

Accreditation Progress Report of Windward Community College

Submitted by

**Windward Community College
45-720 Kea`ahala Road
Kane`ohe, Hawai`i 96744**

To

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

October 14, 2004

Table of Contents

	Page
Certification of Progress Report	1
Statement of Report Preparation	2
Letter from ACCJC requesting a Progress Report	3
Progress Report	5
Appendices	8
Memorandum - Windward Community College Budget Committee: Charge and Calendar December 11, 2003	9
Academic Development Plan Summary Report from Dean of Instruction Carol Pang May 19, 2004	12
Memorandum – Prioritization of Strategic Plan Directions May 6, 2004	14
University of Hawai`i Community College System Assessment, Planning and Budget Development Activities August 10, 2004	16
IEC Memorandum and Reports	21
Clarification of Committee for Institutional Assessment March 30, 2004	22
Chancellor’s “Charge of the Committee” April 08, 2004	24
Report to the Chancellor May 05, 2004	25
Summary of Assessment Activities, 2000 – Present July 14, 2004	26

Certification of Institutional Progress Report

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
 Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Windward Community College
 45-720 Kea`ahala Road
 Kane`ohe, HI 96744

This Institutional Progress Report is submitted to provide information regarding the specific concerns identified by the Commission in its evaluation of the Windward Community College Self-Study Report dated July 2000, its evaluation of the Windward Community College Interim Report dated January 2003, its evaluation of the Windward Community College Focused midterm Report dated January 2004, and to report progress in meeting those concerns.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe that the Progress Report accurately reflects progress made in responding to the Commission's recommendations.

Signed _____
Dr. Angela Meixell Chancellor Windward Community College _____ Date

Dr. David McClain Acting President, University of Hawai'i _____ Date

Dr. Patricia Y. Lee Chair, Board of Regents _____ Date

Statement of Report Preparation

In a letter dated January 23, 2004 the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, accepted Windward Community College's Focused Midterm Report with the requirement that the College submit a Progress Report by October 14, 2004 addressing the college's progress in addressing program review. A complete copy of that letter follows on Page 3 of this Progress Report.

Upon receipt of the request for the Progress Report, Chancellor Angela Meixell asked Accreditation Liaison Officer Paul Field to collect the necessary information from the three committees that deal with budget, planning and program review.

The three committees that contributed information for this report were:

- 1) Budget Committee
- 2) Academic Development Plan / Strategic Plan Committee
- 3) Institutional Effectiveness Committee

The report itself was written by Paul Field, ALO and edited by Jean Shibuya. The report will be put on the campus faculty/staff list serve for comment and has been sent to the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai'i for certification.



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc1@pacbell.net
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
MARTHA ROMERO
Claremont Graduate University

Vice Chairperson
JOSEPH L. RICHEY
Public Member

Executive Director
BARBARA A. BENO

Associate Director
DEBORAH G. BLUE

Associate Director
DARLENE PACHECO

Business Officer
BARBARA DUNHAM

ITAS
TOM LANE

January 23, 2004

Dr. Angela Chaillé Meixell
Chancellor
Windward Community College
45-720 Keaahala Road
Kaneohe, HI 96744

Dear Chancellor Meixell:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 7-9, 2004, reviewed the Focused Midterm Report submitted by Windward Community College. I am pleased to inform you that the Commission acted to accept the Focused Midterm Report and require a Progress Report by **October 14, 2004**, on the institution's progress in addressing program review.

The Commission noted that the college has made substantial progress in addressing most of the recommendations that were the subject of the focused midterm. However, the college has not made adequate progress in developing and implementing a program review process linked to institutional planning and resource allocation. The college lacks a program review process that assesses student achievement and student progress, that applies to all programs and is used to inform institutional planning. This issue was also discussed in the context of the institution's substantive change review during fall 2003. The visiting team that conducted a comprehensive review of the Windward Community College in fall 2000 made the following recommendation on this matter:

Recommendation 6: The College shall carry out its educational planning in a way that draws upon program evaluation results and ties educational planning directly to planning for staffing, budget development, and program elimination/addition. (Standards 4.A.1, 4.D.2, 4.D.6).

A fall 2003 team visit to the University of Hawaii Community Colleges also found the lack of an active program review process to be a system-wide issue. Consequently, the Commission has advised the system to address this issue. The College is advised to review *2002 Standards of Accreditation* as well as the following recommendation provided to the University of Hawaii Community Colleges in a team report in January 2004, in developing its Progress Report:

Dr. Angela Chaillé Meixell
Windward Community College
January 23, 2004
Page Two

Recommendation 2: *The Team recommends that the UH Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:*

- *that the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;*
- *that the community college system as well as each college sets priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;*
- *that the colleges and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;*
- *that the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and*
- *that the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly report to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress.*

(Standards I.B., II A. 1. and 2., II.B.3.a., II B. 4., II.C.1.e and II.C.2; III.A.6., III.B.2.b., III.C.1. and 2., III.D.1. a, IV.B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards.)

The Commission requires you to give the Focused Midterm Report and this letter dissemination to campus leadership and the Board of Regents. The Commission also requires that the report be made available to the public. Placing copies in the college library can accomplish this.

Please note that the next comprehensive evaluation of Windward Community College will occur in **fall 2006**.

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

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno
Executive Director

BAB/tl

cc: Dr. Evan Dobelle, President
Dr. David McClain, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mr. Michael Rota, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mr. Paul Field, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Board President

Enclosure

Progress Report

Windward Community College has made considerable progress over the past year in addressing program review and long range planning and tying these into the budget process. This has been the result of the work of three committees: a revamped Budget Committee, the Academic Development Plan/Strategic Plan Committee and the new Institutional Effectiveness Committee. A brief history of these committees and their activities follows.

