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Summary of Progress

In its “Letter Reaffirming Accreditation” dated February 11, 2013, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges/Western Association of Schools and Colleges (hereafter ACCJC) reaffirmed Kapi’olani Community College’s accreditation. This Letter also states that the College must submit a Follow-Up Report responding to nine recommendations cited in the Commission’s letter. A Follow-Up Report was submitted October 15, 2013 (link 1). On February 7, 2014, ACCJC notified the College that it met the requirements of Recommendations 1, 7, and 9 and took action to require the College to submit a Follow-Up Report addressing portions of Recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8 by October 15, 2014. Recommendation 6 was changed to a Commission Requirement.

The College immediately began preparations to respond to the recommendations. The College disseminated ACCJC’s action letter to the campus community (live link, link 2) and the Chancellor communicated the ACCJC decision in meetings with the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) and Administrative Staff Council. Throughout the spring 2014 semester, the College held myriad discussions, conducted research, and implemented changes about the issues highlighted in these recommendations.

Activities included Faculty Senate-sponsored forums on student learning outcomes held on February 13 and April 9. Student Congress hosted discussions about campus technology. The Chancellor conducted listening tours with all the instructional departments. The Chancellor formed four workgroups based on the Chancellor’s Advisory Council to address (1) Budgeting and Planning (2) Accreditation and Assessment (3) Technology, and (4) Enrollment Management and Marketing. Revisions to the planning and budgeting processes were formalized and codified to support the tie-in of planning, resource allocation for program and institutional improvement, and closing the loop. Faculty Senate (1) produced recommendations for the purchase of an assessment management system (AMS) to improve the College’s assessment process and to archive its results, (2) recommended the hiring of an assessment coordinator to support the implementation of a system, and (3) hosted a college-wide conversation on SLOs and faculty evaluation with Vice President of the University of Hawai’i Community Colleges (UHCC) John Morton and UH Professional Assembly’s Executive Director J. N. Musto. Much progress was made on identifying an Assessment Management System to resolve the issue of archiving assessment results. The Technology Plan was improved through the hard work of the newly formed Chancellor’s Advisory Council’s Workgroup for Technology. The College website was upgraded in March and a new campus accreditation website was developed.

The report, including the technology plan, was discussed and reviewed widely. On May 15, 2014, the CAC Workgroup for Accreditation and Assessment reviewed Draft 2 of the Follow-Up Report. On September 3, the Chancellor’s Advisory Council Workgroup for Accreditation and Assessment reviewed the Final Draft of the report, including the Technology Plan. On September 2 the Final Draft of the report, including the Technology Plan, was sent to the
Authorized Governance Organizations (AGO) and the Chancellor’s Advisory Council for review. On September 8 the CAC Workgroup for Technology reviewed the Technology Plan. On September 9, at the Chancellor’s Advisory Council meeting, the CAC and the AGOs provided feedback on the report.
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym/Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGOs</td>
<td>Authorized Governance Organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPD</td>
<td>Annual Reports of Program Data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Chancellor's Advisory Council. This council is composed of department heads, unit heads, members of the Administrative Staff, and representatives of Authorized Governance Organizations and other key personnel; the CAC advises the Chancellor on policy and planning and other matters and serves as a communication vehicle for the Chancellor and its members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAC</td>
<td>Counseling and Academic Advising Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Comprehensive Program Review (3 year review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>Funds allocated by the State Legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP</td>
<td>Long Range Development Plan. This is a campus physical plant development plan approved by the Board of Regents, unfunded as of 2014 and planned to begin 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCET</td>
<td>Office of Continuing Education and Training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFIE</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Effectiveness. This office supports college-wide strategic planning and grant applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPAC</td>
<td>Policy, Planning, and Assessment Council. The Council was renamed the Chancellor’s Advisory Council in 2013 to emphasize the advisory nature of the council (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTRF</td>
<td>Research Training and Revolving Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFSF</td>
<td>Tuition and Fees Special Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH BOR</td>
<td>University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCC</td>
<td>University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCAA</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCAS</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCSA</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Team Recommendations

**Recommendation 2.** In order to meet the Standards, the College planning processes should be effectively communicated to all College constituencies and reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement. (I.B.4, I.B.6).

The 2013 site visit team concluded that:

“Kapi‘olani Community College meets the first part of the standard, which calls for effectively communicating the planning and budgeting processes to all parts of the college community. It is making progress toward assessing the effectiveness of these processes to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement.”

I. Integrated Planning

Kapi‘olani Community College (KCC) reviews its planning processes annually to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement. This review process incorporates the University of Hawai‘i System’s Strategic Plan and the University of Hawai‘i Community College (UHCC) System’s Strategic Plan with the College’s Strategic Plan and program planning. On the system level, both strategic plans establish strategic directions and outcomes. At the College (institutional) level, the College’s Strategic Plan and Executive Administration Assessment, with additional information at the program level from the Annual Report of Program Data and the Comprehensive Program Review, establish and guide decision making and resource allocation for institutional and program direction and improvement.

II. Assessing the Effectiveness of Planning and Budgeting Processes to Ensure Resource Allocation Leads to Program and Institutional Improvement

A. University of Hawai‘i Community College System Level

The UHCC Strategic Plan and the UHCC System’s Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures 2008-2015 (link 1) provide a system-based planning framework for the seven Community Colleges. The College attends to these performance measures and goals when developing its plans and budget allocations. Every semester the Vice President (VP) for UHCC visits each community college campus and holds a public forum informing the campus of its standings relative to its Strategic Goals and the System’s Performance Measures. The College uses the outcomes and performance measures data provided by the VP for UHCC, along with data generated through its own internal integrated program review planning and budget allocation cycle, to set priorities to better serve the community-at-large.
The five system-wide Performance Measure areas are:

- Degrees and Certificates Achievement
- Native Hawaiian Achievement of Degrees and Certificates
- STEM Achievement of Degrees and Certificates
- Pell Grant Recipients
- Transfers to 4-year institutions

The data is reviewed annually by the UHCC System to ensure its goals are being met, as well as at the College. The goals for each performance area are established using baseline data from the UHCC System and the colleges. In Fiscal Year 2014, the College met or exceeded all goals set by the UHCC System and was awarded the maximum amount of funds set aside for these five Performance Measures. Each achieved performance goal reflects how resources were planned and allocated to make the biggest impact on program and institutional improvement.

