

December 14, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Douglas Dykstra, Chancellor, Windward Community College

SUBJECT: Inaccuracies in 2012 Evaluation Report

Thank-you for this opportunity to address what I consider to be inaccuracies in the report of the visiting team. I believe these inaccuracies to be rooted in a serious and fundamental problem in the performance of the visiting team. This problem has been identified in some of the assessments of the visiting team that have been completed by faculty, staff and students of the college. In short, the visitors did not corroborate evidence that would become foundational to subsequent college recommendations and/or negative judgments about college responses to recommendations from 2006. I have polled members of my administrative team and **none of them, myself included**, were interviewed about evidence foundational to the recommendations on integrated planning, student learning outcomes in non-credit courses and in student affairs, evaluation of the governance and decision-making structures, and staffing plans.

The visiting team has found that the college has **partially met** the requirements of **Recommendation #1 (2006)**. The only negative evidence adduced in the findings and evidence section on pps. 11-12 is that the Planning and Budget Council's "(P)lanning activities were limited during 2010-11; planning resumed in spring 2012." This is a complete inaccuracy as demonstrated by the evidence to follow. If anyone on the team had bothered to corroborate this damaging inaccuracy I, in my capacity as chair of the Planning and Budget Council, could have corrected it. Since this is the only negative information to be found in the findings and evidence on pps. 11-12, I believe that the conclusion on p. 12 that "The College has partially met the recommendation..." is without foundation and should be changed to a conclusion that the college has met Recommendation #1 (2006). A summary of Planning and Budget Council minutes follows:

During 2010 – 2011, the Planning and Budget Council did the following:

- (1) The Administration Team was authorized the discretion to expand the four specific spending categories of the redistribution of the \$500,000 in the best interest of the college (February 5, 2010, minutes)
- (2) Determined the categories for all PBC Requests to be:

OE: Operating Equipment
OO: Operating Other
PN: PCR-New Initiative
PW: PCR-Workload
PF: PCR-New Facilities

CP: CIP-New Facility
CR: CIP-Renovation
CM: CIP-Repairs & Maintenance

[\(February 12, 2010, minutes\)](#)

- (3) Established and prioritized Program Change Requests (major budget requests for funding keyed to System priorities) to be sent to the UHCC Office for submission to the UH System President's Office for inclusion in the Biennium Budget
[\(February 19, 2010, minutes\)](#)

- (4) Prioritized and allocated Equipment Purchases - Equipment Purchases Reviewed: \$492,652 proposed to be spent including approximately \$17,500 of equipment requests from the past.

No questions or opposition to this prospect. [\(February 26, 2010 and April 16, 2012, Minutes\)](#)

- (5) Voted to purchase a Bio-core Q Machine for \$160K: using the \$113K of ARRA funds recently released by the UHCC System. [\(April 16, 2012, and May 18, 2010, Minutes\)](#)

- (6) A space for divisional priorities was added to the PBC Summary Sheet for 2010-2011 at the [October 1, 2010](#), PBC meeting. This must be completed by the responsible Unit Administrator (Vice Chancellor, Chancellor, or Director) and be informed by a separate Departmental prioritization into tiers 1, 2 or 3 with 1 being the highest priority.

- (7) In 2009-2010, testimony was provided to the PBC by Unit Administrators. In 2010-2011, the requestor of the budget item before the PBC will provide testimony before PBC completes its rating of the item and the unit administrator will determine who is to present the testimony.
[\(October 1, 2010, Minutes\)](#)

- (8) PBC Summary sheet will be reduced to one rating based on merit to include a narrative summary with a description and rationale explaining how it is linked to SLO/Process Outcome analysis as well as Program Review analysis along with an itemized list of positions, supplies and equipment to be rated by each PBC member on a 0 to 5 point scale. [\(October 1, 2010, Minutes\)](#)

A title of request line to be completed by the requestor was added to the PBC Summary Sheet demonstrating ongoing evaluation of council procedures and documents. [\(October 1, 2010, Minutes\)](#)

- (9) The 2010-11 Operational Expenditure Plan was presented by Cliff Togo along with line item explanations. ([November 5, 2010](#))
- (10) Ke Kumu Pali (KKP- Council of faculty and staff on WinCC campus in support of Hawaiian Studies curricula and programs) is established as an enfranchised, participating body in the deliberations of the Planning and Budget Council where it will submit its annual report and describe its budget requests via the Chancellor preparatory to sending its budget requests on to Pukoa Council (U.H. System Council of fac/staff in support of Hawaiian Studies). ([November 5, 2010](#))
- (11) Proxies will be recognized to act on behalf of Planning and Budget Council representatives if the Chair of the Planning and Budget Council is notified in writing at least one day in advance by the representative of the intent to send a proxy. ([November 5, 2010](#))
- (12) A second voting student representative shall be added to the Planning and Budget Council to be recruited by the Student Government from a student constituency other than the Student Government itself. . ([November 5, 2010](#))
- (13) The URL for PBC Policy & Procedures is <http://windward.hawaii.edu/ir/PBCCouncil/2009/PBCPolicyAndProcedures11-3-09.pdf> ([November 5, 2010](#))
- (14) The three available options for a college Mission, Vision and Core Values statement were discussed pursuant to a procedure managed by the Faculty Senate requesting the PBC to give its advisory recommendations along with similar advice from the Accreditation Steering Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. ([December 10, 2010](#))
- (15) The Director of Planning and Program Evaluation provided an update on the college's progress with Strategic Plan targets by emphasizing fields in which the college is challenged to hit the targets, hence the focus was focused on a minority of the strategic plan targets. ([December 10, 2010](#))
- (16) Achieving the Dream items reported in the Strategic Plan suggest a mixed bag of results suggesting that the interventions being tried may be helping as necessary cause of improvements but perhaps not sufficient cause. ([December 10, 2010](#))
- (17) The suggestion of a Summer Rump Committee of the PBC that would comprise those members of the committee who will be available in the summer months when inevitably planning and budget decisions have to be made on a short turnaround basis was discussed and will be formed for the 2010-2011 year. ([December 10, 2010](#))
- (18) This is a Supplemental Budget year when typically we are not allowed to make new spending requests. Consequently we will consider matters such as:

- Allocation of the equipment (new & replacement) fund of up to \$500K depending upon our fiscal health for the year;
- Position allocations based on the availability of vacated, unfilled positions;
- Planning for the allocation of performance based budget supplements (good news, if funded by the Legislature we are now attaining our graduation targets for Native Hawaiian students as well as for All Students...the only goals that heretofore we had failed to meet);
- Planning for satisfaction of our Library Learning Commons equipment and position needs since we may have to set up an escrow fund for the equipment and consider re-allocating recently vacated positions to fulfill our LLC needs. ([December 10, 2010](#))

(19) Academic Support unit heads from the Library, Media Center and the Computer Center were asked to work together chaired by the Dean of Division I. The outcome of such a meeting would be to produce a proposal to accommodate the needs of all three over the course of this academic year and the two following years in light of the huge equipment needs of the new Library Learning Center. ([February 11, 2011](#))

(20) A new, non-voting member of the PBC tasked to advise the PBC on the adequacy of its efforts to analyze and apply outcomes assessment data as a substantive aspect of its program/unit review documentation was introduced. ([February 25, 2011](#))

(21) A Supplies Budget Allocation Adjustment Formula to adjust the budgets in accordance with enrollment increases and/or decreases was presented and unanimously accepted. ([February 25, 2011](#))

(22) Academic Support presented the request for technology new equipment for the new Library Learning Commons. Owing to a combination of factors including price Planning & Budget Council Meeting Notes February 25, 2011, decreases over the years; elimination of outdated technology, substitution of cheaper models and newer, alternative technology and other factors the cost of equipping the facility has been brought down from \$975K to \$415K which could be accomplished if the purchasing takes place over a three-year period. ([February 25, 2011](#))

(23) A draft of a PBC Summary Sheet rating [rubric](#) was distributed and committee members were asked to e-mail recommended edits or questions asap. ([April 1, 2011, Minutes](#))

(24) An assessment of PBC procedures will be conducted at the end of the spring semester to produce possible considerations for upcoming amendments to the processes and procedures of the Council. ([April 1, 2011, Minutes](#))

- (25) The PBC considered the possible options for funding the equipment requests for the Library Learning Commons with the knowledge that the \$415,000 total requested would be purchased sometime after January 1st 2012 to accommodate schedule for moving into the LLC anytime from mid-February 2012 through mid-summer 2012. ([April 29, 2011](#))
- (26) The LLC equipment fund requirements will be funded by taking \$150,000 from the accumulated summer school balance and committing the total balance of summer school receipts for the next two summers (2011 & 2012) until the equipment needs of the LLC (\$415,000) are fully funded. ([April 29, 2011](#))
- (27) That the PBC fund the other half of the equipment requests of Computing Services (\$100,000); Media Services (\$75,000); and Operations and Maintenance (\$25,000) to bring the total funding for equipment to \$400,000 divided as follows: Computing Services (\$200,000); Media Services (\$150,000); and Operations and Maintenance (\$50,000). ([April 29, 2011](#))
- (28) With the remaining available \$100,000 the council discussion clearly indicated that the equipment list as voted on by the council should be taken as a motion that the Chancellor should fund in full by moving down the list seriatim until the available funding was exhausted. ([April 29, 2011](#))
- (29) All Vice Chancellors and Directors should incorporate depreciation reports as a portion of future program and unit reviews. ([October 21, 2011](#))
- (30) The Chancellor distributed a vision statement entitled [*Tactical Targets for Windward Community College in Pursuit of Strategic Plan Goals to 2015 and Beyond*](#) for a first reading by the PBC. ([October 21, 2011](#))
- (31) Vice Chancellor Cliff Togo distributed handout for WCC Operational Expenditure Plan FY 11-12 (FY 2012) and also displayed it on the screen. ([November 18, 2011](#))
- (32) The Council approved a proportional distribution of the available equipment replacement funds as follows:
- Computer Technology= 40% of available funds
 - Media Technology = 30% available funds
 - Auxiliary Svces = 10% available funds
 - All other depts./units = 20% available funds
- (33) The Chancellor reminded the committee that we will have to put 5% into an escrow account which will be managed by the System office. ([December 2, 2011](#))

College Recommendation #2 (2012) is also greatly undermined by the foregoing summary of minutes from the Planning and Budget Council when one notes that the recommendation calls for "...the college (to) design, document and implement an effective, integrated planning model, system of program review and resource allocation process which is inclusive of all institutional planning activities (emphasis added) **including administrative services and technology.**" This is what the Planning and Budget Council is and has been for more than three years, moreover Administrative Services has held three permanent, voting seats on the Council and Computer Tech Services has held one of two Academic Support voting seats. Currently the other seat is held by Media Tech Services. In short Administrative Services, Computer Tech Services and now Media Tech Services are organic parts of the formal body that analyzes program review documents along with outcomes assessment reports to produce planning and budgeting initiatives on behalf of the college as a whole. The remainder of the recommendation proposes that "(T)he college should develop formal systematic evaluation mechanisms for assessing the quality and effectiveness of planning structures and processes...", and this will be part and parcel of the college's re-furbished GSIEC assessment process discussed later in this rejoinder to the visiting team's evaluation report. This does need to be done and the recommendation will give us the impetus to do so, however the earlier emphasis upon integrating Administrative Services and Technology in the process is mystifying. Again it is too bad that no one from the visiting team had the foresight to interview me about this matter.