Budget Committee

In the fall of 2003 it was announced that the college was facing a serious budget deficit. Director of Administrative Services, Steven Nakasone, invited all faculty and staff to meet and discuss the problem and look for possible short-term solutions. After two well-attended general meetings it was decided that a representative budget committee should be formed to address not only the immediate budget problem but also future budget planning. In a memo entitled "Windward Community College Budget Committee" dated December 11, 2003, (Entire memo appears in appendices P. 11) Chancellor Angela Meixell gave the following charge to the Budget Committee:

The charge for the Windward Community College Budget Committee is to review, evaluate, prioritize, and make recommendations to the Chancellor regarding the use of resources in the College's operating budgets, and regarding resource requests for future college funds.

The Budget Committee was also asked to develop a working calendar based on the University of Hawai'i system budget calendar.

All major sectors of the college are now represented on the Budget Committee. The make-up of the committee and the areas represented are as follows:

Paul Field, Associate Professor History, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Winston Kong, Assistant Professor/Counselor, Student Services
Steven Nakasone, Director, Administrative Services
Sandra Okazaki, Director, Vocational and Community Education
Michael Tom, Assistant Professor/Academic Computing Coordinator,
Academic Support
Marvin Yoshida, Associate Professor Accounting, Instruction Division II
Elizabeth Young, Professor Journalism, Instruction Division I
To Be Named, Student Representative (Last year's student rep graduated)

The Budget Committee decided to use the Windward Community College Academic Development Plan 2002-2008 (ADP) to guide its long range planning. However, although the ADP did an excellent job of laying out broad guidelines for the future growth of the college it did not provide specific priorities for budgeting purposes.

As a result, in January 2004, Chancellor Meixell asked Dean of Instruction Carol Pang to reconvene the ADP Committee and assign priorities to the Academic Development Plan. The next section of this report summarizes Dean Pang's report on the ADP Committee and the transformation of this committee into the Strategic Plan Committee. (Her full report is found in the appendices on Page ?)

Academic Development Plan (ADP)/ Strategic Plan Committee

The Academic Development Plan, 2002-2008

In November 2001, the Academic Development Plan Task Force (Committee) convened and after deciding on a format divided the document into logical sections with members volunteering to research and complete particular sections, including compiling the status of each of the goals in the 1996 – 2002 Academic Development Plan.

“Think-tank” discussions were conducted on campus by the Dean of Student Services and her staff. Faculty and staff were invited to these meetings to identify goals and directions for the various sections of the report.

A draft of the Plan was distributed to all faculty and staff on April 19, 2002 with a call for comments. In the early weeks of the Fall 2002 semester a second draft was distributed and comments were again solicited. The final Plan was printed and distributed later that semester.

Prioritizing the Directions/Goals of the Academic Development Plan - The Strategic Plan

In January 2004, the Academic Development Plan Task Force was reconvened to prioritize its goals or strategic directions. The Task Force was expanded to include Department Chairs (rather than just Division representatives), at least two ETC/OCET faculty or staff, and two students in addition to the original membership.

The first step in the prioritization process was to review and update the current ADP and provide brief status statements for each goal. Then each unit prioritized each item (on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = high and 5 = low) for which it was identified as a responsible party. It was also noted that the priority would be time-based rather than value based. That is, all items were important, but it was necessary to know which ones should be done immediately, versus later.

The committee then reduced the entire list of Strategic Directions to a “short list” of those receiving average scores of 1.5 or less. Each constituent group was then asked to rank what they believed were the top 5 Strategic Directions. With justifications for the items, the rank “votes” were collected and compiled. The results were presented to the Committee to review and the Committee then revisited the list of “Resources Needed” for the top priority items for completeness and appropriateness.

The Committee's final report was sent to the Chancellor. (Appendices Page 14)
The college used the findings of this report when it developed its budget request for the University of Hawai'i's 2006-2008 biennium budget.

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

The ADP / Strategic Plan Committee addressed the question of budgeting for new initiatives but did not review existing programs. The lack of an active program review process has been a long-standing problem for both Windward Community College and the University of Hawai'i Community College system. However, in the past year there has been progress on both fronts.

On January 6, 2004, Windward Community College hosted a system-wide Evaluation, Planning and Assessment Workshop. A draft report on the system's progress in this area appears in the appendices P. 16. Immediately after the workshop the personnel from Windward Community College who had attended were asked by Chancellor Meixell to become an "Ad Hoc Program Review Committee" for the college. After several meetings this ad hoc group recommended that the college expand the representation and scope of the existing Assessment Committee to create a campus-wide program review committee. This committee was renamed the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and is chaired by Language Arts Professor, Ellen Ishida-Babineau. The charge to this committee from the Chancellor appears on P. 24 of the appendices.

A summary of the activities of the IEC Committee appears on Page 26 in the appendices. This committee will provide information to the Budget Committee to be considered when making decisions on the allocation of funds to existing programs.

Summary of Progress

In the past year Windward Community College has made considerable progress in creating an active system of planning and program review that will tie into the budget process. There is still work to be done. A college budget calendar which matches the budget deadlines of the University of Hawai'i and the Hawai'i State Legislature must be finalized and disseminated. The Budget Committee needs to finalize and publish its new budgeting guidelines. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee needs to complete a cycle of program review so it can make recommendations to the Budget Committee. However, the pieces necessary to do this are now in place and the college should be able to report further progress in its self-study to be completed in 2006.

