed by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) over the years as to how this type of organizational model facilitated the ability to carry out our mission as community colleges. In response to those concerns, the UHCC was among the first multi-college districts accredited by the ACCJC to schedule common dates for the reaccreditation of its seven colleges. This alignment of visits has allowed for a more extensive look at the role and functioning of both the University and UHCC system.

In preparation for the ACCJC Comprehensive visit in fall 2000, the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges undertook a separate self study of the University of Hawai`i Community Colleges system operations. While the ACCJC does not accredit systems, it was believed at the time that the preparation of a system self study would be the most appropriate way to demonstrate that the system functions were performing in a manner consistent with ACCJC Standards.

As part of the 2000 visit, the Visiting Team Chairs for each of the seven colleges formed an eight-person team that spent extra time looking at system issues, and issued a separate system recommendations report. The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges prepared the *Response to the UHCC System Recommendations Made as Part of the ACCJC Comprehensive Visit in 2000, August 2006* to detail the progress made on the recommendations from the 2000 UHCC System Report. Drafts of this report were distributed to the administrative and faculty leadership at each college for editing with regards to completeness and accuracy.

Since the 2000 ACCJC Comprehensive Visit and report, there have been major organizational changes within the University of Hawai`i (UH) system and the UHCC system that have affected the ability of UHCC to fully meet all the recommendations contained in the report. In 2001, with the arrival of President Evan Dobelle, the University began the reorganization of its administrative structure by separating the President’s role from that of the Chancellor for the UH Mānoa campus and adding a system Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA).

As part of that system administrative reorganization, the University of Hawai`i Board of Regents (BOR) received a proposal in November 2002 that included the elimination of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges. This reorganization proposal, which was approved by the BOR in December 2002 and approved by the ACCJC through its Substantive Change approval process in April 2003, resulted in a change in the reporting relationship that existed between the CEOs of the individually accredited community colleges and the UH system.

The 2002 University reorganization resulted in the creation of Council of Chancellors reporting directly to the President. The Council included the chancellors of each of the ten individual campuses within the UH system. The reorganization also eliminated the Office of the Senior Vice President and Chancellor for Community Colleges and reassigned the support functions of the office to various UH system-level vice presidential offices and to the community colleges. In June 2004, President Evan Dobelle left the University of Hawai`i system, and Dr. David McClain was appointed Interim President.
As part of the action approving the 2002 University reorganization, the ACCJC requested a series of reports detailing various aspects of the implementation of the reorganization. These reports were followed by site visits from the Commission. As a result of that process, it became increasingly clear that the new organization presented significant challenges in the colleges’ ability to continue to meet the ACCJC standards in a number of areas.

Following a review of several alternative organizational models and discussion and consultation, the BOR, on June 21, 2005, approved a reorganization of the University of Hawai`i system-wide administration. Key elements of the reorganization included:

a. The creation of a new position of Vice President for Community Colleges within the University of Hawai`i system organization. The Vice President is responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, development of appropriate support services for the seven-community college system, governance and advocacy for the community colleges.

b. Reconsolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the community colleges under associate vice presidents for community colleges.

On July 23, 2005 the BOR appointed Dr. John Morton, formerly, Chancellor of Kapi‘olani Community College, as Interim Vice President for Community Colleges.

Although the various organizational and relational changes delayed the implementation of several recommendations, there has been significant progress over the past several years on most of the recommendations.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **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)**

The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges (OVPCC), Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis (APAPA) has continued to convene the Institutional Research (IR) Cadre and expanded the membership to include liaisons from the community college Chief Academic Officers and the Deans of Student Services. These additions provided important communication and information exchange links. All IR Cadre members meet face-to-face monthly with additional meetings as needed. The IR Cadre meets to coordinate systemwide efforts, discuss issues of concerns, share best practices, and for training and professional development. Proceedings from the meetings are posted at [http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/ir.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/ir.html).

Training activities have addressed:

- Graduate and Leavers' Survey
- Perkins data
- National Student Clearinghouse
- Economic Modeling Solutions, Inc/Strategic Advantage data
- US Census data
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) reports
- IPEDS and National Center Education Statistics data
- UH System MAPS reports
- Community College Small Class data
- Community College Fact Book data
- Community College Academic Program Profile data
- Demographic Information and Achievement data for accreditation
- Confidential Data use, storage, and disposal

Following the establishment of UHCC Policy, UHCCP 5.202 Review of Established Programs, the IR Cadre has worked to define the quantitative indicators for program review to fulfill the policy requirement that comparable measures are used consistently across the system.

Additionally, the IR Cadre worked to identify, define, source data, and specify collection methodology for a common set of self study Demographic Information and Achievement Data (DIAD). The DIAD provides an institutional data threshold common across the system regardless of staffing or expertise at an individual college.