The UHCC System assesses its Strategic Planning process annually by utilizing the aggregate data from its seven community colleges to adjust its Strategic Plan for both System and institutional improvement. For example, in surveying and assessing the educational environment of the State of Hawai‘i and the 10 campus University of Hawai‘i System, the UHCC system, on the recommendation of the UHCC Strategic Plan Task Force (comprised of Chancellors, Student Congress Chairs, and Faculty Senate Chairs), is making changes to the UH Community Colleges Strategic Directions 2015-2021. One example is the expansion of the strategic direction of the Hawai‘i Graduation Initiative to include (besides Native Hawaiians) Filipino and Pacific Islander students. As these two groups were found to be under-represented in relation to their participation in the UHCC system, they will be added as target groups to the next UHCC Strategic Plan 2015-2021, as well as to each college’s strategic plan with specific performance measures, e.g., “Increase…the number of Native Hawaiian, Filipino, and Pacific Islander students who complete certificates and degrees... Data will be monitored to ensure plans and resource allocations to support enrollment growth and greater engagement, learning, and achievement for these groups of students as well as Native Hawaiians, so as to meet the Workforce Development needs of the State of Hawai‘i while providing resources for the College’s individual community members so that each can fulfill her/his potential as lifelong learners.

B. Kapi‘olani Community College: Institutional Level

Integrated planning and budgeting for institutional and program improvement at the College occurs on the institutional level through its Strategic Plan, Long Range Development Plan, and Technology Plan processes (see Recommendation 8 for the Technology Plan).

1. KCC Strategic Plan
At the College level, the KCC 2008-2015 Strategic Plan (link) is the primary institutional planning document that states its institutional strategic outcomes, performance measures, and potential strategies, which are summarized into eight campuswide strategies (p. 40) for attaining the outcomes. Annually, the College provides an assessment of the its planning and budgeting
processes for the previous year’s Strategic Plan objectives and outcomes in its Executive Administration Assessment Report along with the adjustment of the coming year’s objectives, strategies, tactics, and desired outcomes (link 3). This report is submitted to the Vice President for UHCC, the UH President, and the College constituencies, and is based on the College’s Strategic Plan Scorecard, the VP for UHCC’s fall and spring data reports, and the College’s administrative staff self-assessments, including their goals and objectives for the coming year.

The College uses the Strategic Plan Scorecard (link 4), the Executive Administration Assessment, and the UHCC VP campus reports for fall and spring semesters to track performance on all strategic plan outcomes. The College uses the scorecard to determine areas of need and inform decisions as to where there is need to prioritize resource allocations in order to achieve desired results. For example, the College’s Strategic Plan (SP) (link 5) OUTCOME B states, “Increase the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and degree completion of students, particularly from underserved regions.” One SP Performance Measure (PM) for this Outcome is, “Promote low income student success and graduation by increasing their Pell Grant participation from 16.1 percent to 38.0 percent.” To continue progress toward this PM, the College implemented one of its College-wide Strategies, “Diversify, Improve and Increase the College’s Financial Aid Portfolio for Students.” As a result, in July 2013, the Vice President for Community Colleges funded $12,000 to support the College’s proposal, “I Can Afford College” Outreach Campaign. This project focused on improving the number of financial aid applications and awards received by recent high school graduates and other first time students. The College’s improvements included hiring an additional financial aid staffer to provide more direct services to students and increase their access to the Pell Grant application process. Improvements were also made in centralized financial aid at the UHCC System level. In addition, students were able to apply online, further increasing accessibility. The fall 2014 enrollment report shows the number of students awarded financial aid has increased by 17% and that the number of financial aid awards processed thus far for the 2014-2015 academic year increased by 16% over academic year 2013-2014 (link 6, p. 1). The College’s scorecard for spring 2014 helped the College track that it exceeded its target for the Performance Measure “Pell Grant recipients,” after having changed its procedures to better inform students about Pell Grants. For FY 2014 the institutional scorecard set a target increase in Pell grant recipients (under B. Hawai‘i’s Educational Capital) at 27.5% and the actual increase was 33.2% (link 7).

The College’s Strategic Plan includes promoting “Native Hawaiian Educational Attainment” (Outcome A), increasing “Hawai‘i’s Educational Capital” (Outcome B), and developing a “Globally Competitive and Collaborative Workforce” (Outcome D). In response to the need to meet the Strategic Plan performance measures related to enrollment, access and workforce development, and in the light of declining enrollment from the College’s primary service area (East Oahu), the College tasked the Office of College and Community Relations (OCCR) to create a marketing plan, as stated in the SP Collegewide Strategy 1, Manage and Grow Enrollment Strategically (link 8, p. 40). After working with a consultant, OCCR proposed a marketing plan at the Administrative Staff Council meeting in spring 2014. The plan was approved and the Chancellor allocated $75,000 to fund the plan (link 9). A marketing agency and a separate video production agency were hired. Six television commercials were produced and aired (live link, link 10), a brand was created and approved, and an insert was placed in the city’s
newspaper. Brochures and rack cards are being produced for the College’s outreach team. Social media was utilized to collect analytics on the effectiveness of the marketing methods (link 11). Preliminary data seems to indicate that marketing efforts in social media had a positive effect on promoting the College and its programs when there was a spike in registration during the height of the marketing campaign (link 12, pg. 6). The Marketing Plan is scheduled for a review during the 2015 spring semester after spring enrollment numbers have been analyzed.

The College also reviews its previous planning processes to ensure that budget decisions support the College in meeting SP goals and outcomes and it revises these according to the indications presented by the data. Consequently, the College has excelled at looking at evidence of program and institutional performance and responding with planning and resources. For example, unsatisfactory success rates of students in developmental English classes led to implementation of accelerated learning instruction and reallocation of a total of 4.0 faculty positions in English and Math to Kahikoluamea department, which provides developmental education. Another example is the College’s improving its student orientation program and providing direct advising in response to unsatisfactory persistence rates (link 13). More examples are detailed in Recommendation 4.

To increase its ability to budget in support of its Strategic Plan, the College obtains extramural funds for institutional improvements, such as Title III funds that benefit Native Hawaiians and other underserved student groups. Based on its Strategic Plan performance measures, e.g., those listed for Outcome A: Native Hawaiian Educational Attainment, the College applies Title III funding and other grant funds to program improvements that support Native Hawaiian as well as other underserved student groups. The grant fund acquisitions are not only tied to specific improvements in targeted populations but also must serve the resource needs identified in at least one of the six strategic outcomes in the 2008-2015 Strategic Plan. For example, in 2014, the Kōpiko Learning Center for Business, Legal and Technology was renovated to create more collaborative educational spaces, funded by the Title III grant and State of Hawai‘i CIP funds. Also, the Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM) program, which has experienced an increase in degree and certificate achievement (link 14, p. 4, link 15), and increased enrollment of Native Hawaiian students, and received increased funding through Title III grant funds and National Science Foundation grants. This project applied the college-wide strategy 3, Develop a New Ecology of Engaged Learning and Teaching for improved Retention and Persistence as one effort to attain PMs for the Strategic Outcome B: i.e., increasing Hawai‘i’s Educational Capital.