Appendices

December 11, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Windward Community College Budget Committee

SUBJECT: Charge and Calendar

Thank you for your willingness to serve the college by working as part of the Windward Community College Budget Committee. We are confident that a more inclusive budget development process will result in better college-wide understanding of the college budget, in well-reasoned, optimum decisions, and in broad support for decisions.

THE CHARGE:

The charge for the Windward Community College Budget Committee is to review, evaluate, prioritize, and make recommendations to the Chancellor regarding the use of resources in the College's operating budgets, and regarding resource requests for future college funds.

THE COMMITTEE:

The Windward Community College Budget Committee will henceforth be a standing committee. It will have broad campus representation of faculty, staff, and students. Membership terms will be two years, but may be repeated. To provide continuity and stability, terms will be rotated.

A chair and a recorder will be elected from the membership on an annual basis in January. The Director of Administrative Services will be advisory to the committee. A record of minutes will be kept on file, and are of public record. Sub-committees may be formed as necessary.

Regarding the existing year expenditure plans, the committee will be asked to review existing distribution practices, and make recommendations for revised practices as needed. When necessary, the

committee will be asked to make recommendations concerning adjustments based on increased or decreased fund availability. The committee will be asked to recommend policy change if deemed appropriate.

Regarding the development of biennium budget requests, the following requirements are being promulgated by the system:

"While each campus may adopt a budget building process consistent with their needs and collaborative operating practices, the resulting campus budget proposals are to reflect the following hallmark characteristics:

- Recognition that funding for higher education is a shared responsibility of the state (through state general fund appropriations), students (through tuition), and campuses (through efficiency, reallocation, and/or generating other revenues).
- The campus' responsibility to generate additional revenues and to diversify revenue sources.
- The recognition of a campus' unique missions in association with the campus' responsibility to be accountable for the measurable outcomes of the campus' strategic plan goals and objectives that concurrently contribute to system strategic plan priorities.
- Recognition of operating cost increases (i.e., cost of increased enrollment, salary increases, and operating and utility costs) in balance with a reasonable amortized rate of growth in the context of the State's projected economic condition and the campus' financial plan that integrates a variety of sources of funding.
- Campus investment in support of statewide and system-wide priorities individually or in collaboration with other campuses.
- Facilities and infrastructure proposals consistent with the campus strategic plans and system priorities and long range plans. "

Windward Budget Calendar

The committee may develop a working calendar based on the knowledge that preliminary outcomes of the campus biennium budget development process must be completed by mid-March.

UH System Budget Development Calendar

Mid-March each chancellor will have an opportunity to make a fifteen-minute presentation. The purpose of the presentations is to permit each campus to explain their campus' biennium budget proposals to all other campuses as a precursor to integrating the individual campus proposals into a system-wide biennium budget proposal.

By no later than April 16 System Biennium Budget Advisory Committee shall meet, formulate, and submit its recommendations to the University's Executive Budget Committee whose members shall be the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chief of Staff, a Chancellor from a senior college, a Chancellor from a community college, and Director of the Budget.

By no later than May 6 In the context recommendations received, the University's Executive Budget Committee will formulate a draft system-wide biennium budget proposal, which shall be subject to consultation on a system-wide basis.

To May 31st Members of the University community at-large may submit comments to the University Executive Budget Committee regarding the draft on an individual or on a group basis.

By no later than June 18 The University Executive Budget Committee shall submit its recommended biennium budget proposal to the President for consideration. Upon approval, the University Biennium Budget proposal shall be concurrently submitted to the Board of Regents and posted with an appropriate announcement to a publicly accessible web-site.

Angela Meixell
Chancellor

The Academic Development Plan (ADP) 2002-2008

The Academic Development Plan Task Force consisted of representatives from all academic divisions, administrative support units, and student government. The names of the committee members can be found on the last page of the Academic Development Plan. Meetings of the Task Force began in November 2001 and ran through the Spring 2002 semester.

The Task Force (Committee) reviewed the Academic Development Plans and Strategic Plans from other UH institutions and decided on a format for the current plan that is much more abbreviated than the College's previous plan. The committee divided the document into logical sections and then members volunteered to research and complete particular sections, including compiling the status of each of the goals in the 1996 – 2002 Academic Development Plan.

The College was provided with the categories or major directions for the new Academic Development Plan. The UH Community College System provided these "directions" for use by all community colleges.

- 1.0 Promote learning and teaching for student success
- 2.0 Function as a seamless state system
- 3.0 Promote workforce and economic development
- 4.0 Develop our human resources: recruitment, retention, and renewal
- 5.0 Develop an effective, efficient, and sustainable infrastructure to support student learning

"Thinktank" discussions were conducted on campus by the Dean of Student Services and a member of her staff. Faculty and staff were invited to these meetings to identify goals and directions in the pre-determined areas described above.

The committee edited and added goal statements, with the knowledge that a draft plan would be sent out for the entire college to review and comment on. The committee also added two new sections:

- 6.0 Forge stronger links with the Windward Community
- 7.0 Strengthen the liberal arts

A draft of the Plan was distributed to all faculty and staff on April 19, 2002, and the deadline for comments was June 28, 2002. In the early weeks of the Fall 2002 semester a second draft was distributed to everyone and comments were again solicited. The final Plan was printed and distributed later that semester.

Prioritizing the Directions/Goals of the Academic Development Plan (The Strategic Plan)

In January 2004, the 2002 Academic Development Plan Task Force reconvened to update the 2002-2008 Plan and prioritize the Strategic Directions. In the first meeting, it was

decided that the membership on the Task Force be expanded to include Department Chairs (rather than just Division representatives), at least two ETC/OCET faculty or staff, and two students in addition to the current membership. All of these changes were implemented except WCC's Student Government sent only one delegate.