The team has found that the college has not met the requirements of **Recommendation #2 (2006)**. However the findings and evidence section on pps. 12-13 recognizes the college for continuing to follow a five-year assessment plan for SLO's at the course level, integrating the results into program reviews and into the integrated planning process. We deserve praise for these accomplishments. **Admittedly** we have continued work to complete the assessment of GELO's and PLO's but if anyone had bothered to corroborate their findings with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Chair of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) they would have found out that we have a plan for this next level of learning outcomes assessment. The IEC is collecting the evidence at present and what we need is encouragement to continue to implement the plan already in place. **We do not deserve the conclusion that we have not met Recommendation #2 (2006). We should at least receive a partially met determination for this recommendation.** Any subsequent recommendation for 2012 on student learning outcomes **should not include** the preamble "As stated in the 2006 visiting team report..." because the college is making substantial progress with broad-based, faculty driven participation in the assessment and analysis of SLOs. As a final bit of contradictory internal evidence from the team's own report I draw your attention to pps. 30-31 beginning at the bottom of the page with: "The college aligns SLOs with its mission, and the Associate in Arts degree, as well as with programs and certificates..." and continuing through the next four sentences in the same vein praising a faculty driven process to analyze SLO assessment that results in making programmatic changes. How

these observations can be included in harmony with the earlier conclusion that we have not met the requirements of Recommendation #2 (2006) cannot be explained logically.

Finally, the report includes claims on pps. 13, 18, 30, 33 & 35 that neither the non-credit courses nor the Student Affairs division has identified SLO's for their respective operations. Again, neither the Interim Director of the Office of Career and Community Education (OCCE), nor the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs was interviewed about these damaging inaccuracies. The rejoinder from OCCE and the Office of Student Affairs follows:

The Career and Community Education (CCE) unit offers workforce training certificates, personal enrichment courses, and an adult basic education course (Ready Set Grow). The unit has stated SLOs for its workforce training courses. The SLOs are aligned with the national or state standards for certification. The unit assesses the SLOs and monitors students' scores on the state and national certification exams. The unit does not have SLOs identified for its personal enrichment courses which include Ikebana, Play in Clay, Clutter Free, and Slack Key Guitar. These classes are designed to be an accessible and affordable way for the community to experience enrichment without tests and grades. The unit monitors students' experience and satisfaction with the enrichment courses through end of class surveys.

The unit **has identified SLOs for Ready Set Grow which has been renamed iCAN.** The Ready Set Grow/ iCAN program began in fall 2011. The SLOs were assessed and modified based on the results at the end of spring 2012. Upon the request of visiting team member Ms. Lisa Marchand, the Interim Director of CCE sent the modified iCAN SLOs and rubrics to her through email on October 16, 2012. **The Interim Director was not asked to provide SLOs and assessment information for the other non-credit courses.**

Following are the SLOs and Assessment charts for Windward CC's non-credit workforce development certificate programs. These assessment charts are found in the Annual Report for CCE for 2011-2012 due to the College by 12/7/12:

Ocean Safety Education Course - The curriculum meets the requirements of the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules regarding safety education and regulations of the sport of tow-in surfing in Hawaii. Students must demonstrate proficiency in all learning outcomes to earn certification. From summer 2010 – spring 2012 the success rate for the Ocean Safety course was 100%.

Aggregate results from summer 2010-spring 2012

SLOs	Assessment tool	Benchmark	Results	Recommendation
The legal and regulatory requirements for persons who participate in the	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made

sport of tow-in surfing in the State of Hawaii.				
Basic cardiopulmonary resuscitation.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made
Equipment commonly used in sport of tow-in surfing.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made
Guidelines for physical fitness training, using S.S.A.F.E. principles, commonly used by ocean safety professionals who perform high surf rescues in the State of Hawaii.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made
Ocean safety practices commonly used in high surf situations in the State of Hawaii using risk management principles.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made
U.S.C.G. boating skills and rules of the road as they apply to the sport of tow-in surfing.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made
Commonly used safety procedures and in-water etiquette used by practitioners of the sport of tow-in surfing.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made

Recreational Thrill Craft Operator Course - The curriculum meets the requirements of the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules regarding boating and safety education for operators of personal

water craft or thrill craft in Hawaiian waters. Students must demonstrate proficiency in all learning outcomes to earn certification. From summer 2010 –spring 2012, the success rate for Recreational Thrill Craft Operator course was 99%.

Aggregate results from summer 2010-spring 2012

SLOs	Assessment tool	Benchmark	Results	Recommendation
Ocean safety principles and practices developed and utilized by ocean safety professionals in the State of Hawaii.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	95% proficient	No changes made
Federal and State of Hawaii boating rules and regulations pertaining to personal water craft operation.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	97% proficient	No changes made
Historical, cultural, and customary ocean recreational practices in the near shore waters of the Hawaiian Islands.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made
Laws and rules pertaining to endangered and protected species commonly found in the near short Hawaiian waters.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made
Basic operation and maintenance of the personal water craft.	Test	90% of students score at Proficient level on test	100% proficient	No changes made

Introduction to Photo-voltaics – The curriculum is aligned to and prepares students for the North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioners (NABCEP) PV Entry-Level Exam. Since spring 2012 38 out of 52 students successfully passed the course. Out of the 38 that passed, 25 took the NABCEP and 52% of those or 13 students received the NABSEP certification.