In addition to supporting individual college participation in the CCSSE survey, the UHCC Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis (APAPA) office has twice (2002 and 2006) coordinated participation as a systemwide consortium as well as facilitated two systemwide workshops with national office staff working with college administrators, faculty, and staff to understand and use CCSSE data as institutional effectiveness measures. A third such workshop is planned for fall 2006. CCSSE data are used in the UH System publication *Measuring our Progress*, the *UHCC Strategic Plan 2002-2010*, and the DIAD.
APAPA compiles the key performance indicators in the UHCC 2002–2010 Strategic Plan and provides an annual update to the UHCC Council of Chancellors.

The community college system office facilitated three systemwide workshops on assessment and preparing for accreditation:

- January 2004 – Evaluation, Planning and Assessment
- May 2004 – Evaluation, Planning and Assessment Part 2
- April 2005 – Assessment of Institutional Quality and Program Review with Dr. Sherrill Amador

Community college system staff members have served as resources and presenters at individual college workshops.

The community college system has sponsored presentations by Dennis Jones, President National Center Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), on using economic and educational data for program planning and assessment and state and institutional approaches to budgeting and resource allocation.

2. **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)

In 2000, each of the ten UH campuses was running stand-alone student information systems. These systems were not designed to facilitate access to student records, or student transfer between the campuses. In 2001, the ten campuses agreed to a financial plan that would implement a new student information system, despite the difficult financial situation facing the state and the UH system at that time. A UH system team evaluated available systems and made a decision to procure and install the SCT-Banner student information system centrally to serve all ten campuses. The seven UH community colleges moved to the new student information in fall 2002, and the three baccalaureate institutions moved to the same system in fall 2003. Appropriate student records such as transcripts and placement are available so that students who concurrently enroll or transfer between community colleges can be adequately counseled and served.

3. **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 COMPASS 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 Community Colleges Chancellors confirmed their college’s commitment to the continued practice of using the same student placement testing instrument and common placement scores in spring 2003. Working with ACT Course Placement Service (CPS), an assessment, analysis, and review of the accuracy of student placement testing cutoff scores results were conducted in 2002 and 2003 under the leadership of APAPA. The analyses provided UHCC the information on which recommendations for revisions to maximize students’ probability of success and placement accuracy were made. The data and ACT’s analyses and recommendations were provided to the Deans of Instruction (DOI), now Chief Academic Officers (CAO), on February
12, 2003, for review and recommendations as appropriate. The CAO recommended a presentation of the data and ACT’s recommendations be made to math, reading, and writing faculty.

Following the February 28, 2003, presentation, the faculty requested additional discussions at the college level and the system level. The CAO convened a systemwide meeting of English and mathematics faculty to review the data and make recommendations to the CAO. Based on faculty input and review of the data, the CAO recommended 1) separating the reading test as a mechanism for placing students into writing classes, 2) a lowering of the transfer-level reading score (not recommended by faculty), 3) raising placement scores for two math courses, 4) a review of the developmental math curriculum, and 5) an analysis of additional semesters of both system and college specific placement data. The timing and coordination required delaying implementation until spring 2006 and fostered the establishment of the Community College Placement Advisory workgroup that advises the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) and the Community College Council of Chancellors. The workgroup is responsible for reviewing placement practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases, review current policies and practices, and recommend policies and practices on issues that have systemwide impact. Additionally, as part of their regular meetings convened by APAPA, systemwide testing coordinators reviewed and made recommendations for standard testing procedures.

In September 2005, Chancellors agreed to maintain the systemwide cutoff scores from 1997/1998 with changes in two math courses and the separation of the reading test and writing test for placement into writing courses. They asked the reading and writing faculties to revisit the recommendations of the CAO regarding placement into transfer-level reading and the math faculties to continue their systemwide discussions.

On November 5, 2005, systemwide reading faculty and CAO met with representatives from Institutional Research to review and discuss the data. ACT had provided analysis of twelve semesters of system and college placement data. Faculty returned to their campuses and discussed the data and forwarded their recommendations to their deans. The CAO met on January 27, 2006, to review faculty recommendations and reach consensus on faculty recommendations that there should be no change to the existing cut offs. They based this recommendation primarily on limited college-specific studies and practitioners’ classroom experience. Additionally, they recommended 1) a systemwide study of the effectiveness of English 21 be conducted, 2) administrators and faculty abide by the results of the study, 3) systemwide demographic profile of students’ reading abilities be compiled, 4) faculty across the system re-examine the curriculum of the current reading courses (ENG 21 and ENG 102, and 5) the Office of the VPCC investigate alternative reading placement tests.

The discussion that resulted in the Chancellors’ September 2005 agreement (Attachment 1; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att1.pdf), also revealed that throughout the system a number of existing course prerequisites that affect student placement decisions across the colleges have not been validated. The Chancellors directed the design and pilot study to validate prerequisite requirements beginning with the validation of reading course prerequisites for developmental transfer level writing courses. The study is being conducted under the leadership APAPA and includes broad systemwide participation.
4. **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 University of Hawai`i system is committed to providing our students with educational opportunities through distance education. As an island state, with diverse and expanding demands for education and training, the development of an effective distance learning program is seen as a way of responding to those demands without duplicating programs throughout the state. Over the past ten years, significant resources have been appropriated and allocated to the establishment of a statewide interactive TV network, the establishment of University Centers through the community colleges on Kaua`i, Maui, and in West Hawai`i to facilitate the delivery of programs and services, and to expand our program offerings.