The KCC Strategic Plan Scorecard (link 16), the UHCC performance funding measures results (link 17, p. 10-11), as well as the Chancellor’s Executive Administration Assessment Report (link 18), have highlighted a concern with a drop in performance in math, writing, and reading success in Remedial/Developmental courses. The declining percentages of student success caused the College to take strong measures. In 2012 the Chancellor convened a faculty-led Foundations Math/English Task Force to examine why students were not succeeding as planned in remedial/developmental courses. Based on the results of this study, the Faculty Senate formed an ad hoc Student Success Committee in late 2013 and Title III funds were allocated to the committee to fund research in student success initiatives at other colleges. In May of 2014, the
Student Success Committee made recommendations to the Faculty Senate, which were approved and communicated to the Administration (link 19).

As a result, in support of the Performance Measures related to student success in the College’s Strategic Plan (link 20, p. 42) for Outcomes A, B, and D, The Queen Kapi‘olani Student Success Campuswide Initiative was established, headed by a 20-member council with representatives from faculty, staff, and students. In spring 2014 additional Title III funds of $125,000 (link 21) were allocated to the council to purchase signage and furniture for collaborative spaces on campus. Although it is too early to determine the impact of this resource allocation, a 2014 Title III grant application request was submitted to fund many of the ideas proposed by the Student Success report (link 22), which incorporates the Dream Builders report and several other initiatives. It also included funding to assess the impact of Student Success programming on student success at all levels. In mid-September the College received news that this grant request was approved.

Additional refinements to the current College’s Strategic Plan, 2008-2015, which will carry-over to the 2015-2021 Strategic Plan are being made in response to the new UH Policy on Sustainability (live link, link 23). This policy directs the system and its colleges to establish sustainability priorities for operations, education, research and service; planning, administration, and engagement; and cultural and community connections. The policy also directs the development of system and campus metrics for reductions in energy, water, and waste, as these relate to buildings, grounds, dining, and transportation. Success in achieving these new metrics will result in cost-savings that can be reinvested in further energy and cost savings over the long-term, and in the continuous quality improvement of the College’s programs and services.

Currently the College is reviewing and giving feedback on the 10-campus UH Strategic Plan and the seven-campus UHCC Strategic Plan. During the 2014 fall semester the College is beginning to develop its own Strategic Directions 2015-2021 Plan, which will be aligned with the two system Strategic Plans.

C. Kapi‘olani Community College: Program Level

1. Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)
At the program level, the ARPD is an annual assessment, by departments and units, of program activities, achievements, and plans as they relate to the College’s Strategic Plan Goals and Outcomes. The Instructional Program Review Committee, under the direction of the UHCC Director of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis, is responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the system program review process and recommending changes to improve the outcomes of the process. At the conclusion of each program review cycle, the cross-functional representatives from all seven community colleges who make up the Instructional Program Review Committee assess the overall program review policy and procedures to determine if improvements are necessary (link 24, 2012 Accreditation Self Evaluation, I.B.7.)
Data and analysis of course learning outcomes inform analysis of program learning outcomes, and this assessment in turn is discussed in the ARPD, which frames program planning. As a result of these assessments, several changes over the last 3-5 years to the ARPD process have expanded the information in the ARPD reports to support planning and resource allocation decisions (live link, link 25). These changes include:

- **Adding a link in the ARPD report form to the program’s 3-year Comprehensive Program Review (CPR).** This link allows planners to access more data, in-depth analysis, and a perspective on 3-year data trends to plan for improvements in future performance.

- **Discussion of the work of counselors embedded in academic departments.** This serves the purpose of reporting on the guidance counselors are providing and, if needed, highlighting any resource needs that may be at issue.

- **Adding Distance Education data.** This section helps a program track measures such as persistence rates and enrollment.

- **Adding and refining the section on Program Student Learning Outcomes.** This refinement enables a review of steps taken to improve student learning and links these steps to program and institutional planning.

- **Adding quantitative indicators and refining effectiveness measures.** The most recent changes have included adding more quantitative indicators and adding statistics on fall-to-fall persistence.

2. **The Comprehensive Program Review (CPR)**

The CPR draws from ARPDs and reports a 3-year view of the program’s health and plans as related to the College’s Strategic Plan Goals and Outcomes. It analyzes (1) trends in program strengths and weaknesses in demand, efficiency, and effectiveness over the previous three years and (2) projects the strategies to improve effectiveness and overall program health in the subsequent three years. It is also used to analyze, from a broader perspective, student success at learning outcomes at both the course and program levels (see discussion in Recommendation 3, Part III, Nursing 210). The current CPR timeframe is 2013 to 2016. The CPRs take a cumulative approach to determine the resources and actions needed to implement these plans and this information guides decisions concerning allocation of available resources during each budget cycle. CPRs are assessed for report effectiveness by the College and amendments are made to the form and process to improve planning and budgeting. Several changes over the last 3-5 years to the CPR process have expanded the information it reports to support planning and resource allocation decisions. As stated in our 2013 Follow-up Report to the ACCJC (link 26, p. 35), under an updated policy K5.202 the CPRs now include program learning outcomes assessment and results and incorporate tactical planning for the subsequent three-year period.
3. Annual Integrated Program Review, Planning, & Budget Allocation Cycle

a. Description
In AY 2012-2013, the College implemented the “Annual Integrated Program Review, Planning, & Budget Allocation Cycle” to adjust to the changing funding conditions of the UH System in general and to improve how individual program and institutional needs are identified and included in decision-making at the institutional level during the College’s internal budgeting process (link 27, p. 19). In AY 2013-2014 the College evaluated this process and instituted several improvements. It improved the implementation and efficiency of the cycle by adding policies, workgroups within the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC), and procedures to improve the integration of the planning and budgeting processes (link 28 to request workflow, link 29 to AY2015 work timeline for AY2016 budget). These changes increased transparency in the resource allocation process through wider campus participation, increased communication among campus stakeholders, and created a more informed decision-making process. The Chancellor established workgroups in the CAC to advise him on budgeting and planning, technology, accreditation and assessment, and student enrollment and marketing to both broaden and deepen dialogue about planning and resource allocation (link 30). The CAC reviews the recommendations of the workgroups and advises the Chancellor. For example, at the conclusion of the FY2015 budget allocation planning process, the Budget and Planning Workgroup voted to recommend the allocation of $100,000 if any Title III funds or other external funds became available to purchase a computer inventory management system. Currently information technology asset management is done manually; this new system will automate this process and, in addition, track operating systems and anti-virus software for the latest patches (link 31, p. 8.) The CAC voted to adopt the Budget and Planning Workgroup’s recommendation (link 32.) The Chancellor, after discussion with the Administrative Staff Council, made the allocation and informed the CAC. The campus was notified of the budget allocations through email (link 33).