Aggregate results from spring 2012-summer 2012

SLOs	Assessment tool	Benchmark	Results	Recommendation
Describe the function and performance characteristics of the basic components of a photovoltaic power system.	Test	75% of students score at Competent level on test	80% scored at competent level	No changes
Determine the energy requirements for any desired application(s).	Test	75% of students score at Competent level on test	70% scored at competent level	Added a 30 hour fundamentals course to help students with problematic concepts underlying this SLO
Determine the capacity and specifications for each of the components required in a solar electric power system.	Test	75% of students score at Competent level on test	70% scored at competent level	Added a 30 hour fundamentals course to help students with problematic concepts underlying this SLO
Evaluate the initial cost and comparative economics of alternative system designs.	Test	75% of students score at Competent level on test	74% scored at competent level	Added a 30 hour fundamentals course to help students with problematic concepts underlying this SLO
Qualify to sit for the NABCEP PV Entry Level Exam.	Must be proficient in above SLOs	75% of students eligible for NABSEP exam	73% eligible for exam	Added a 30 hour fundamentals course to help students with problematic concepts

Certified Nurse Aide Training – The curriculum prepares students for the Hawai'i State Nurse Assistant Competency Evaluation Testing Program. Student must demonstrate proficiency on all SLOs in order to pass the course and qualify to take the certification exam.

Aggregate results from summer 2010-spring 2012

SLOs	Assessment tool	Benchmark	Results	Recommendation
Demonstrate patient safety and emergency procedures	Skills test during clinical	80% of students score at Proficient level on skills test	85% proficient	Based on student surveys unit is developing online skills demonstration so students can practice more before the final skills test.
Demonstrate personal care skills including bed making, oral care, and skin care	Skills test during clinical	80% of students score at Proficient level on skills test	80% proficient	Based on student surveys unit is developing online skills demonstration so students can practice more before the final skills test.
Observe and report on patient symptoms, vital signs, height, weight	Skills test during clinical	80% of students score at Proficient level on skills test	85% proficient	Based on student surveys unit is developing online skills demonstration so students can practice more before the final skills test.
Demonstrate proper feeding techniques	Skills test during clinical	80% of students score at Proficient level on skills test at Proficient level on skills test	83% proficient	Based on student surveys unit is developing online skills demonstration so students can practice more before the final skills test.
Demonstrate techniques for assisting patients with elimination	Skills test during clinical	80% of students score at Proficient level on skills test	80% proficient	Based on student surveys unit is developing online skills demonstration so students can practice more before the final skills test.
Demonstrate proper techniques when caring for residents with tubes	Skills test during clinical	80% of students score at Proficient level on skills test	90% proficient	Based on student surveys unit is developing online skills demonstration so students can practice more before the final skills test.

Demonstrate appropriate response to patients with mental health and social service needs	Skills test during clinical	80% of students score at Proficient level on skills test	83% proficient	Based on student surveys unit is developing online skills demonstration so students can practice more before the final skills test.
Demonstrate proper techniques for patients with cognitive impairments including dementia and Alzheimer	Skills test during clinical	80% of students score at Proficient level on skills test	83% proficient	Based on student surveys unit is developing online skills demonstration so students can practice more before the final skills test.

Ready Set Grow – provides adult learners basic skill instruction in reading, writing and math.

Ready Set Grow Assessment Chart: fall 2011- spring 2012

SLO	Assessment Tool	Benchmark	Results	Recommendation
Students will be able to solve real-world and mathematical problems involving everyday living concepts of purchasing and paying for products.	Tests and projects	80% of students score at level 2 (satisfactory)	60% scored at level 2 or higher	Modify math curriculum
Students will be able to integrate reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills in the daily tasks of navigating daily living in school and work.	Projects	80% of students score at level 2 (satisfactory)	80% scored at level 2 or higher	Although students met benchmark, program is modifying curriculum
Students will be able to produce clear, concise, grammatical and punctuation correct sentences and paragraphs in various living and work related documents such as letters, memos, research papers, and	Projects	80% of students score at level 2 (satisfactory)	80% scored at level 2 or higher	Although students met benchmark, program is modifying curriculum

other written work projects.				
Students will produce an individual career plan that will outline the necessary steps and activities to accomplish a career goal in the next three years.	Career Plan	80% of students score at level 2 (satisfactory)	100% scored at level 2 or higher	No Changes
Students will perform decision-making and interpersonal skills at the level where problem solving and resolving conflict in the context of a team is done effectively.	Team project	80% of students score at level 2 (satisfactory)	70% scored at level 2 or higher	Modify team project and rubric

As to the claim that Student Support Services do not have SLO's or the assessment of SLO's please note that this claim is made on page 13, and repeated on page 35, "...program-based SLOs in Student Affairs is minimal." And again on page 36 "...five other Student Affairs departments depend on program work/responsibility goals, student grades and satisfaction surveys, but not student learning outcomes." Or again on page 36, "...the SLO for counseling is not stated as an actual learning outcome."

Please consider the following facts concerning Student Support Services and SLO assessment: **Standard IIB: Student Support Services**

Since the 2006 accreditation site visit, Student Affairs has indeed engaged in significant professional development centered on Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment. Evidence of this was sent to the Evaluation Visit Team Assistant, Michelle Davila on 10/17/2012 after the WCC Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs visit with visiting team member Dr. Yamagata-Noji. This was not asked for by visiting team members at the time, but the Vice Chancellor did so as a personal follow-up to provide data for observations made in her meeting with Dr. Yamagata-Noji. This follow-up provided five examples of such professional development which have occurred since 2010 (when the Vice Chancellor began work at WCC). The examples gave time, title, and a brief description including who attended. A final paragraph on this page noted the resulting visioning done for Counseling which had resulted in a revision of outcomes for Counseling. Each professional development event can be verified with agendas from workshops and convocations available on our website (e.g.) http://windward.hawaii.edu/Calendar/2010/Convocation_Fall/, http://windward.hawaii.edu/Calendar/2011/Convocation_Fall/, etc.) or through travel documents for off-site workshops and training.