The University Distance Learning leadership currently resides within the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy. Since 2001, there have been a variety of conversations about how to advance the University of Hawai`i in the area of distance learning. These have played out in a number of committee discussions, workshops, and most notably, in the preparation of the new Strategic Plans for the University of Hawai`i and its major units.

As part of the UH systemwide strategic planning process, a number of Strategic Issue Teams (SITs) were formed to provide input to the planning process. At the direction of former Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, Deane Neubauer, the SIT for Information Technology and Distance Learning was charged to follow up on the strategic planning with an Action Plan that would lay out the specific actions UH should take to move forward.

A draft action plan was prepared and shared with the entire UH community for comment by email, memo or in an online discussion forum. Based on the many thoughtful insights, concerns and ideas shared from throughout the University, the SIT finalized the University of Hawai`i Distance and Distributed Learning Action Plan and submitted it to former Interim VP Neubauer in early May 2003. This plan (Attachment 2; [http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att2.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att2.pdf)) serves as a guide to the development of policies, programs, and resources for all units, including the Community Colleges.

During the FB 2004-06 State budget request cycle, the University formulated a systemwide budget request to address distance education needs for all of our colleges. Unfortunately, the legislature did not agree with the priority the University had placed on distance education support and failed to provide the funds requested by the University. This distance education initiative continues to be a high priority for the University and all of its campuses, and while additional funds were not provided during the last legislative session, the University continues to provide distance education opportunities to the extent possible through reallocations from within its current service base to address the ever-growing demand for distance courses. The University will continue its efforts to seek additional funds to expand its offerings through distance education.

5. **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)**

At the time of this review in 2000, all faculty and administrative, professional, and technical (APT) appointments and salary placements were recommended by the campuses and approved
by the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges. Upon the reorganization of the community colleges in December 2002, and with the re-titling of the campus heads as Chancellors, the Chancellor of each campus was delegated the authority to appoint faculty and APT personnel. Therefore, the hiring process is currently within the control of the campus staff. The only exception to this is in salary placement when the new hire is being appointed at a salary level that the Chancellor does not have the authority to approve; by policy, these salaries must be approved by the President. The selection of civil service employees are also made at the campus, however, the final background and physical clearances are handled by the UH System Office of Human Resources. The authority to appoint executive/managerial employees has always rested with and continues to be with the President and/or the Board of Regents. The President has the authority to appoint managerial employees up to a certain salary level; anything beyond that threshold requires Board approval. Any actions pertaining to executive employees require Board approval.

6. **The Chancellor’s Office should establish approaches to increase support of staff development. (Standard 7.C.1)**

On December 6, 2000, the Chancellor for the Community Colleges launched the Wo Learning Champions initiative. The Wo Learning Champions initiative focuses on professional development for faculty and staff in Hawai‘i’s community colleges. With a focus on learning and an emphasis on leadership development, the Wo Learning Champions program invests in junior members of the academic community, renews its senior faculty, and promotes the enrichment of all at the State’s community colleges.

The Wo Learning Champions are representatives from all seven of Hawai‘i’s community colleges and the Employment Training Center. The Champions have as their overall goal to design a program of professional enrichment for UHCC faculty and staff, to implement the program; and to oversee the plan for its continued growth. Specifically, their responsibilities are to design a program of professional development for faculty/staff renewal and enrichment that will:

- Keep learning at the center of its focus;
- Have systemwide impact; and
- Allow for expansion and enrichment of activities as new resources become available.

The Wo Learning Champions initiative is funded through the support of two foundations: the Bob and Betty Wo Family Foundation and the Jim and Juanita Wo Family Foundation. The Wo families have recognized the crucial role that the state’s community colleges play in the lives of the members of our community as well as in the economic development of the state. Furthermore, the Wo families have also recognized the critical importance of professional development for faculty and staff at these institutions. As a result, they have pledged a gift of $1,000,000 over a five-year period.

Each year since its inception, the enrichment program has been funded by an additional amount, up to $25,000, in support from the Wo Family Foundations. The principal and interest of the endowment have been reinvested. In subsequent years, the activities will be funded by interest on the endowment.

Since the first group of Wo Learning Champions began planning activities in January 2001, a number of events have been conducted for the benefit of faculty and staff in the University of
Hawai‘i community colleges. The first of these was the Learning Assessment Workshop, conducted at Kapi‘olani Community College on February 18, 2002. In that same semester, the first Spring Seminar was conducted. In spring 2003, the Wo Learning Champion from Leeward CC, coordinated an Innovations Institute for the faculty on his campus. On alternate years since 2004, the Wo Learning Champions have coordinated Wo Innovations in Learning Day, a day-long program of faculty and staff development activities unique to each college. Since 2005, they have conducted a competition to recognize faculty and staff by selecting the winner of the Innovation of the Year award. The Wo Learning Champions have also sponsored a distinguished lecturer series, faculty/staff exchange grants, and a Wo Speakers Bureau.