In addition, the Chancellor requested that the Academic Development Plan be renamed the Strategic Plan, and the Committee suggested that two additional areas be added to section 7.0 of the ADP, i.e., Support Goals for ETC/OCET and Support Goals for Student Services. Both of these were done, pending full college approval of the revised plan.

The new Strategic Plan Prioritization Committee developed an aggressive schedule to complete the update and prioritization tasks before the end of the Spring 2004 semester. The first step in the process was to review and update the current ADP and provide brief status statements for each goal. At the same time, it was decided that the person(s) identified as responsible for each goal was (were) to not only provide the brief status report, but also identify the resources the College would need to carry out the goal if it was not yet completed. Then each unit prioritized each item (on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = high and 5 = low) for which it was identified as a responsible party. It was also noted that the priority would be time-based rather than value based. That is, we recognized that all items were important, but we needed to know which ones should be done immediately, versus later.

After the initial ratings from all "responsible units" were submitted and averaged (when more than one person or party was responsible for that item), the committee decided to reduce the entire list of Strategic Directions to a "short list" of those receiving average scores of 1.5 or less. This took our list of 92 items to 45 items to 26 items to the top ranked 16 items.

The next step involved going back to each constituent group and asking them to rank order what they believed were the top 5 Strategic Directions. The ranks would then be reverse weighted (the item ranked #1 would receive 5 points, the items ranked #2 would receive 4 points, etc.) and the points tallied to determine the college's priorities. However, before this was to take place, it was suggested by a committee member that we collect "justifications" or explanations of need for each of the "short list items" from the responsible parties. This was done, although for those who did not meet the submittal deadline, no additional information was provided to the voters.

With justifications for the items, the rank "votes" were collected and compiled. The results were presented to the Committee to review and to reconcile questions that may have occurred. The Committee then revisited the list of "Resources Needed" for the top priority items for completeness and appropriateness.

The final report of the Committee's findings was sent to the Chancellor on May 6, 2004.

My docs/ADP summary report for Paul F

WINDWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

May 6, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Angela Meixell
Chancellor

FROM: Carol Pang *cp*
Dean of Instruction

SUBJECT: Prioritization of Strategic Plan Directions

On behalf of the ad hoc Strategic Plan Committee that was charged with prioritizing the Strategic Directions of Windward Community College's 2002-2008 Strategic Plan (formerly referred to as the Academic Development Plan), I would like to report the results of our committee's work.

The methodology for the prioritization project is documented in the committee meeting notes and memoranda which are attached. In its final meeting, held on April 16, 2004, the committee endorsed the following top five priorities and the corresponding resources needed.

Rank	Strategic Direction	Responsible Person(s)	Resources Needed
1	5.0 G. Provide staffing (faculty, staff, operations and maintenance, technicians, and possibly management) to enable full use of WCC facilities (including, but not limited to the Gallery, the Imaginarium, and the Theatre). Note: "Resources Needed" were prioritized into 4 categories. The highest priority group is first, followed by the next highest priority group, etc.	Chancellor, Dean of Instruction, Academic Support Staff	Computer Tech (1.0) Theatre Manager (1.0) Theatre Tech (0.5) Imaginarium Mngr/Dir (1.0) Imaginarium Tech (0.5) Facilities Coordinator (1.0) Janitor (1.0) Student Act/Life Coord. (1.0) Gallery Asst. (0.5) Bldg. Mtnce Wkr (1.0) APT for Palanakila (Fine Arts & Performing Arts) (1.0) * Laborer (1.0) Account Clerk (1.0) Business Office Clerk (1.0) Personnel Clerk (1.0)
2	5.0 H. Increase campus security personnel and inform campus community of security procedure and liabilities (protect property and people using our facilities, especially after dark).	Director of Administrative Services	\$100,000+/yr. for security
3	5.0 A. Complete plans and construction of new buildings and renovation of existing buildings in the master plan, especially the library and all parking, roads, lighting, phone lines, data lines, and utilities.	UH Administration	CIP funds for design and construction

4	7.0 J. (first bullet) Support college matriculation services, including outreach, recruitment, admission counseling, and transfer planning.	Student Services	-- Counselor position (1.0) -- Financial Aids Officer position (1.0)
5	5.0 D. Assess and establish life-cycle funding for college equipment. Institute fees where appropriate to cover the cost of supplies, maintenance, and equipment replacement.	Chancellor, College Administration	\$700,000/yr. (includes A/V, computer and Imaginarium equipment)**
<p>* This position was added after the final meeting of the ad hoc Strategic Plan prioritization committee. Ben Moffat and Paul Field recommended it's inclusion and an email was sent to all committee members to solicit comments. One committee member questioned whether it was appropriate to include this position in Strategic Direction 21, the necessity of the position, and how the position would impact the current workload of the art faculty. By the date on this memo, there was no resolution on this item.</p> <p>** Funds for maintenance of building equipment and replacement of parts = \$150,000 per year. Additional funding of \$298,650 each year over a 4-year cycle also needed to replace audio-visual equipment. Imaginarium replacement costs range from: \$8,200 to \$16,000 a year. The average allocation per station includes purchasing computer, monitor, printer, networking equipment (e.g., hubs, switches, cables, wireless stations), peripherals (e.g., scanners) and renewing existing software licenses. The actual cost for individual computers will vary considerably among higher-priced servers, laptops, and specialized faculty computers and lower-priced classroom and staff computers. The printer allocations take into account personal office printers and costlier shared workgroup printers. The given figure does not include new or individual software purchases nor support costs.</p>			

Should you have any questions, please contact me at x420.