In the conversation with Dr. Yamagata-Noji, the Vice Chancellor had discussed that Counseling had significantly revised their learning outcomes. No requests for evidence were asked for at that time or earlier. Other staff noted that they also discussed this visioning and outcome creation in their meetings. During the time of the site visit, the new outcomes were displayed on the wall of the Student Affairs conference room (Hale 'Akoakoa 201).

Counseling met for three half day workshops in Spring 2012 to review and revise their mission and outcomes. At the final meeting on May 9, 2012, the counselors finalized the following three outcomes, which have begun to be assessed for the 2012-13 school year:

1. Students will access accurate and appropriate information with regard to Academic Status, Resource Availability and their Next Step in their Educational Plan.
2. Counselors will foster student engagement through promoting a relationship based on trust (consistency and reliable information), respect and multiple contacts.
3. Students will develop critical thinking through Identifying Resources; Evaluating Options; Establishing Priorities; Designing Education Plans and Implementing Actions.

Note that outcomes (1) and (3) are student learning outcomes. Outcome (1) links directly to our General Education SLO regarding information literacy. Outcome (3) links directly to our Critical Thinking and Creativity General Education SLO. These were not substantiated in our last annual report as they have been developed since then. They are currently being assessed, are displayed on the Student Affairs conference room wall, and will be included in the next annual report.

Other SLO's in Student Affairs were also documented in our previous annual report(s). These included the SLO for Supplemental Instruction:

After attending regular SI sessions, the student will be able to apply learned study habits to improve class course work.

The SLO for Career Services is also documented in our annual reports:

Students will define their academic goal, plan a course schedule for the semester, and register for these courses accordingly.

Finally the shared SLO of our three TRIO programs is substantiated in our previous annual reports:

Students will submit an accurate and completed FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid).

Thus, 6 major areas with Student Affairs have documented learning outcomes with completed assessment, evidence of this assessment, budgetary requests made based on this assessment, and reflection on practice made based on this assessment. Financial Aid, Admissions & Records, and Outreach are the three remaining areas which do not have student learning outcomes. These areas have process or service area outcomes generally related to efficiency, demand, and satisfaction, which link to our mission and our strategic plan. These were revised through our professional development workshop on 9/12-13/2011 with Dr. Terri Manning, which concerned Non-instructional SLO's. These process outcomes have been continuously reviewed and utilized for unit improvement plans as well as budget requests and reflection on practice. Indeed, a new position was allocated to Financial Aid in 2012 based on their annual review.

In discussion with Dr. Yamagata-Noji, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs also noted that our New Student Orientation, Frosh Camp, Supplemental Instruction, and the Intro to College class that Student Affairs oversees have all been directly linked to General Education SLO's and are part of the GE SLO matrix at WCC.

The team has found that the college has **partially met Recommendation #5 (2006)** and I believe that you must find that the college has met the recommendation. The internal logic of your own findings and evidence section in which the final two paragraphs on page 15 accept the validity of GSIEC (Governance Sub-committee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee) survey efforts beginning in 2008 and refer to the Mongold Report's external evaluation of GSIEC which has produced "...a new Policy of Assessing Governance which was passed by the Faculty Senate in late spring 2012..." cannot exist in the same report with the final sentence of the preceding paragraph. That sentence states in part "...and the college does not have a plan to conduct follow-up assessment of the governance structure." **The two sentences are mutually contradictory, and I believe that logic dictates that you accept the Mongold Report as the foundation of the college's plan to re-structure its GSIEC governance evaluations stronger than before.**

Any subsequent recommendation on these matters for 2012 (i.e. **College Recommendation #5 2012**) should praise the college for implementing an extensive effort to evaluate governance processes and encourage us to continue to implement the findings of the Mongold Report to improve, simplify and strengthen those governance assessment efforts. I am compelled to object to the negative tone of this visiting team's observations concerning the work of GSIEC. Hereafter you will find the casual hire forms for the work of an external evaluator (Mongold is the Sr. Analyst for the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy at the UH System Office) who produced the Mongold Report as well as evidence of the efforts to survey and assess governance efforts under the auspices of GSIEC:

In accordance with the [Policies and Procedures](#) of the GSIEC, which were passed by the Faculty Senate, the following GSIEC Surveys were distributed in 2009. Thirty-five percent of the campus responded. Members of the Commission may access any of the hot-linked items with the following temporary user name: accjcwcc808@gmail.com and password: 399432492

Governance SubCommittee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (GSIEC) - 2009

The governance structure or leader, self-assessments, survey tabulation results, and charts for each governance structure or leader is linked below. The self-assessments are based on the charts and data tables. After reviewing the self-assessment you can use the charts and data tables to "drill-down" to review the survey results in detail.