In 2003, the Tsunoda Community College Leadership Development Fund was established in recognition of Emeritus Chancellor Joyce S. Tsunoda. The endowment in her name was established to support leadership in the community college system by “growing leaders from within.”

Following the successful model of the Wo Learning Champions, a Community College Leadership Champion is any faculty, staff or administrator, currently employed by a college, who has demonstrated leadership potential; who is committed to diversity, public stewardship, working for the greater good; and, who desires to pursue personal and professional development in community college leadership. Based on these qualifications, each community college selects one individual to serve a two-year term. The Leadership Champions have been selected from faculty and staff from the liberal arts, career and technical programs, student services and institutional support.

At the end of 2005, the Fund had grown to approximately $180,000, and had an expendable balance of more than $75,000. With support from the Fund the Champions have attended the Community College Leadership Develop Institute first at Claremont Graduate University and now at the University of San Diego. Monthly meetings take the Champions to different campuses to learn more about the UHCC system and what it takes to be a leader in the complex environment of a statewide network of community colleges. Among the most valuable opportunities at these meetings are frank, personal conversations with the Chancellors, the VPCC, and the UH System President.

The mission of the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Leadership Champions (CCLC) is to identify, encourage, develop, and support the next generation of community college leadership.

The goals of CCLC are to:

- Identify and encourage individuals to welcome roles of leadership;
- Develop creative dynamic leadership committed to the core values of the community colleges; and
- Support an atmosphere of leadership among faculty, staff, and administration.

The UHCC Strategic Plan 2002-2010, approved by the BOR in November 2002, has as a major goal to Develop Our Human Resources: Recruitment, Retention, and Renewal. This goal has the following key performance outcomes:

- Reduce the annual credits taught by teaching faculty to an average of 24 credits or equivalent by July 2005.
• Bring faculty and administrative salary compensation up to a level comparable to the 80th percentile of public two-year institutions on the NEA and CUPA annual compensation surveys by July 2010.
• Increase opportunities for professional and staff development by budgeting three percent of personnel costs for this purpose by 2010.

In spring 2003, the University, State, and the faculty union approved a new collective bargaining agreement that deferred salary issues for a year and adopted a new community college teaching assignment agreement that calls for a 27 student semester hour credit annual load for instructional faculty. In spring 2004, the University, State, and the faculty union approved a new salary agreement that covers a six-year period. This agreement was approved by the Legislature in May 2004, 2005, and again in 2006 when the additional funds required to implement the 2006-07 portions of following increases were appropriated. This action allowed UHCC to make significant progress on two key performance outcomes.

7. 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 Community College Budget and Planning Office (CCBPO) provides system leadership and coordinates the preparation and execution of the operating budget of the Community College system. The Physical Facilities, Planning and Construction Office (PFPCO) provides system leadership and coordinates the maintenance of existing facilities and the development of new facilities for the Community College system. CCBPO also directs the fiscal and financial operations of the Community College Systemwide Support program, including the processing of detailed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) transactions.

CCBPO works closely with PFPCO to ensure that Community College CIP budget requests for new and renovated facilities are appropriately coordinated with corresponding operating budget requests in support of these new and renovated facilities. Estimates of the future operating support requirements are included in the Capital Project Information and Justification Sheets (Table R) (Attachment 3; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att3.pdf) under the section, “Impact upon future operating requirements.” CCBPO determines the appropriate timing and works with the campuses to develop these supporting operating budget requests. These operating budget requests will include all required staffing (janitors, building maintenance workers, etc.) as well as utility, maintenance and repair, equipment, etc. funding needed for the proper functioning and maintenance of the facilities. This is an established, standard process used for the development of the operating and CIP budgets of the Community Colleges.

8. 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 own functioning. (Standard 10.A.5)

On October 7-8, 2004, the Board of Regents (BOR) held a self study workshop conducted by Dr. Tom Ingram, President of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Dr. Ingram facilitated a program in which the President and the Regents stepped back
from regular board business, candidly reviewed performance, and developed a specific set of objectives to strengthen the Board’s effectiveness. He encouraged candid discussion in a retreat setting about various issues and helped the BOR and the President devise specific strategies to work together in the most effective way.

The workshop was especially helpful to the recently appointed Interim President and Regents. Nine of the eleven Regents have served on the BOR for a year or less. All BOR members completed a survey, the “AGB Self study Criteria,” prior to the workshop. The anonymous responses were compiled and summarized in a report that included all comments from the Regents. The results were shared with the President, Dr. Ingram, and all BOR members. The Regents submitted candid perceptions of the Board’s effectiveness in such areas as institutional mission and educational policy, planning, the physical plant, financial management, financial support, board membership and organization, and relationships among the BOR, the President, faculty, and student body.