C: Paul Field (Humanities) ✓
Nancy Heu (Academic Support)
Gerri Kabei (OCET/ETC)
Jerry Levinson (Academic Support/APT)
Ben Moffat (Faculty Senate)
Sandy Matsui (Student Services)
Chelsea Moritomo (Student)
Linka Corbin-Mullikin (Instruction)
Steve Nakasone (Administrative Services)
Sandra Okazaki (OCET/ETC)
Frank Palacat (Social Sciences)
Alan Ragains (Language Arts)
Jean Okumura (Math/Business)
Dave Ringuette (Natural Sciences)
Charles Whitten (Student Services)

University of Hawai'i Community Colleges System Assessment, Planning, and Budget Development Activities

In January 2004 and June 2004, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) made the following recommendation as part of its acceptance of the progress reports submitted by the University as part of the implementation of the new system organization:

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

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

Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

Leadership for implementing the recommended changes comes from the Council of Community College Chancellors (CCCC) with appropriate staff support provided by the community college support offices assigned to University system Vice Presidents.

Ongoing programs and current activities that support assessment of institutional effectiveness include the community colleges' annual Program Health Indicator (PHI) reports and UHCC Community Colleges Fact Book, participation in the national Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and the analysis of the current course placement process and placement testing procedures.

- **Program Health Indicators** reports provide a comprehensive, yet succinct, review of the activities of instructional programs, incorporating current year information which is comparable across programs and campuses. Major sections of the resulting program report provide descriptive information about the development and history of a program, program goals, faculty and advisory committee of the program, admission and degree requirements, courses offered in the most recent academic year and course enrollments, program performance indicators, including graphic representations of program performance on selected indicators relative to pre-established norms, and, finally, an analysis of the program outcomes. Three major clusters of program performance indicators are utilized, reflecting program demand, program efficiency, and program outcomes. The PHI reports are used by the campuses to provide an annual report to the Board of Regents on the status of academic program actions and satisfy reporting requirements under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act.

- ❑ **Fact Book** provides a *snapshot* of student, faculty, degree, and enrollment data for the UHCC System and the seven individual campuses. The report is designed to provide quick and easy access to relevant facts and current information.
- ❑ **CCSSE** -- Campuses have administered the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to enhance assessment of the quality in community college education, of good educational practices and of programs and services for students. The survey is researched-based and a project of the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin. The 2002 CCSSE survey was administered to over 3,000 students at the seven community colleges. The 2004 survey was administered at Hawai'i CC, Kapi'olani CC, Kaua'i CC, Maui CC, and Windward CC. The 2004 UH System Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) is using CCSSE (NSSE for upper division campuses) in over 20 percent of the measures.
- ❑ **Community Colleges Placement Testing (ACT COMPASS)** - The Community College Chancellors confirmed their colleges' commitment to the continued practice of using the same student placement testing instrument and common placement scores. Working with ACT, an assessment, analysis, and review of the accuracy of student placement testing cutoff scores results were conducted in 2002 and 2003. The analysis provides UHCC data on which to base revision recommendations to maximize students' probability of success and placement accuracy. The results were provided to the Deans of Instruction for review and recommendation as appropriate. Additionally, system wide testing coordinators met to review and make recommendations for standard testing procedures.

On January 6 and 7, 2004, the community colleges conducted a workshop at Windward Community College attended by approximately 140 faculty, staff, and administrators. The purpose of the workshop was to start a systemwide dialog designed to develop a better understanding of the new ACCJC standards, assess existing policies and practices and develop an action plan to meet the new ACCJC standards. From that workshop, a number of actions were initiated including:

- ❑ A charge by the Council of Community College Chancellors to the community colleges Institutional Research Cadre to develop a data portfolio/template for each campus to be used to support assessment for institutional effectiveness. The IR Cadre, composed of IR staff representatives from all campuses, has been meeting regularly under the leadership of the community college Director of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis to respond to the charge.
 - Using the UH System Data Portfolio prepared for the WASC Senior Commission visit as a model, the IR Cadre developed a portfolio/template that lists required data elements, data element definitions, data source references, and how the data will be presented and stored. IR Cadre portfolio/template recommendations were to be the subject of inter-campus discussions. A draft data portfolio/template was presented to CC Deans of Instruction and Assistant Deans of Instructions (DOI/ADOI) July 15, 2004 for review, suggest modifications, approval of recommendations, and provide more information and/or develop procedures to resolve the

operational, administrative, and policy issues.

- ❑ Review of campus policies and practices relating to assessment, planning, budgeting, and evaluation to determine congruence with ACCJC standards, and making changes as required. This process is being led by the Chancellor of each campus;
- ❑ Implementation of new practices on each campus during the 2004-05 Academic Year (AY) in preparation for the development of campus self-studies during the 2005-06 AY. The implementation process is the responsibility of the Chancellor of each campus.

On May 18, 2004, the CCCC conducted a systemwide interactive TV discussion on the progress made to date by the individual campuses on the development and implementation of campus assessment policies and procedures. More than 50 faculty, staff, and students participated in the four-hour workshop. As part of the workshop, the Institutional Research Cadre members reported the status of their portion of the data portfolio/template project.

Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement - Linked to Budget Development

Existing Board of Regents Policy (BORP Chapter 4, Section 4-3) calls for both the development of a community college statewide academic plan that includes an evaluation of State workforce requirements, and individual campus educational development plans. These plans are central to the operation of the University and its campuses.