<u>Structure or Leader</u>	<u>Self- Assessments</u>	Non-member (NM) and Member (M) Charts (C) and Data Tables (T)			
		<u>NM-C</u>	<u>NM-T</u>	<u>M-C</u>	<u>M-T</u>
Faculty Senate Chair Windward	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Faculty Senate Chair System	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Faculty Senate Chair Recording	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Faculty Senate Organization	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Office of Administrative Services	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Vice Chancellor Administrative Services	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Office of the Chancellor	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Vice Chancellor	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Assistant Dean I	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Assistant Dean II	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Office of Vice Chancellor	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Office of Student Services	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Office of Vocational and Community Education	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Director Vocational and Community Education	Jan 2009	X	X	X	X
Aesthetics Committee	Mar 2009	X	X	X	X
CCAAC - Instruction	Mar 2009	X	X	X	X
CAAC - ETC	Sept 2009	X	X	X	X

Dean's Advisory Council	<u>Mar 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
International Education	<u>Mar 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Ke Kumu Pali	<u>Mar 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Marketing Committee	<u>Mar 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Master Planning/Space Utilization Committee	<u>Mar 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Staff Development Committee	<u>Mar 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Technology Vision Committee	<u>Mar 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Academic Department Chairs					
Business and Mathematics	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Humanities	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Language Arts	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Natural sciences	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Social Sciences	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Budget Committee	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Enrollment Management Committee	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
ETC Coordinators					
AutoBody Repair & Finishing	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na
Business Technology	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na
Career and Workforce Development	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na
Counseling	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na
Essential Skills	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na
Health	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na
Intoduction to Culinary Arts	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na
OCET	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Trades	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na
Institutional Effectiveness Committee	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Strategic Planning Committee	<u>Apr 2009</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>

After the surveys had been distributed the GSIEC Committee met and discussed the content of the Self-Evaluation with the leaders of the governance entities. In 2009, the Committee met again and self-assessed the process itself, and eliminated groups that no longer were in existence, i.e. the Strategic Planning Committee, the Budget Committee, and the Tech Vision Committee as well as the ETC-CCACC. A new [GSIEC Table for Assessing Governance Entities](#) (2009-2010 Table Rev. 1)on campus was drawn up at this time. Subsequently, after the announcement that ETC was to be dissolved in December 2010, the ETC Coordinators were removed from the [Table](#) (2010-2011 Table Rev.2), and when the Enrollment Management Committee was disbanded, it was also removed.

After the final Table revision, the GSIEC Surveys were distributed in 2010, and there was a 20% response rate.

Governance SubCommittee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (GSIEC) - 2010

The governance structure or leader, their updated 2009 self-assessments, 2010 survey tabulation results, and charts for each governance structure or leader is linked below. The self-assessments are based on the charts and data tables. After 1) reviewing the self-assessment update for 2009 (see the blue text in the 2009 update), you can 2) submit the survey for 2009-10, 3) review the 2010 charts and data tables (after the survey is complete), and 4) review the 2010 self-assessments based on the survey results. The 2010 self-assessments will similarly be updated for the 2011 survey year. (na = not applicable; nr = not required; ns = not submitted)

Structure or Leader	Updated 2009 Self- Assessments	2010 Self- Assessments	Non-member (NM) and Member (M) Charts (C) and DataTables (T)			
			NM-C	NM-T	M-C	M-T
Faculty Senate Chair Windward	X	X	X	X	X	X
Faculty Senate Chair System	X	X	X	X	X	X
Faculty Senate Chair Recording	X	na	X	X	X	X
Faculty Senate Organization	X	X	X	X	X	X
Office of Administrative Services	X	X	X	X	X	X
Vice Chancellor Administrative Services	X	X	X	X	X	X
Office of the Chancellor	na	X	X	X	X	X
Vice Chancellor	X	X	X	X	X	X
Assistant Dean I	X	X	X	X	X	X
Assistant Dean II	X	X	X	X	X	X
Office of Vice Chancellor	X	X	X	X	X	X
Office of Student Services	X	X	X	X	X	X
Office of Vocational and Community Education	X	X	X	X	X	X
Director Vocational and Community Education	X	X	X	X	X	X

Aesthetics Committee	ns	X	X	X	X	X
CCAAC - Instruction	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X
CAAC - ETC	nr	nr	nr	nr	nr	nr
Dean's Advisory Council	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X
International Education	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X
Ke Kumu Pali	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X
Marketing Committee	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X
Master Planning/Space Utilization Committee	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X
Staff Development Committee	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X
Academic Department Chairs						
Business and Mathematics	<u>X</u>	X	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Humanities	<u>X</u>	X	na	na	X	X
Language Arts	<u>X</u>	X	na	na	X	X
Natural sciences	<u>X</u>	X	na	na	X	X
Social Sciences	na	<u>X</u>	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
ETC Coordinators						
AutoBody Repair & Finishing	<u>X</u>	nr	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Business Technology	<u>X</u>	nr	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Career and Workforce Development	<u>X</u>	nr	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Counseling	ns	nr	na	na	ns	ns
Essential Skills	<u>X</u>	nr	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Health	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Intoduction to Culinary Arts	<u>X</u>	nr	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
OCET	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Trades	<u>X</u>	nr	na	na	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Institutional Effectiveness Committee	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X
Planning and Budget Council	<u>X</u>	X	X	X	X	X

The Committee continued to follow the Policies and Procedures established in 2008, and self-assessed the process again. The [Table](#) (2010-2011 Rev. 3) was revised for a third time for the 2011 GSIEC Perception Surveys. The timing for the distribution of these surveys was thrown off because of the responsibilities of the convener of the GSIEC Committee who was also coordinator for the building of the new Library. These surveys were distributed late in the Spring 2012 semester with a two-week period for completion.

It was near finals and many of the faculty on campus didn't have time to complete them. The response rate for these was low at 15%.