The College made several revisions to policy and procedures to codify and operationalize the Annual Integrated Program Review, Planning, & Budget Allocation Cycle. A brief summary of the revised cycle follows.

 Recommendation 2 10
Chart 1. Revised Planning and Budget Cycle

- **Assess.** Each faculty or staff member who identifies an opportunity to improve his/her program or the institution may submit an *Allocation Request and New Proposal Form* (aka ARF) and must justify the suggestion by using at least one of four criteria: critical health and safety issue, the ARPD, the CPR, or the College’s Strategic Plan. The ARF improved the budget and planning cycle by explicitly tying requests for resources to ARPD and CPRs for program improvements (link 34).

- **Prioritize.** The individual submits the ARF to the department chair or unit head. The chair or unit head prioritizes requests within her/his department or unit using the same criteria and submits the prioritized list to the next level of authority (dean or Vice Chancellor). The dean or Vice Chancellor assembles the requests and sets priorities within her/his area of responsibility again based on program and UHCC System and institutional data. The Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching and Technology (CELT) reviews the requests to ensure technology needs were considered in the budget request process and to identify any capacity issues in supporting the requested...
technology. The Chancellor reviews the VCs’ and deans’ allocation priorities and sends them to the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services (VCAS).

- **Plan Resource Allocation.** The VCAS takes the lists and presents them to the four Authorized Governance Organizations (AGOs), which includes the Associated Students of Kapi‘olani Community College (ASKCC), Staff Council, Faculty Senate, and Kalāualani (the Native Hawaiian Council). The AGOs represent all the constituent groups of the College community. They prioritize the requests, which are forwarded to the Budget and Planning Workgroup of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (CAC). The Workgroup analyzes the requests and submits recommendations to the CAC. The CAC discusses the Workgroup’s recommendations, votes on the proposal and forwards their recommendations to the Chancellor for decision. The Chancellor determines a final allocation plan and documents any rationale for changes in priorities. This vetting process was added to ensure transparency in decisions concerning funds available for resource allocation and for improving communications.

- **Review.** The Vice Chancellors receive an allocation based on funding available, mainly through the Legislature appropriation, tuition and fees, RTRF (Research Training and Revolving Funds), Perkins Grants, and attainment of UHCC Performance Measures. However, if a Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the deans or unit heads (whichever is appropriate) determines that a request for funding that was not supported through the Annual Integrated Program Review, Planning, & Budget Allocation Cycle process or a new emerging need is essential for a particular program, that VC can fund the request from the budget provided for her/his unit. Afterward, VCs, deans, and unit heads communicate the final allocation plan to their constituents and check the plan against any changes in UH System allocations, policies, laws, or procedures.

- **Implement.** Once the state appropriation is received, the Allocation Plan is reviewed once more for needed adjustments. The resource allocation process is reviewed and evaluated.

The planning and budgeting processes established at the College directly impact resource allocation and re-allocation when grant opportunities arise or resources are made available outside the annual budget cycle timeframe. One outcome of the Budget Cycle revisions in March 2014 is that the ARF process now informs decisions regarding grant opportunities, as well as decisions to reallocate grant funds when the opportunity arises, e.g., as exemplified earlier with the purchasing of computer inventory management software.

The College has received several major grants in support of its Strategic Plan Outcomes, and in accord with its SP Campuswide Strategy #5, *Diversify, Sustain and Increase the College’s Funding Portfolio and Revenue Streams*. For example, an Achieving the Dream (AtD) study was commissioned by the VP for UHCC and funded by grant donations from Bishop Estate Board of Trustees and via the reallocation of College funds to examine student success. The mission of AtD is focused primarily on helping low-income students and students of color complete their
education and obtain market-valued credentials. The College conducted a study of transfer students for the purpose of determining their needs. The data revealed that a large number of these students were part-time students (link 35, p. 6). The study was presented at the PPAC (now the CAC), the Counseling and Academic Advising Council (CAAC), and the Administrative Staff Council. These bodies recommended that a position be allocated to work with part-time students. The College reallocated and filled a position to work with its part-time and transfer students. A follow-up study was conducted to determine how the College could assist the part-time students with the goal of increasing student success rates in transfer and graduation (link 36). These actions targeted the attainment of UHCC, and specifically KCC Strategic Plan performance measures, e.g., those for Strategic Outcome D, Globally Competitive and Collaborative Workforce, which address issues such as enrollment, degrees and certificates awarded, and transfers.

In addition, during FY 2013 and FY 2014, departments that requested funding for items that met Perkins indicators, 1P1 - Technical Attainment, 2P1- Completion, were eligible to receive funding exceeding $400,000 from Perkins Act grants for program improvements. Departmental proposals were required to be aligned, not only with Perkins Act Indicators, but also ARPDs, CLRs, CPRs and the UHCC System and College’s Strategic Plans. Consequently, in 2013-14, the Nursing Programs and all health programs improved student skill attainment outcomes by being awarded funds to purchase and implement the simulation mannequins and scenario-based training for clinical skills development. Simulation has also become an accreditation standard for each program where patient centered care is a focus of the curriculum. This award was over $100,000 (link 37). In addition, the radiologic program award in 2014-15, provided funding to purchase digital imaging equipment - over $200,000 - to improve the student clinical skills but the outcomes also brought the program up to industry standards helping to increase the workforce readiness and job placement success rate for program graduates. Finally, Perkins grants leading to improvements included the Hospitality Program’s enrollment management grants, the effect of which was an increase in HOST majors when enrollment at the College is decreasing.

b. Revisions in Operational Policies
In March 2014 the College established three operational policies to codify the revisions to the cycle: (1) Kapi‘olani CC Operational Policy (KOP) #1.1112, the Participation in College Decision-Making Processes Operational Policy (link 38), (2) KOP#1.111, the Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation Operational Policy (link 39), and (3) the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) Charter (link 40).

The analysis and improvement of the Annual Integrated Program Review, Planning, & Budget Allocation Cycle involved numerous in-depth discussions in the Administrative Staff Council, the Chancellor’s Advisory Council, the CAC’s Budget and Planning Workgroup, and all four Authorized Governance Organizations. Department chairs and unit heads briefed their faculty and staff on the new procedures and everyone was encouraged to participate (see section on Communications below). The improvement of the cycle exemplifies how the College reviews, revises, and implements improvements to tie planning to resource allocation for program and institutional improvement. In addition, to continue the cycle of assessment for budget FY 2016,
on June 24, 2014, the CAC discussed several ideas for improving the process. For example, next year the process will begin earlier and the ARF will be revised to make it easier to fill out.

b. Establishment of a 5-year budget planning process
As an added improvement to the planning and budgeting process, the College implemented a mandatory five-year budget planning process (link 41) to support program administrators, department chairs, and unit heads in planning resource needs and monitoring budget projections for the five-year horizon. Two training workshops were held in June 2014 to assist participants in formulating their five-year projections and completing the required spreadsheets.