At the BOR Self Study Workshop, the Regents discussed the Board’s responsibilities, allowing ample opportunity to explore Regents’ perceptions and the ambiguities of the Board and the expectations of individual Regents. The BOR reviewed and discussed the self study summary report and focused on issues and concerns identified by the Regents. It is important to note that Dr. Ingram did comment that this Board had navigated through one of the most challenging and difficult situations he had encountered.

As a result of the self study workshop, the Regents have a clearer understanding of the Board’s overall and individual responsibilities. There is consensus on next steps. With Dr. Ingram’s guidance the BOR had an extremely constructive discussion about the Board’s committees, structure, meeting format, and some policies and procedures that have been in place for decades and simply do not work well anymore. As a result, the BOR is committed to making some immediate changes to its committee structure and meeting format and to reviewing and revising outdated policies and procedures.

The BOR agreed that the self study workshop should be conducted on a three- or four-year cycle to help renew its commitment to the institution and its responsibilities.

9. **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. (Standard 1.1–4)**

As described in the Background section of this report, the University and UHCC systems have undergone major changes since the 2000 ACCJC visit. As part of the action approving the 2002 University reorganization, the ACCJC requested a series of reports detailing various aspects of the implementation of the reorganization. These reports were followed by site visits from the Commission. As a result of that process, numerous internal discussions took place regarding the issues of centralization/decentralization. While discussions of this nature frequently occur in multi-college districts, the regular visits and reports provided by the ACCJC visiting teams generated a larger public discussion within the University system at the highest levels.

In fall of 2004, the community college chancellors and the two associate vice presidents with UHCC system responsibilities organized a series of meetings and discussions on organizational issues. In mid-December 2004, a meeting was then held with Interim President McClain to
discuss the following criteria and organizational alternatives. Further meetings were held with the Interim President in January and in February of 2005.

Critical Questions Considered:

In considering organization models, the following questions were used in evaluating those models. These questions are, in some cases, contradictory and therefore no structure would optimize all factors. The questions all assumed that it is in our best interest to be some kind of “system” of community colleges.

- How do we maximize the collective impact of community colleges on resource allocation decisions and policy formation within the hierarchical UH system?
- If the President creates a UH cabinet that includes campus CEOs, how will the CCs be represented in that cabinet?
- How do we optimize our collective relationship with our baccalaureate peers, especially around areas of curriculum, articulation, student flow, enrollment management, etc.?
- How do we develop and communicate a consistent community college message with external publics?
- How do we mobilize to achieve collective goals?
- How do we provide administrative support to small and large campuses?
- How do we resolve conflicts around policies or decisions that need to be consistent, especially in areas where by law or Board policy or accreditation standards we are still considered a system?
- How do we ensure campuses the freedom and flexibility to act when there doesn’t need to be common or consistent direction?
- How do we gain economies of scale across campuses?
- How do we gain consistency of practice or adoption of best practices across campuses?
- How do we resolve the Board of Regents if ACCJC is requiring the Board to interact with us much more intensely as if it were a local board?
- How do we become more than just the sum of our seven campuses?

Prospective Organizational Models:

Below are several organizational models, with variants, that were considered during the discussions:

The CC Separate System (Kentucky 1997- Present) Model

Separate Governing Board
CEO for the CC system with campus CEOs reporting to the CC System CEO, who reports to the Separate Governing Board
System administrative and academic policy/support reports to CC System CEO
Relationship with other UH campuses negotiated politically

Variant A – Same model except the CC System CEO reports to the UH Board of Regents, which serves as the Separate Governing Board, and not to the UH President, similar to the role the BOR plays for Career and Technical Education.
The CC System CEO (Tsunoda 1972-2002) Model

CC System CEO reports to the UH President, who reports to the Board of Regents
Campus CEOs report to the System CEO
System administrative and academic policy/support reports to CC System CEO
CC System CEO sits on UH President’s Cabinet and represents CC interests within UH

Variant A – Same model except the role of the system office focuses primarily on policy, coordination, external relations, etc. and less on operations

The CC System Coordinator (Melendy – 1965-72) Model

Vice President or similar high level position created for CC Coordination
Campus CEOs report to the UH President
CC System administrative and academic policy/support reports to the Coordinating VP
Coordinating VP sits on UH President’s Cabinet and represents CC interests within UH

Variant A – Same model except VP has more direct control over those functions such as system planning and system budgeting where policy, law, or accreditation dictates that we be a system. Only coordinating responsibility for plan implementation, campus initiatives, campus operations

Variant B – Assoc VP for Academic Affairs assumes the VP role; Assoc VP for Administration and CC Operations reports to VP

The Dobelle Model (2002-2005)

No CC System CEO
Campus CEOs report to the UH President
CC System administrative support reports to VP Admin and VP Finance
CC System academic support reports to VP Academic Policy and Planning
CC System decisions negotiated through Council of Community College Chancellors
Associate VP for Administration (Community Colleges) and Associate VP for Academic Affairs (Community Colleges) sit on UH President’s Senior Management Group