Governance SubCommittee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (GSIEC) - 2011

The governance structure or leader, and their 2011 survey tabulation results and charts for each governance structure or leader is linked below. The self-assessments are based on the charts and data tables. (na = not applicable; nr = not required; ns or black "X"= not submitted)

<u>Structure or Leader</u>	<u>2011 Self- Assessments</u>	Non-member (NM) and Member (M) Charts (C) and Data Tables (T)			
		<u>NM-C</u>	<u>NM-T</u>	<u>M-C</u>	<u>M-T</u>
Faculty Senate Chair Windward	X	na	na	X	X
Faculty Senate Chair System	X	na	na	X	X
Faculty Senate Chair Recording	X	na	na	X	X
Faculty Senate Organization	X	na	na	X	X
Office of Administrative Services	X	X	X	X	X
Vice Chancellor Administrative Services	X	X	X	X	X
Office of the Chancellor	X	X	X	X	X
Vice Chancellor	X	X	X	X	X
Assistant Dean I	nr	nr	nr	nr	nr
Assistant Dean II	X	X	X	X	X
Office of Vice Chancellor	X	X	X	X	X
Office of Student Services	X	X	X	X	X
Office of Vocational and Community Education	nr	nr	nr	nr	nr
Director Vocational and Community Education	nr	nr	nr	nr	nr
Accreditation Steering Committee	X	X	X	X	X
Aesthetics Committee	X	X	X	X	X
CCAAC - Instruction	X	X	X	X	X
Dean's Advisory Council	X	X	X	X	X
International Education	X	X	X	X	X
Ke Kumu Pali	X	X	X	X	X
Marketing Committee	X	X	X	X	X

Master Planning/Space Utilization Committee	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Staff Development Committee	X	X	X	X	X
Academic Department Chairs					
Business and Mathematics	X	na	na	X	X
Humanities	X	na	na	X	X
Language Arts	X	na	na	X	X
Natural sciences	X	na	na	X	X
Social Sciences	X	na	na	X	X
Institutional Effectiveness Committee	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
Planning and Budget Council	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>

**UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
CASUAL & OVERLOAD PAYROLL FORMS**

Social Security Number 410044272				ID Number 01	
TERMINATE No	NAME (Last, First Middle) MONGOLD, DAVID J		ADDRESS 60 N. BERETANIA ST, #1502 HONOLULU, HI 96817		LAST PAID DATE
BIRTH DATE 02/22/1956	SEX Male	U.S. CITIZEN Yes	VISA TYPE	MARITAL STATUS Married	
TAX EXEMPT 02 02 FEDERAL STATE	PAYROLL NO. F4	WARRANT DIST. 907	FICA E	EIC	
APPOINTMENT PERIOD From: 09/12/2011 To: 12/16/2011		RATE 35.00 HOURLY ---- MONTHLY	POSITION TITLE INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT PAYROLL ACCOUNT CODE WI 267472 12 Campus Code Major Minor Account Year		
REMARKS Evaluate GSIEC surveys, procedures. Conduct interviews with faculty, staff, administrators, present evaluation results to IEC, perform other duties. Work to be performed during off-duty hours, some work to be done at WCC during normal business hours. Approx. 10 hrs/wk. Program supervisor to ensure total hours do not exceed 100. TIMESHEET REQUIRED.					
Chairperson, Dept. Head or Principal Investigator		Date	Dean, Director or Provost		Date
Dean of Graduate Division (For Overload Only)		Date	Sr Vice President/Chancellor or Vice President		Date
Fiscal Officer Date		Date	Appointing Officer		Date

The visiting team alleges on **page 42** that the college has "...a plan to increase the number of faculty and staff from underrepresented demographic groups, but baseline targets could not be established and reviewed systematically by the Planning and Budget Council to gauge progress." The Human Resources Officer is mystified by this observation and the Chancellor has not been interviewed on this matter as should have been the case because the Chancellor must report annually to his supervisors on the status of recruitment of under-represented groups in the faculty and staff of the college. **Using baselines the college is able to take compensatory recruitment measures** to boost the numbers of applicants from under-represented groups, but the final selection of those hired always will be to select the best qualified. Both the Chancellor and the Human Resources Officer are in possession of an Affirmative Action Plan for Windward Community College and it is marked "Confidential Trade Secret Materials," but the existence of this plan enables our college to pursue equal opportunity hiring with no qualms about "baseline targets" as purported by the visiting team. Again, what a shame that this concern was not brought to the attention of the Human Resources Officer or the Chancellor at the proper time.

The visiting team goes on to allege "...some dissatisfaction with the lack of faculty and staff in certain areas like the library and student services." The library regularly requests an additional librarian as part of its Unit Review document and this request is prioritized with all other position requests by the Planning and Budget Council in accord with its operational rules. Student Services has absolutely no such staffing problems at present as reported by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs who was never interviewed about alleged short staffing in her operation. Hereafter find her comments about the issue:

*P42 some dissatisfaction with lack of faculty and staff in student services...
Currently, we have 11 general funds paid counseling positions and an additional 4 grant funded counselor positions. This provides a ratio of 183 students per counselor including grant-funded positions and 249 students per counselor if only considering general funded positions. In January, we will gain another grant-funded counselor position, leading to a ratio of 171 students per counselor. This is one of the lowest ratios in this system. It is also in alignment for conducting intrusive counseling for ALL WCC students, according to various studies (e.g. <http://www.league.org/blog/post.cfm/the-case-for-being-intrusive>). This means, we could feasibly implement national best practice counseling techniques for at-risk students for ALL of our students utilizing existing resources.*

Additionally, the college hopes that the Commission realizes that Windward CC is perhaps the only community college in the state that has utilized program review to attempt to improve a moribund program and finally to dissolve it when all attempts to rejuvenate it failed. The faculty and staff positions in the Employment Training Center (ETC) have been re-allocated to the benefit of the credit programs at the college. For instance four counselors from ETC boosted the counselor ranks by more than 50% in addition to the re-assignment of a clerical post and a staff post to Student Affairs/Financial Aid from ETC. Likewise Academic Affairs and OCCE benefited from clerical reassignments taken from ETC at a time when the State austerity measures had

placed a freeze on all clerical new hires. Additionally two positions from ETC have gone to the Library Learning Commons for janitorial positions which inexplicably the visiting team insists we were not able to do. Finally the failure of the state legislature to fund the biennium budget request for positions for the new Veterinary Technology A.S. degree program was compensated by the use of two vacant ETC faculty positions transitioned to Vet Tech.