III. Effective Communication

Our primary vehicle for communicating with the College community is through our participatory and shared governance system composed of the College’s Authorized Governance Organizations (AGOs) and Standing Advisory Councils. As stated above, the Associated Students of Kapi‘olani Community College, Staff Council, Faculty Senate and Kalāualani (the Native Hawaiian Council) represent all the constituents on the campus. The Chancellor meets monthly with the AGOs and they are involved in reviewing, advising, and making recommendations to the Chancellor on institutional policy and initiatives appropriate to their specific charters. Also, the Chancellor seeks advice from the AGOs on institution-wide issues that may not be directly related to the areas of responsibility stated in their charters (link 42).

In addition to the AGOs, the College has four Standing Advisory Councils: Administrative Staff Council, Chancellor’s Advisory Council, Vice Chancellors’ Advisory Council, and the Counseling and Academic Advising Council. The Administrative Staff Council’s members are the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, deans, and the representative from Kalāualani. The Chancellor’s Advisory Council members include the Chancellor, heads of the AGOs, Vice Chancellors, deans, department chairs and unit heads, Human Resources Manager, Auxiliary and Facility Services Officer, Admin Officer (Business Office), Title III Coordinator, Director of OCET, Director of OFIE, Association of Students at KCC faculty advisor, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor, Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Chair of Counseling and Academic Advising Council, and the Accreditation Liaison Officer. The Vice Chancellors’ Advisory Council members are the Vice Chancellors, deans, department chairs, and unit heads. The Counseling and Academic Advising Council are the 35 counselors/advisors across the campus.

The AGOs and Standing Councils meet regularly and sponsor forums to provide information and collect feedback from their constituents on current compelling issues. Also, to ensure communication of important issues, members of the campus community receive updates by News & Events email about issues such as the development of the 2015-2021 College Strategic Plan (link 43). For example, the budget allocation memo from the Chancellor is scheduled to go out at the end of September to the Vice Chancellors and then will be sent to the CAC members. Minutes from the Administrative Staff Council and Chancellor’s Advisory Council are emailed to campus community members and posted on the College’s intranet (live link, link 44). The Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) collects and disseminates timely and ongoing data
on the College’s institutional effectiveness measures, five of which are derived from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (Active and Collaborative Learning, Faculty-Student Interaction, Academic Challenge, Student Effort, and Support for Learners) and the remainder of which are being aligned with ARPD effectiveness measures. The Chancellor’s office also communicates to its KCC ‘ohana (family) via the Chancellor’s newsletter, The KCC Advantage. These newsletters provide details and insight into projects, people, issues and directions on campus and celebrate the accomplishments of faculty, students, and staff.

As noted in the 2013 site visit report, Kapi‘olani Community College continues to effectively communicate the planning and budgeting processes to all parts of the College community. In fact, the process was honed to increase communication across the campus, especially concerning the budgeting and planning process. Every effort was made to ensure greater participation and transparency, as evidenced in the planning discussions that took place from fall 2013 through early fall 2014.

Based on the information provided above, and that provided to the ACCJC in 2012 and 2013, the College demonstrates that it has addressed the Recommendation and therefore meets the Standards, i.e., the College effectively communicates its planning processes to all College constituencies and reviews these processes on an annual basis to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement.
Recommendation 3. In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College assess student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporate the findings into course and program improvements. (ER 10, I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

The 2013 site visit team concluded:

“At this point the college has assessed SLOs for all courses and programs, including most student services. Still, there is a need to refine the processes, demonstrate how results are incorporated into course and program improvements, and to improve how results are archived and available for review. These are necessary elements for the College to fully meet the standards.”

I. Introduction

The College assesses student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporates the findings into course and program improvements. The course and instructional programs are discussed in this Recommendation 3 and the student service programs are discussed in detail in Recommendation 5.

All courses and instructional programs at the College have student learning outcomes, referred to as competencies at the course level. These course outcomes are listed in the catalog and on all syllabi distributed to students. In addition, all approved programs published in the catalog include learning outcomes as part of the description, along with the courses included in the curriculum. All course outcomes are aligned with program outcomes as part of the development of a master course outline. This alignment is archived with the master course outline in Curriculum Central, the UHCC system’s web-based curriculum management system.

II. Refining the Process

In fall 2013 the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on SLOs revised the Course Learning Report (CLR) used to document both fall and spring assessment results and next steps to improve student learning. The form includes an additional reporting area on the first page to ensure that authors report on the implementation of the strategies identified as a result of the previous course-level assessments. The next section, Incorporating the Results into Course and Program Improvement, includes a discussion of how faculty used the Next Steps column to document improvements using the NURS 210 course to illustrate the process.

Improvements in the Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD) and Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) reporting process, as detailed in Recommendation 2 and Recommendation 4, continue to be discussed by administration and faculty. Ongoing support of faculty is provided by the College’s three Assessment Coaches (assigned by the Chancellor and Faculty Senate) and the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee. The coaches conduct ongoing workshops (link 1, link 2) on SLO skills and work on creating a
supportive culture for assessment. They coach faculty on CLRs (link 3) and they work with program and discipline coordinators and department chairs on ARPDs and CPRs.

This work, another example of how the College allocates its resources for program and institutional improvement (Recommendation 2), is supported through allocation of non-instructional teaching equivalencies. In FY 2012-2013 and FY 2013-2014, the College directly allocated $99,000 and $67,500 respectively for faculty released time (non-instructional teaching equivalency) to improve program and course learning assessment. This level of support continues in 2014-2015. The instructional faculty who serve as coaches are released from teaching two classes each semester, attesting to the College’s commitment to supporting faculty in making improvements to both the process and the integration of results for program improvement. The College also supports all Program Coordinators through funding for non-instructional teaching equivalencies to improve learning assessment as part of their overall responsibilities.