Variant A – Council of Community College Chancellors negotiates but UH President makes final decision on CC System decisions

The CC Collective Leadership Model

No CC System CEO
Campus CEOs report to the UH President
CC System decisions decided by Council of Community College Chancellors
Council names a permanent or rotating chair
Chair sits on UH President’s cabinet
CC System administrative and academic policy/support reports to the Chair

As the issue was the ability to meet the ACCJC Standard for a multi-college district, the then Interim President requested that a draft functional statement for the CEO of the UH Community Colleges as a system be created to clarify the roles of the CC system CEO compared with that of the college CEO. This draft functional statement for an “Executive Chancellor” of the
community colleges, mirroring the ACCJC description of the division of responsibility between the college CEO and the head of a multi-college district, was used by the Chancellors during their December 2004 and January and February 2005 discussions. Similar discussions were held involving the Interim President and community college faculty leadership.

A number of issues were considered during these discussions concerning each of these approaches. Chancellors and faculty generally agreed that there were a number of positive attributes of the Dobelle Model. At the same time, they recognized that more “coherence” among community college operations is needed in order to satisfy current ACCJC standards. Of particular note was the desire of some chancellors, and their faculties, to maintain a direct reporting relationship to the UH President. Other chancellors and their faculties were more accepting of a reporting relationship through a CC System CEO to the UH President.

After further discussion and consultation, the Board of Regents on June 21, 2005 approved a reorganization of the community colleges. Key elements of the reorganization include:

- The creation of a new position of Vice President for Community Colleges within the University of Hawai‘i system organization. The Vice President is responsible for executive leadership, policy decision-making, resource allocation, development of appropriate support services for the seven community college system, governance, and advocacy for the community colleges.
- Re-consolidation of the academic and administrative support units for the community colleges under Associate Vice Presidents for Community Colleges.
- The retention of the title “Chancellor” by the college CEOs with authority and leadership responsibilities for the immediate operation, management, administration, and governance of their college within BOR governing and Presidential administrative policy. The Chancellors continue to meet and participate in the University-wide Council of Chancellors as well as the Council of Community College Chancellors and have a dual reporting relationship to the Vice President for Community Colleges for community college matters and to the President of the University for matters of UH system concern. The structure is designed to ensure that the Chancellors have the appropriate authority as CEOs of accredited colleges while maintaining the system governance structure to assure policy and planning coherence and equitable resource allocation within the system of community colleges.

The BOR approved reorganization is contained in Attachment 4; [http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att4.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att4.pdf)

On July 23, 2005 the BOR appointed Dr. John Morton, formerly, Chancellor of Kapi'olani Community College, as Interim Vice President for Community Colleges. Interim Vice President Morton and his staff are working with both colleges and UH system personnel to establish clear reporting lines and levels of authority and responsibility for system staff and colleges.

As part of the work in reestablishing a UHCC system office, a map that details the allocation of functional authority between the colleges and the system has been developed (Attachment 5; [http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att5.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att5.pdf)).
10. 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)

As reported in Recommendation 1, the UHCC Academic Planning, Assessment and Policy Analysis (APAPA) office has continued to convene the Institutional Research (IR) Cadre. All IR Cadre members attend monthly face-to-face meetings with additional meetings as needed. The IR Cadre meets to coordinate systemwide efforts, including the research calendar. APAPA Office maintains the calendar of systemwide activities.

A 1998 reorganization of the UHCC institutional research function resulted in the majority of the staff (including positions and funding) in the system office being reassigned to the colleges. Prior to that time, the UHCC Chancellor’s Office had the responsibility for providing basic institutional research services to each of the seven colleges as well as systemwide services. The decision to decentralize the operation of institutional research was intended to provide each college with more direct support for its own research needs while maintaining the flow of data into the system office for system analysis and reporting. Colleges were expected to conduct and maintain former core systemwide activities such as the survey of graduates and leavers.

The 2002 system reorganization eliminated the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges, and placed the responsibility for assigning college staff to meet critical needs with each college Chancellor. Between 2000 and 2005, the decline in state revenues precluded any request for additional state resources supporting increased program improvement and institutional effectiveness from being approved. Since mid-2005 the improving state economy has allowed the state to increase the University’s General Fund appropriation. In the recently completed 2006 legislative session, the UHCC system was appropriated 8.25 positions and $535,852 to support the program review process and establish a program improvement fund. 7.25 positions and the related $240,827 have been allocated to the colleges to provide additional support to meet their growing institutional research needs. The remaining position will be in the UHCC system office and will be used to support reporting, programming, and professional development and training needs.