Finally the visiting team on page 42 in the Conclusions section of its coverage asserts: "Windward has compensated for increased student headcount by using grants and student hires to maintain service levels." Earlier statements in the visiting team report inform the reader that Windward's credit student enrollment has increased by more than 50% in the last several years. To make the claim that we covered the increased enrollment with grants and student help is preposterous. Our campus could not have possibly accommodated such an influx without a major increase in the employment of adjunct faculty. In fact in 2008-09 the college was spending \$616,677 on adjunct faculty, and in 2011-12 the college spent \$1,590,042 on adjunct faculty. This is an increase of 158% in this expenditure. In doing so we have turned no students away from our doors unlike many community college systems throughout the country during the same time period. Moreover we have made money (from \$0 of excess reserve funds above the required 5% threshold in 2009 to \$252,000 of excess reserves in 2012) thanks to the subsidies provided by the Enrollment Growth Funding Initiative which your visiting team could have learned more about.

Apropos **College Recommendation #3 (2012)** calling for a comprehensive staffing plan when the college already has a staffing plan and is in fact one of a minority of colleges in the UH system to have filled or to be in the process of filling all of its vacancies. Moreover we have a system for seeking new positions that is keyed to program review along with Planning and Budget Council analysis and prioritization of the requested new positions. Additionally, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has a policy for review of all newly vacated positions that requires the host department for the position to justify its continued use for its original academic discipline. A comprehensive professional development plan and full implementation of the civil service evaluation process are admittedly areas requiring improvement.

Hereafter find the Vice Chancellor's policy for review of newly vacated positions:

First draft 3/22/11
Revised 8/2/11
Revised 8/20/11
Revised 10/26/11

Reallocating Faculty Positions

As faculty positions become available through retirement or resignation, a routine review by the position supervisor, the appropriate Vice Chancellor or Director, and the Chancellor will be initiated to determine if the primary purpose of the position should be maintained or redescribed, or if the position should be reallocated.

The process will be as follows:

When a position becomes available, the appropriate supervisor (department chair, director, dean) recommends to the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor that the position be refilled as is, changed, or reallocated. The recommendation should include the following information:

- Summary of duties and responsibilities of current and proposed position (if different from current) and how the position relates to the mission, vision, and core values of the institution.
- Critical nature of work load of reallocated position.
- What programmatic functions/purposes the position directly supports
- How the position might collaborate with other positions to address the strategic plan
- Alternative method(s) of delivering required service if recommendation is not approved
- Appropriateness of the current position description
- If the position description were to change, would it change the nature of the position to the extent that it becomes, in fact, a new position
- Extent to which the current position fits the mission and strategic plan of the program/department/unit and College

For teaching faculty positions, the recommendation should also include the following information:

- List of classes likely to be taught by this position
- Current and projected ratios of lecturer-taught classes to those taught by full time faculty (would reallocation create a ratio significantly different from comparable disciplines?)
- fill rate for classes in the discipline for the last three years (should be at least 90%)
- number of potential lecturers available to staff classes in the discipline (supply data from lecturer pool; recent success in hiring lecturers etc.)
- critical workload factors outside of teaching (eg studio oversight, discipline coordinator, performance director) associated with this position

The Chancellor will review the recommendation with the appropriate Vice Chancellor(s) and director. If the recommendation is to reallocate a position from one unit to another, the Vice Chancellors/director of both units will be consulted.

If the Chancellor's decision is to reallocate a position, positions in the top tier for new positions (See Process for Prioritizing New Faculty Positions) will be given strong consideration.

Staffing for new programs requested by the state or supported by the mission and strategic plan of the college, but not yet included in the new faculty priorities, will also be considered.

I am sorry to have presented you with such a long rejoinder to the visiting team's report, but it has been necessary to provide explanations and documentation when necessary to compensate for a team report that did not seek to corroborate the information it was gathering. The resultant negativity of the visiting team report will alienate faculty/staff who have worked hard on SLO assessment; integrated planning and budgeting in the Planning and Budget Council, efforts to review and rejuvenate the GSIEC governance assessment surveys, and successful efforts to assure that qualified faculty are engaged to meet the needs of all students who choose to attend this college. To briefly summarize the requests made in this rejoinder document please note:

- Recommendation #1 (2006) should be changed from partially met to the college has met;
- College Recommendation #2 (2012) should emphasize primarily the need to refurbish the GSIEC governance assessment process to systematically assess the quality and effectiveness of integrated planning structures and processes and use assessment results for the improvement of learning and institutional effectiveness;
- Recommendation #2 (2006) should be changed from the college has not met to the college has partially met;

- College Recommendation #1 (2012) should remove the preamble, “As noted in the 2006 visiting team report...” Moreover inaccurate assertions about the state of SLO assessment in Student Services departments should be removed from the recommendation and inaccurate reports about the state of SLO Assessment in non-credit courses should be removed from the report itself ;
- Recommendation #5 (2006) should be changed from partially met to the college has met;
- College Recommendation #5 (2012) should focus primarily on the follow through to implement the already completed external evaluation of the governance assessment process;
- College Recommendation #3 (2012) should drop the call for a comprehensive staffing plan but emphasize the development of a professional development plan and the full implementation of the civil service evaluation process.

Thank-you for your consideration of these requests.