In 2013-2014, the College started a pilot project that aims at improving the alignment of course, program, and degree learning outcomes so as to make better use of assessment data in improving courses and programs. The College participated in the Lumina-funded ACCJC-sponsored Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) Project (live link, link 4). Over 20 faculty mapped and aligned the College's five General Education Outcomes and competencies in 14 courses to the Degree Qualifications Profile Outcomes in the context of the Associate in Arts in Hawaiian Studies Degree. The results of this analysis at the program level suggested that the Aesthetic Engagement outcome could be merged with the Integrative Knowledge outcome. At the course level, faculty members were able to modify their outcomes to align more explicitly with the DQP outcomes. The efforts of the faculty were recognized at the DQP Project Conference on May 2, 2014, when the College was one of three colleges out of 16 participating institutions to receive an Award of Excellence. As a result of participating in this project, a number of next steps have been identified to engage a wider group of faculty in discussion about General Education outcomes, Liberal Arts Program Outcomes, and Institutional Learning Outcomes, and their inter-relationships, with the ultimate goal of improving the assessment process and the capacity to demonstrate student learning at the various levels.

III. Incorporating the Results into Course and Program Improvement

The results of faculty dialogue on course and program outcomes assessments are integrated into two different documents: the master course outline (link 5) and the Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD, live link, link 6). This dialogue informs both the improvement of assessment and the improvement of instruction.

A. Course Improvement
The results of course-level outcomes assessment are integrated into the master course outline when the course is revised as part of the curriculum review cycle. Item #51 in the master course outline template asks the author to document the justification for the specific revision proposed. Here, the authors report on changes to the course based on the results of recent outcomes assessments. For example, English faculty implemented the following changes as a result of SLO assessment and reported the improvements in the master course outline curriculum proposal:
English faculty (1) realigned competencies in English 100, Composition I; (2) realigned and reduced competencies in English 200, Composition II; (3) realigned and combined competencies in English 270 (alpha), Literary History, and English 271 (alpha), Literary Genre; (4) realigned competencies in English 272 (alpha), Literature and Culture; (5) and realigned and reduced competencies in English 273 (alpha), Creative Writing and Literature.

Similar practices have been implemented in the Career and Technical Education Programs. The Hospitality and Tourism Education (HOST) faculty modified course competencies and realigned them to Program Learning Outcomes. Faculty members who teach HOST 100, Career and Customer Service Skills, have engaged in collaborative assessment conversations to analyze embedded learning outcomes assessment methods ensuring that they directly measure and connect to course competencies.

Kahikoluamea instructors used an assessment of competencies in ENG 22, Beginning Composition, to dialogue with library faculty on how the library can support learning. Writing intensive instructors looked at their assessment results and suggested creating a venue through which students can obtain free handouts related to writing and writing conventions. This information is documented in Reporting on Assessment Outcomes (link 7). Two Aloha Writer’s Kiosks are now operating, one in the library and one in the Kahikoluamea Center.

**B. Program Improvement**

The results of program learning outcomes assessment are integrated into the Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD), wherein faculty analyze the program’s strengths and weaknesses based on performance indicators, as well as the outcomes of program learning outcomes assessment. The analysis leads to action plans, which may include requests for resources if needed. In the ARPD, faculty members align the results of course-level assessments to the program outcomes and determine whether students have met or not met the program outcomes that are being assessed that year. Based on these results, faculty may propose changes to the curriculum, to the outcome, or to the assessment instruments. For example, the 2013 Liberal Arts ARPD identified 14 such improvements based on the assessment of General Education outcomes (link 8). Similarly, faculty in the Associate in Science in Natural Science documented changes in the 2013 ARPD. These are excerpted here:

“This through the process of assessing the ASNS SLOs in 2011 and 2012, it became apparent that the program SLOs needed to be revised to better reflect the ASNS program outcomes. A group of STEM faculty met over the course of the 2012-2013 academic year and came up with a draft of proposed program SLOs in December 2012. Data from spring 2013 were used to pilot the new SLOs, and further revisions were made. The SLOs were distributed to the Math and Sciences department members for feedback in fall 2013 and final revisions were made. These proposed ASNS program SLOs were submitted to the Curriculum Committee for approval in October 2013.”

Every three years, programs complete a Comprehensive Program Review (CPR), looking back at the previous three years of ARPDs and, based on these analyses and the results of program learning outcomes assessment, develop the program’s action plans for improving the program in
the upcoming three years. An example of program improvement based on the results of program learning outcomes assessment includes Information Technology (link 9, p. 24). Based on the analysis of the program’s quantitative analytics and the results of outcomes assessment, each program may request resources be allocated to implement the strategies for improvement.

An example of the interaction between CLRs, ARPDs, and CPRs and their impact on teaching can be found in how Nursing faculty worked with its 2013 CPR. They analyzed their program Student Learning Outcomes in the Nursing program CPR (link 10, pg. 18) and concluded that:

“students consistently state that direct clinical instructor feedback is helpful in recognizing their strengths and determining areas in need of improvement, [we should] continue this strategy.”

The spring 2014 CLR for Nursing 210 records that the instructors worked to enhance “clinical instructor feedback.” They used Student Success Contracts to increase this feedback. Table 1 below, excerpted from the CLR, illustrates how these instructors assessed the effectiveness of these contracts and incorporated the results into an action plan that affirms the continued use of this method. The results of the CLR, once again, will be incorporated into the 2014 ARPD (published at the end of fall 2014), which in turn will be used in the next update of the 3-year CPR and to inform future CLRs. More examples of these CLRs can be found at (live link, link 11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM OUTCOME</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Expected Level of Achievement</th>
<th>Results of Assessment</th>
<th>Next Steps *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe and analyze episodes of clinical practice and self-care; and identify areas of strength and those requiring development.</td>
<td><strong>Competency 2:</strong> Identify own responsibility for reflective practice in a performance based curriculum.</td>
<td>What: Self reflection of individual practice and performance in clinical. &lt;br&gt;How: Clinical weekly self-evaluation/Reflection Journal regarding individual practice and performance using Safety and Professionalism reflection papers. Rubric provided. &lt;br&gt;Midterm and final clinical evaluation; rubric provided &lt;br&gt;Who : all students &lt;br&gt;When: Spring 2014</td>
<td>Expected: 100% of students will meet earning passing score on weekly Safety and Professionalism reflection papers using rubric provided. &lt;br&gt;100% of students will earn passing score on Midterm and final clinical evaluation using rubric provided.</td>
<td>Results: 100% of the students who completed the course submitted weekly reflection papers with passing scores on the rubrics for Professionalism, Safety, Midterm and Final Clinical evaluations. &lt;br&gt;Percentage of students passing rubrics was 96%. (one student withdrew). &lt;br&gt;Rubrics were helpful in evaluating expected outcomes. Students recognized areas of weakness through self-evaluation. Students implemented steps to improve their practice and performance. &lt;br&gt;Some students required more than average assistance with priority setting and organization in their practice and performance of nursing care.</td>
<td>Action: Use individual “Student Success Contracts” that align with the course Student Learning Outcomes in order to better promote student responsibility for own learning and practice. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Student Success Contracts facilitated collaborative planning by instructor and student to assess areas of weakness, develop a targeted plan of action, implement, and date of re-evaluation</strong> &lt;br&gt;Schedule clinical days in LTC facilities. Schedule clinical days in Acute Care rotation. &lt;br&gt;Date: Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Improving the Archiving of Assessment Results

Each program’s course and program outcomes and the results of outcomes assessment are available through the online Annual Report of Program Data report system and the program’s online Comprehensive Program Review reports (live link, link 12). CLRs continue to be developed and stored in password-protected departmental Laulima (Sakai) sites, then archived at a public website to provide access to all members of the college community as well as members of the general public (live link, link 13).