11. 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)

Recognizing the need to integrate systemwide program review, institutional assessment and improvement processes, the Chancellors met in February 2005 to receive briefings from each college as to current policies, practices, and timetables and to seek agreement on a number of principles that will guide all colleges in the development and modification of their program review processes. After extensive discussions, the following eight principles were adopted to address ACCJC concerns, satisfy ACCJC standards and UH BOR and Executive Policy requirements on program review, and provide system consistency and continuous improvement process:

- Each instructional and non-instructional program shall undergo a comprehensive review at least once every five years.
• Program reviews shall result in improvement plans that are linked to each college’s Strategic Plan.
• There shall be an annual report of program data which are analyzed, reviewed, and, where appropriate, reflected in updated action plans.
• There shall be an overarching commitment to continuous quality improvement.
• The program review process shall be collegial.
• Program review information shall be publicly available.
• Comparable measures shall be consistent across campuses.
• Program reviews and resulting plans for improvement shall be used in decisions regarding resource allocation.

The community college Chancellors made a presentation (Attachment 6; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_5a/accreditation/response/Att6.pdf) to the BOR at its March 2005 meeting describing an integrated approach to program review that would be implemented in the 2005-2006 Academic Year. The presentation included the scope of the required program review task within the community colleges, the planned review schedule for each college, and the principles the Chancellors articulated to guide the college processes to comply with both University policies and ACCJC standards.

In October 2006, the UHCC Policy on Review of Established Programs (UHCCP 5.202) (Attachment 7; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_5a/accreditation/response/Att7.pdf) was issued. As stated in UHCCP 5.202, “This policy establishes a coordinated program review process within each College and across the Community College System that meets the requirements of the University Board of Regents and Executive policies, external mandates such as those required by the Federal Carl Perkins Act of 1998, and the standards of good practice established by program and regional accrediting bodies.”

In July 2006, the BOR Community College committee received a presentation (Attachment 8; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_5a/accreditation/response/Att8.pdf) on the outcomes of the new UHCC program review process.

12. 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)

The UHCC Chancellor’s Office initiated discussion and dialogue across the system in the late 1980s with the establishment of a number of major task forces composed of faculty and staff from each of the seven colleges. The task forces examined a series of issues including: the structure of the associate degrees being offered by the seven colleges; a system framework for general education that would serve as a guide in the development of specific associate degree requirements; and student degree level competencies for both the Associate in Arts (AA) degrees (Attachment 9; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_5a/accreditation/response/Att9.pdf) and Associate in Science (AS) degrees (Attachment 10; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_5a/accreditation/response/Att10.pdf). The resulting work of these task forces was adopted as the official UHCC system frameworks and used to evaluate the appropriateness of specific college degree requirements.

Through an affiliation with the League of Innovation, UHCC had become aware of the work of Dr. Ruth Stiehl from Oregon State University. Dr. Stiehl has created a visual system for
mapping and establishing Learning Outcomes (Attachment 11; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att11.pdf). As a part of a 2-year project for the League of Innovation and the Vanguard College project, Dr. Stiehl has worked with college programs across the country to help build faculty capacity to reconstruct curricula through systemic and strategic thinking.

In the 2003-2004 Academic Year, the UHCC System Professional Development Committee responsible for Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs initiated, planned, and implemented a two-day train-the-trainer workshop facilitated by outcomes and assessment expert, Dr. Ruth Stiehl. The training takes faculty through a hands-on program where faculty critically looks at their program to create student learning outcomes specifically for their program.

In the 2004-2005 Academic Year, federal Carl Perkins Vocational Education funds were allocated to implement a two part training sequence, and each of the seven UHCC colleges was invited to send a team of participants (from a single CTE discipline and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)/Assessment college leaders) to the workshop. Faculty members from eight CTE programs participated and were assisted with writing program SLOs and developing corresponding assessment strategies.

**Part I: Developing Effective and Measurable Student Learning Outcomes**

November 19-20, 2004 at Windward CC (2 full-day workshops – 44 participants from all seven colleges)

Program representatives mapped their courses and developed student learning outcomes for their programs. Programs included: Accounting (Leeward CC), Administration of Justice (Honolulu CC), Agriculture (Hawai`i CC), Construction Technology (Maui CC), Early Childhood Education (Honolulu CC), Electrical Installation and Maintenance (Honolulu CC), Electronics (Kauai/Hawai`i CC), New Media Arts (Kapi`olani CC).

**Part 2: Developing Assessment Strategies to Measure Student Learning Outcomes**

February 11-12, 2005 at Windward CC (2 half-day workshops – 39 participants from all seven colleges)

Program representatives reviewed their student learning outcomes with Dr. Ruth Stiehl and began to explore assessment strategies.

Hawai`i Community College also hired Dr. Stiehl to work on student learning outcomes for its general education program.

The evaluations in all sessions showed tremendous support for Dr. Ruth Stiehl and her methodology for developing and assessing SLOs and requested that she return to work with other programs.