Over the years, the community colleges have developed a systemwide planning process in response to the University BOR policy. This process has incorporated a number of elements that link processes of evaluation, planning, operational improvement, and budget development. The UH Community Colleges Strategic Planning Outline (Attached) highlighted the following elements:

- Mission and Philosophy
- Planning Context
- Assessment
- Priorities
- Resource Requirements

The resulting Community College System Strategic Plan, along with the seven individual campus strategic plans, serves as the basis for the development and improvement of programs and services, the development and renewal of physical facilities, and setting priorities for resource reallocations and State General Fund budget requests. The linkage of the Planning with Budget Development is particularly important considering that the University is still required to utilize the State Budgeting process for the State appropriated portion of the University's revenue and more than 80% of the community colleges revenues are derived from State appropriated funds.

Each of the seven UH community colleges is a separately accredited institution with a separate faculty and administration and they can and do identify individual campus

budget requirements. However, they are part of single State appropriation made to the University of Hawai'i system. Accordingly, a community college budget request consolidating the requirements for all seven campuses is required to be submitted for consideration by the Board of Regents and State.

In fall 2001, the community colleges formed Strategic Planning Council composed of the campus Chancellors (then Provosts), the Chairs of the Faculty Senates, and representatives of the Student Government Associations. This Council, under the leadership of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Michael Rota (then Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), examined external data related to the statewide environment and internal data related to campus functioning (e.g. student demand, program efficiency, and campus outcomes), and analyzed assumptions (attached Strategic Plan Appendices provide summaries). This analytical effort led to setting community college system goals and priorities, and the development of a comprehensive financial plan that incorporated anticipated revenues and expenditures needed to accomplish the plan goals by the year 2010.

This analysis has proven to be of considerable value to other State entities. Substantial pieces of the evaluation and analysis have been used by the State Workforce Development Council in its annual plan, the Office of the State Director for Career and Technical Education in its annual plan, and the Governor's Office in its submission of a grant application to the National Governors Association (NGA) dealing with workforce preparation and the role of postsecondary education. The NGA provided Hawai'i and seven other states funding to design and implement comprehensive state plans to deal with the need to get more adults into and successfully complete postsecondary education.

Following campus reviews of the Community College Strategic Plan and appropriate modifications, the Plan (attached) was submitted to the Board of Regents and approved in November 2002. Subsequently, six of the individual campus academic plans have been approved by the BOR as required by ACCJC policy (the Hawai'i CC plan was deferred pending the appointment of a permanent Chancellor). The additional State General Fund requirements identified in the Financial Plan became the basis for the community colleges 2003-05 Biennial Budget request.

Following the reorganization of the University system in December 2002 (the Substantive Change request was approved by the ACCJC in April 2003), the community college Chancellors decided to maintain the integrated planning process used to develop the current comprehensive Community Colleges Strategic Plan, and to continue the Strategic Planning Council.

In September 2003, the Strategic Planning Council convened to work on the development of the 2006-07 Biennial General Fund Budget request. The Council examined the progress made in accomplishing the priorities established in the BOR approved Plan and examined the external and internal issues that helped guide the development of the current plan.

In January 2004, the Council conducted a workshop designed to update participants on the progress made toward implementing the priorities contained in the plan, to re-assess

external and internal factors, to modify priorities if necessary, and to develop a process for the development of a financial plan for the next fiscal biennium. The Council reviewed the status and progress of 25 Key Performance Outcomes of the UHCC Strategic Plan.

The Council concluded that while community colleges have made progress over the past two years, the critical operational issues are still the highest priorities and should still serve as priorities in the development of the campuses' resource base and the community colleges' consolidated financial planning.

Following the agreement on community college priorities and goals for the 2006-07 Biennium, each campus developed a specific listing of its individual General Fund Budget request within a two year planning target of a 10% increase in our current service base. The requests were grouped into three clusters:

- Workforce and Economic Development
- Operational Improvements
- University System Initiatives

Periodic status and progress reports on the community colleges planning and budget development process are being provided to the University system through a process called "Stock-Taking." This process allows detailed outcomes from the CC planning and budget process to be fed into the University process at appropriate intervals. The University Stock-Taking process currently involves two Chancellors, one Faculty Senate Chair, and the Associate VP for Academic Affairs. The Stocktaking Process has led to the examination of important issues such as including future tuition strategies, financing of major deferred repairs and maintenance requirements, and development of a differential strategy for State General Fund support.

The University-wide General Fund budget request is being developed and the Board of Regents has scheduled a separate workshop on budget issues September 2, 2004. It is expected that the BOR will be asked to approve the community college's proposed budget request as part of the overall University of Hawai'i system budget at its regularly scheduled meeting in October 2004.

Institutional Effectiveness Committee
Memoranda and Reports

March 30, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Angela Meixell, Chancellor

FROM: Ellen Ishida-Babineau
Committee Chair

SUBJECT: Clarification of Committee for Institutional Assessment

First, my fellow team members and I would like to thank you for giving us the opportunity to attend an outstanding workshop this past spring break. The workshops were highly informative and inspiring. We learned a variety of concepts, principles, and processes related to assessment, and the workshops left us energized and eager to implement institutional assessment at Windward.

As a team, we were required to complete a capstone project, using the information gained during the workshops. Attached is a copy of this project. As you will note, the project is a plan of action proposed by the team. The first step in the plan is to clarify the role, scope, and level of authority of this committee. We have a few recommendations:

1. This committee is called the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC).
2. Since the committee should be under your purview, I will report directly to you. I suggest that the following individuals comprise this committee:
 - Patti Chong, Counselor
 - Jean Shibuya, Professor and Chair of CAAC
 - Clayton Akatsuka, Associate Professor
 - Tara Severns, Librarian
 - Frank Palacat, Instructor
 - Sandy Matsui, Dean of Student Services
 - Russell Chan, Registrar
 - Leslie Lyum, Professor
 - Nancy Heu, Head Librarian and Acting Assistant Dean of Support Services
 - A student (to be named by ASUH-WCC Senate and approved by the committee)

The committee make-up may change in the future, but I believe those who attended the workshop are committed to institutional effectiveness.