In the meantime, the College has been aggressively working on improving its archiving practices and it has conducted extensive research on online Assessment Management Systems (AMS). The College has supported two CTE programs, Culinary and Health Sciences, in implementing the system Live Text due to its ability to focus on the individual student’s mastery of highly specific skills and its ability to aggregate that level of detail into course and program assessment.

The Faculty Senate’s Ad Hoc Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee has assessed a number of proprietary software programs and programs developed in-house by other University of Hawai’i community colleges. The committee’s specifications included (1) enhanced archiving and reporting of documents and results related to course and program learning outcomes assessment and (2) the capacity of the platform to accommodate student learning outcomes for instructional faculty, counselors, administrative services, student services, and library faculty.

On February 13, 2014, the Faculty Senate hosted a forum on Student Learning Outcomes, at which the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee reported on its research into AMSs and the SLO coaches reported on their work. Ongoing progress was shared by members of the Ad Hoc Committee in monthly meetings of the CAC Accreditation and Assessment Workgroup. The results of the Ad Hoc Committee’s report to Faculty Senate (link 14) were presented to the Administration in April 2014. In May the Faculty Senate recommended to the Chancellor that an AMS be implemented (link 15).

As a result of the Committee’s recommendations, the College proposed to the UH Community College system that the purchase of a centralized assessment management system (AMS) for all seven campuses be considered. In the meantime, the College had refined its technical specification list, continued to carry the initiative forward, and, on August 1, earmarked carry-over Title III grant funds to support the purchase of an appropriate software package (link 16). The Faculty Senate, fully aware that the implementation of an AMS at the College is a critical and large project, proposed that consideration be given to the hiring of an Assessment Coordinator who will oversee the implementation of the AMS and continue coordinating improvements in learning outcomes assessment at the course, program, and institutional levels (link 17). Funding for this position has also been included in the recently approved Title III grant to begin October 1, 2014.

The search for an AMS was launched in full force effective August 1. Five vendors were invited to campus-wide presentations about their products and a campus-wide debriefing session.
gathered and focused the impressions of all attendees. At a special joint meeting of the CAC and the CAC Accreditation and Assessment Workgroup called September 5, 2014, a recommendation was made to select Taskstream (link 18). The CAC approved this recommendation and forwarded this to the Chancellor. With the Chancellor’s approval, as of September 12, procurement papers were developed and submitted.

Based on the information provided above, and that provided to the ACCJC in 2012 and 2013, the College meets the Standards, i.e., the College assesses student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program and incorporates the findings to promote improvement in these courses and programs. In addition, the College has provided evidence that it refines these processes and improves how results are archived and available for review.
Recommendation 4. In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College utilize student learning outcomes assessment to support institutional planning decisions. (I.B, I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)

The 2013 site visit team concluded:

“Evidence substantiated by the team as well as interviews conducted on site clearly indicate that Kapi‘olani Community College is using learning outcomes to support its culture of planning, and there are meaningful dialogs that take place. However, with the focus on course level outcomes, it is unclear how programmatic and institutional decisions based upon aggregated SLO assessment results, including trends and issues, is being accomplished at this time. All indications are that the institution is striving to ensure planning and decisions are made based on the learning outcomes, and that will evolve as SLO assessment results at all levels are available, analyzed, and linked to college decisions.”

I. Basing Programmatic and Institutional Decisions on Aggregated SLO Assessment Results

The College’s response to Recommendation 2 provides evidence illustrating how the College reviews its planning processes on an annual basis to ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement. The response to Recommendation 2 provides evidence showing: (a) how Strategic Plan outcome data are reviewed annually; (b) how the reporting and analysis of course and program SLOs have been improved; and (c) how the revised Annual Integrated Program Review, Planning, & Budget Allocation Cycle takes data based on program SLOs from ARPDs and CPRs and processes them, along with the Strategic Plan outcome data and the Chancellor’s Executive Administration Assessment Report (link 1), through a resource allocation request procedure resulting in informed resource allocation decisions for the purpose of program and institutional improvement.

The College’s response to Recommendation 3 outlines how individual programs make use of the results of SLO assessment to make decisions about how best to improve the program and the students’ learning at the course and program level.

In this response to Recommendation 4, the College demonstrates how it has integrated the results of assessment into its programmatic and institutional decisions.

Aggregated data from student achievement across courses and programs and student learning outcomes analyzed in ARPDs and CPRs have driven a number of key institutional decisions, e.g.:

- The unsatisfactory success rates of students in all developmental mathematics classes (link 2) led to the College’s institution-level investment in implementing a math emporium model for these courses (see attached 2010 ARPD for Developmental Math link 3). The College requested and received funding from the VP for UHCC to create the
labs for the Emporium and to hire student assistants (proposal link 4). Also, through involvement in the Achieving the Dream initiative, the College was able to consult with institutions that had implemented the emporium model and faculty were trained in the delivery and support of this instructional model. At this same time, focus on gatekeeper courses in other discipline areas led to the Vanguard Project, where faculty in the Arts and Sciences redesigned significant portions of their courses to encourage student success with $52,260 in support from the Vice President’s Office (see Gatekeeper ATD report, link 5 and Vanguard award letter, link 6).

- The unsatisfactory success rates of students in developmental English classes (2011-2012 Gatekeepers link 7) led to the implementation of accelerated learning instruction, combining developmental and transfer-level instruction into a single semester, also funded by $60,461 from the Office of the Vice President for UH Community Colleges (KCC Developmental Education award, link 8).

- For all first semester students, the College allocated resources to improve the First Year Experience by requiring a more robust New Student Orientation and more directed advising. The expectation is that students who receive clear instructions on what to take in the first semester and how to map the courses into a major will have much better persistence rates than those who choose their own courses. In addition, in AY 2014-2015, a one-year success course pilot will be offered for developmental math students. This population has been identified as most at risk as they are two levels below college level and have the lowest rates of persistence (link 9).