In the 2005-2006 Academic Year, federal Carl Perkins Vocational Education funds were allocated to continue the work of Dr. Ruth Stiehl with six colleges on student learning outcomes needs specific to their college. Through the Perkins grant, Dr. Stiehl traveled to each campus to conduct a workshop specific to their needs. Additionally Hawai`i and Windward Community Colleges used college funds to host workshops for their general education programs.
Participating colleges and the number of participants:

- Hawai`i CC – February 16-17, 2006 (27 participants)
- Kapi`olani CC – March 2, 2006 (25 participants)
- Kauai CC – February 21-22, 2006 (21 participants)
- Leeward CC – February 27-28, 2006 (12 participants)
- Maui CC – February 23-24, 2006 (49 participants)
- Windward CC- March 3, 2006 (76 participants)

As a result of these workshops, colleges are using a similar method to develop student learning outcomes. Through Dr. Stiehl’s efforts, colleges have been encouraged to share their student learning outcomes. Dr. Stiehl has also shared best practices in student learning outcomes from other colleges.

A follow-up meeting with college coordinators revealed the need for Dr. Stiehl to return to focus more emphasis on assessment. Dr. Stiehl has recently written the *Assessment Primer*.

In the 2006-2007 Academic Year, federal Carl Perkins Vocational Education funds were allocated to continue this systemwide approach to training on student learning outcomes, with an emphasis on assessment.

With the establishment of the Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges in June 2005, the UH system responsibility for dealing with issues of credit articulation and student transfer across the UH system was shifted to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy (OVPAPP). The individual filling the staff position in the UHCC system was transferred to a new position in the OVPPP effective July 1, 2006 and will continue to focus on the issues of credit articulation and student transfer across the UH system.

The now vacant UHCC staff position has been re-described to focus on providing system leadership in the area of student learning and success. It is expected that the position will be filled by the start of the 2006 fall semester. The transfer of the credit articulation and student transfer function to the UH system provides the UHCC staff time to focus on system leadership responsibilities in a number of key areas, including updating student degree learning outcomes and the systematic development and application of assessment strategies.

13. **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 UHCC system established a distance learning committee to develop a more systematic approach to the development and distribution of courses and programs that utilized evolving electronic communication modes, including television and the World Wide Web. The task force identified a number of infrastructure and policy restrictions that made it difficult to achieve our goal of delivering a distance delivered AA degree.
One major infrastructure barrier, an antiquated and widely decentralized student information system, was addressed with the UH system installation of the new student information system, SCT-Banner, which is now operational at each campus. This system has made student cross-campus enrollment more efficient and provided enrollment services staff with improved capabilities for identification of individual students as well as data collection and analysis of student registrations and course-taking patterns. The varying policies and practices at each college in the UH system have, however, proven more difficult to resolve.

The major organizational changes faced by the UHCC system including questions of responsibility and authority, have limited the UHCC system’s ability to provide effective leadership on major system initiatives such as the development and implementation of common, consistent and streamlined policies and procedures. The Deans of Student Services (DOSS), financial aid officers, and registrars from across the UHCC system have worked together to discuss issues of systemwide concern develop strategies reduce barriers to students in admission, financial aid, inter-college transfer, and to provide comprehensive student support services to students enrolled at a distance.

Using a best practice model, the DOSS, in partnership with the UHCC Distance Learning Committee, have developed protocols to deal with distance learning students in the following areas:

- Financial aid
- Student multi-college registration
- Counseling and advising
- Support services for students with disabilities
- Common dates/deadlines including first and last day of registration including late registration, tuition refund dates, withdrawal deadlines, last day to make up “incomplete” grades, last day of change to credit/non-credit grade option, and last day to select “audit” grade.

14. **The system should consider and implement the infrastructure supporting the movement towards greater entrepreneurship including clarifying account 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 University continues to work towards improving its systems and procedures to encourage greater entrepreneurship at the college level. The delegation of authority to execute affiliation agreements and “sheltered classes” agreements codified in UHCCP 8.101 (Attachment 12; http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/system_aa/accreditation/response/Att12.pdf) is a first step in streamlining this process. Additional delegation of authority to execute contracts by Chancellors is under discussion.

UHCC system and college fund-raising is conducted under the leadership of the University of Hawai‘i Foundation. The UH Foundation was established in 1955 to encourage private support for the University of Hawai‘i. Today, it is the central fundraising organization for the UH System providing a host of fundraising services to all 10 UH campuses along with managing more than 3,400 gift accounts for the benefit of the university.
The mission of the University of Hawai‘i Foundation is to transform and create a better future for Hawai‘i through alumni and community philanthropic support for public higher education, to be a trusted manager of private investments, and to build and sustain the university’s relationships with donors, alumni, the community, and institutional and university partners.

The UH Foundation is a private, non-profit, institutionally related corporation designated as a 501(c) (3) organization by the Internal Revenue Service. It is a legally separate entity from the University of Hawai‘i, the UH Alumni Association, and all other UH affiliates. However, the Foundation does work closely with these organizations as well as with others in the community exclusively for the benefit of the university.

The UH Foundation supports the community colleges system and colleges through staff assigned as development officers whose function is to provide leadership and facilitation of college and Foundation fundraising activities. Funding of these positions is shared 50/50 between the college and the UH Foundation. At the close of the 2001 Fiscal Year, the book value of the Foundation Endowment for the community colleges stood at $3.9M; at the end of the 2005 Fiscal Year, the book value had grown to $7.4M.