3. The role and scope of the committee is to plan and oversee an institutional schedule to ensure a systematic, comprehensive, and on-going assessment of the credit programs (liberal arts and certificate programs), non-credit programs (Employment Training Center vocational programs), and other identified units. Another function of the committee is to develop and sustain a culture of assessment throughout the institution and to provide, through workshops, presentations, and activities, the necessary training and skills for units to assess themselves.

We feel strongly that in order for assessment to become a natural part of the way we operate and educate students, a paradigm shift has to occur. As an institution, we need to constantly ask ourselves: Are we doing what we say we are doing? Are we really accomplishing our mission as an institution? How do we know? How do we know students are learning what we say they are learning? What are we doing that ensures we have a learner-centered institution? How will assessment be linked with the planning, budgeting, and allocation of resources?

4. As the team develops, plans, and implements activities, we need to have your support. In institutions that have successfully created a culture of assessment, the administrators have been in the forefront promoting, supporting, and motivating their constituents in their assessment efforts. We hope that you will provide your moral support and lend your authority to the plans and activities of this committee.
5. The chair of this committee should receive at least 6 credits during the initial effort. This obviously will have an impact on the budget, but the committee feels that this is a large task and will require concentrated effort, particularly to maintain and expand the movement toward an on-going, systematic process of self-assessment. This will require the coordination of programs, departments, disciplines, and courses.

If possible, committee members should also have some kind of compensation. If monetary compensation is not possible, acknowledgement (in public or personally) from you is important.

6. We would like you to endorse the activities of this committee, so after considering our suggestions, we request that you acknowledge our role, scope, and level of authority (however you may see them) in a memorandum so we know our mission as a committee.

Cc: Patti Chong, Counselor
 Jean Shibuya, Professor and Chair of CAAC
 Clayton Akatsuka, Associate Professor
 Tara Severns, Librarian
 Frank Palacat, Instructor
 Sandy Matsui, Dean of Student Services
 Russell Chan, Registrar
 Nancy Heu, Head Librarian and Acting Assistant Dean of Support Services
 Robert deLoach, Professor
 Carol Pang, Dean of Instruction
 Linka Mulliken, Assistant Dean of Instruction

WINDWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Office of the Chancellor

April 8, 2004

MEMORANDUM


To: Committee for Institutional Assessment
Via: Ellen Ishida Babineau
Subject: Charge of the Committee

In February, the Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment, Program Review, and Accreditation recommended that the college expand the representation and scope of the assessment committee, and named Ellen Ishida-Babineau to chair the new committee. I am very pleased that Ellen accepted that assignment and moved forward to form the new committee.

The role and scope of the committee is to plan and oversee an institutional schedule to ensure a systematic, comprehensive, and on-going assessment of the credit programs (liberal arts and certificate programs), non-credit programs (Employment Training Center vocational programs), and other identified units. Another function of the committee is to develop and sustain a culture of assessment throughout the institution and to provide, through workshops, presentations, and activities, the necessary training and skills for units to assess themselves. We feel strongly that in order for assessment to become a natural part of the way we operate and educate students, a paradigm shift has to occur. As an institution, we need to constantly ask ourselves: Are we doing what we say we are doing? Are we really accomplishing our mission as an institution? How do we know? How do we know students are learning what we say they are learning? What are we doing that ensures we have a learner-centered institution? How will assessment be linked with the planning, budgeting, and allocation of resources?

As the team develops, plans, and implements activities, you will have my full support. Ellen will receive a teaching load reduction to serve as Coordinator of Institutional Assessment.

This new standing committee has the important task of helping Windward Community College to develop an institutional climate where information drives our daily decision-making. I am excited about the prospect. Thank you for your dedication to the project.


Angela Meixell
Chancellor

May 3, 2004

TO: Chancellor Meixell

FROM: Ellen Ishida-Babineau,
Chair of Institutional Effectiveness Committee

SUBJECT: Report to Chancellor's Staff Meeting, May 4, 2004.

I. Members of the Committee

	Name	Department/Unit	Sub-Committee
1	Clayton Akatsuka	Mathematics/Business	Academic Outcomes
2	Russell Chan	Student Affairs: Registrar	Institutional Plan
3	Leslie Lyum	ETC	Culture of Assessment
4	Patti Chong	Student Affairs: Counseling	Culture of Assessment
5	Frank Palacat*	Social Sciences	Academic Outcomes
6	Janice Nuckols	Humanities	Academic Outcomes
7	Jean Shibuya*	CAAC; Language Arts	Academic Outcomes
8	Nancy Heu	Academic Support/Admin	Academic Support/Student Affairs
9	Sandy Matsui	Student Affairs/Admin	Academic Support/Student Affairs
10	Malie Hirao	Staff	Institutional Timeline
11	Tara Severns	Academic Support/Library	Outcomes
12	Mikki O'Phelan	Student Representative	Academic Support/Student Affairs
13		Natural Sciences	
14		ETC: VocTech	
15	Paul Field	Accreditation Liaison Officer	Ex-officio
16	Robert deLoach	Assessment Committee	Ex-officio

*Co-Chairs

II. Subcommittees identified:

- A. Culture of Assessment
- B. Institutional Timeline
- C. Academic Outcomes (institutional, program, department, discipline, course outcomes)
- D. Academic Support/Student Affairs

III. Accomplishments/Plans

- A. Creation of Accreditation/Assessment workroom/meeting place in Palanakila 117
- B. Subcommittees meeting before the next general meeting, May 19, 2004: plans for initial activities, plans of action, workshops are on the way. The target date for initiating all activities is August (convocation week).
- C. Revising glossary of assessment terms
- D. Frank Palacat has created a website: WCC Institutional Effectiveness; this website is still in construction.
- E. IEC Newsletter
- F. Discussion underway for Assessment Library

WINDWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

July 14, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Paul Field
Accreditation Liaison Officer

FROM: Ellen Ishida-Babineau *EB*
Chair, Institutional Effectiveness Committee

SUBJECT: Summary of Assessment Activities, 2000-present

In May 2000, David Denison and Robert deLoach, Social Sciences faculty, presented the document *AA Degree Assessment at Windward Community College: Some Considerations and Recommendations* to the Windward administration. This document, with strong support from the administration, laid the foundation for the assessment process on this campus. Following recommendations from this document, representatives from Language Arts, Mathematics, and Humanities (Fine Arts) were sent to the 2001 AAHE Assessment Conference in Colorado. The faculty members became the initial Assessment Committee, spearheaded by Robert deLoach. By August 2001, a student, a clerical staff member, an APT member (the registrar), and an administrator were included.

The Assessment Committee followed three basic rules: develop a cadre of trained faculty members, start small, and make sure the assessment process is faculty-driven. The committee decided to start the assessment process with the General Education requirements for the AA degree. The following is a chronology¹ of assessment activities up through May 2004:

Fall 2001	Spring 2002
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communications start assessment process Writing Intensive courses start assessment process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communications completed Writing Intensive Courses completed
Fall 2002	Spring 2003
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logical Reasoning starts assessment process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> World Civilizations starts assessment process Social Sciences starts assessment process Natural Sciences starts assessment process
Fall 2003	Spring 2004
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative/Logical Reasoning (Mathematics) starts assessment process World Civilizations completes assessment process Arts and Humanities starts assessment process Computer and Information Literacy starts assessment process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) created to consolidate all assessment on campus (14 members: academic departments/ETC, administrators, staff, and students represented); IEC website created. Quantitative/Logical Reasoning (Mathematics) assessment completed Logical Reasoning completes assessment process and starts 2nd assessment Social Sciences completes assessment process Dean of Instruction Office starts assessment process Student Services starts assessment process OCET/ETC starts assessment process Administrative Services starts assessment process Humanities—Performing Arts starts assessment process Learning Resources starts assessment process Computer and Information Literacy assessment process completed

¹From a revision of the *Windward Community College, Brief Progress Report* presented on May 18, 2004 at UHCC Follow-up Meeting held via HITS. Assessment Committee progress based on *Windward Community College Assessment Plan, 2001-2005*.

As assessment extended to other General Education outcomes, the committee expanded to include others who attended various workshops and conferences, locally and nationally. By the end of AY 2003-2004, the Assessment Committee was composed of thirteen members, each member having completed most, if not all, the steps in the assessment process for their discipline area.

Since 2001, the focus has been on assessing outcomes for AA General Education requirements. However, in Spring 2004, Robert deLoach expanded the assessment process to the non-instructional units. The Office of the Dean of Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, Learning Resources, and OCET/ETC are currently in the assessment process. These units are expected to complete the first cycle of assessment in Fall 2004.

Recognizing the need to consolidate all assessment efforts into a comprehensive, systematic, and cohesive plan of action, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) was formed by Chancellor Meixell. See attached Memorandum to the Committee for Institutional Assessment, dated April 8, 2004. The IEC is comprised of representatives from all academic departments, administration, learning resources, student services, CAAC, and clerical staff. See attached memo to Chancellor Meixell, Report to Chancellor's Staff Meeting, May 4, 2004. Since that memo, Ingelia White has joined the committee, representing the Natural Sciences department.

The mission of the IEC is to provide an institutional framework and timeline for the assessment cycle; provide leadership, training, and support throughout the assessment cycle; and to support and maintain the culture of assessment initiated by the original Assessment Committee. The IEC has **tentatively** planned the following activities²:

Fall 2004	Spring 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convocation: Conduct departmental goals workshop • Departments work on departmental goals • Mission Statement; create SLO's for Mission Statement • Celebration after department goals submitted • Draft an institutional framework and time for all units and programs • Work with other components (Budgeting, Strategic Planning, and Accreditation) to create campus policy regarding decision-making process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convocation: Share departmental goals with campus • Start work on course outcomes
Fall 2005	Spring 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convocation: Present institutional goals • Course outcomes submitted to CAAC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmental goals included in catalog; Deadline: February 15, 2006 • Convocation: Conduct workshops to start assessment of courses/departmental goals • Departments assess alignment with Mission Statement and Department Goals.

The IEC will be meeting on August 2 and August 9 to finalize activities during Convocation week.

In addition, the IEC and the Accreditation Committee have collaborated to house all assessment and accreditation material in one area. This meeting area/library/work area will be in Palanakila. Anticipating a need for additional resources, the IEC ordered the following material:

Assessment in Student Affairs
Learner-Centered Teaching
Assessment Essentials
Assessment in Practice
Building Scholarship Assessment
Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation
Assessment Clear and Simple
The ABCs of Evaluation

Both committees now need to set up this area so that it is functional by August 16, 2004.

²A combination of *Windward Community College, Brief Progress Report* and the *Combined Timeline for Academic Outcomes and Culture of Assessment, Fall 2004-Spring 2005* given to the IEC members on May 19, 2004.