- The unsatisfactory success rates of students across gatekeeper science courses (Student MathChem success link 10) resulted in the inclusion of support for professional development in a number of grant proposals across the institution, in particular a five-year $1,000,000 grant funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF I3 link 11). Through these professional development opportunities, the faculty “toolbox” of strategies for improving student success now includes student involvement through Peer-Led Unit Mastery (led by students), Peer Mentoring, and a strong emphasis on undergraduate research as a learning strategy.

- Begun as part of a five-year Science Talent Expansion Program grant funded by the National Science Foundation in 2007, the College developed the PLUS program, a peer-mentoring strategy inspired by the Peer-Led Team Learning (PLTL) model. PLUS consists of course-specific problem-solving sessions led by peer leaders (former students of the course and instructor). The peer leaders work closely with the instructor teaching the course and help the STEM students understand key concepts, techniques, and methods assigned by the instructor teaching the course. PLUS leaders are provided with a stipend. An analysis of grade data revealed that students who attended PLUS sessions had higher success rates than those who did not attend, and the average number of PLUS sessions attended by a student correlated positively with the grade earned in the course (p** < 0.01). According to survey data, experience as a PLUS leader enhanced deepening understanding of key concepts (100%) in vital STEM courses and increased
recommendation in success at the 4-year college level (100%). The model proved so successful that it has been extended to other grant-funded initiatives in STEM.

- Peer mentors are essential to the College’s retention strategy for STEM; they not only help STEM students in their curriculum, but advise and support them in complementary aspects of their learning experience by showing them how to study, approach faculty, find resources, seek out scholarship opportunities, and make connections with their peers. Peer mentors are stationed in the STEM Center, where they are easily accessible to the STEM students. Peer mentors are provided with a stipend. Peer mentors are used in other areas of the College: Kahikoluamea, Student Affairs, Library, and the Native Hawaiian Success Center.

- A second important strategy in STEM initiatives is Undergraduate Research Experience (URE). Students are provided with undergraduate research experience opportunities in the life sciences, physical sciences, and engineering. Students are provided with stipends and are mentored by a faculty member with expertise. Undergraduate research experiences include engineering (Robotics, CanSat, Electrokinetics (lifter), Orbital Dynamics) and biological science research projects (pupillometry in sleep, bacteria in poi, sea grass monitoring, native butterfly habitat, elasmobranchs, neuroblastomas, monoclonal research, and others). The URE support for students has been provided by various grants funded by the National Science Foundation. From fall 2010 through fall 2013, 244 students successfully completed STEM URE projects. STEM students have presented in local conferences at the University of Hawai‘i John A. Burns School of Medicine, Native Hawaiian Science and Engineering Mentoring Program, Hawai‘i Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR), and Hawai‘i Conservation Conference. They have also presented peer reviewed research posters at national conferences such as the Emerging Researchers National Conference in STEM, American Society for Microbiology, National Conference on Undergraduate Research, and Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science. They also competed in the NASA-sponsored CANSAT International Competition and the MARSBOT Competition. Several students have won poster and travel awards to these conferences. In 2013, STEM students won the CANSAT International Competition, winning over universities in the US, Canada, Turkey, and India. Students engaged in URE are also encouraged to apply for summer internships. In summer 2014, 17 of the College’s Native Hawaiian STEM students were accepted in internship programs in Hawaii, the continental USA, Costa Rica, France, and Papua New Guinea. The data attest to the effectiveness of URE in promoting student success: 49 percent of students participating in URE went on to transfer, with many of them graduating with Bachelor’s degrees, compared with a transfer rate of less than 20 percent for the general population of Liberal Arts students.

The College’s STEM Program has institutionalized its current Undergraduate Research Experience (URE) beginning with two primary initiatives. The first was to establish a "research intensive" or “RI” designation for STEM courses. The RI designation, like the Writing-Intensive designation, entails a reduction in class size. RI-designated courses have five fewer students, thus balancing faculty workload. In RI courses all the students
are required to engage in URE. RI courses in Chemistry, Engineering, Microbiology, and Physics have been offered since fall 2013. The “RI” designation appears on the students’ transcripts, indicating the additional rigor and learning attained in the course. Additionally, the STEM faculty developed an undergraduate research course to be offered across multiple disciplines. In spring 2014, SCI 295, the independent research course, was offered in Biology, Chemistry, Ecology, Engineering, Microbiology, and Physics. This course enables and empowers students to continue their research over two or more semesters under the guidance of a dedicated faculty member. Prior to these two initiatives, students received grant support for their participation in URE, but that participation was not part of their academic record. Now, with RI-designated courses and SCI 295, they receive course credit for URE and evidence of their research experiences appears on their academic transcripts.

The effectiveness of undergraduate research has been attested locally, with a higher percentage of URE students transferring compared with the general population of Liberal Arts students, as noted earlier. In addition, national research has also demonstrated this model’s effectiveness.

Based on this national and local evidence and on ongoing interactions with the Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR), the College has committed to extending the undergraduate research model across the curriculum. In spring 2014, funded by Title III, faculty from multiple disciplines (social sciences, culinary arts, respiratory therapy, engineering, and English) attended a CUR workshop in Kentucky in preparation for launching undergraduate research in their discipline areas in 2014-2015.

For those courses that embed service learning in their classes, assessments of reflective essays of students show that retention rates tend to be higher. As a result, the College broadened its service learning options to students to include developmental classes and service learning leaders (peer mentors) through OFIE, the sustainability program, Health Sciences, and other programs. The College provides funding for one full-time service learning coordinator who works primarily with agencies and students, a one-course release per semester for a faculty member who works primarily with other faculty conducting service learning, and tuition support for five student service-learning pathway leaders.

- The results of “Student Effort” in the 2014 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), where the College placed below the average score for large community colleges, led to the implementation of a High Impact Practice professional development program which began summer 2014 (link 12).

- ARPDs and CPRs guided the allocation of carry-over funds from the College’s Title III grant. The Library and Learning Resources CPR provided the justification for allocating carry-over Title III funds to support a renovation for testing services in the Lama Building. There will be more seats to support testing for distance education, placement testing, placement and entry tests for nursing programs (the latter two support efforts to increase enrollment) (link 13 to LLR CPR). These outcomes relate to the Strategic Plan’s
Outcome B: Hawaii’s Educational Capital, especially PM B5, related to distance learning strategies and Outcome D: Globally Competitive and Collaborative Workforce, especially, PM D4 concerning increase in completion in campus STEM fields (College’s scorecard for spring 2014 - [link](#).

Carry-over Title III funds were also used to upgrade campus desktop computers to Windows 7 ([link](#)). The justification for this allocation can be found in: the College’s Strategic Plan, Outcome F: Resources and Stewardship, PM F2, i.e., establish minimum technology standards and bring all classrooms, labs, and offices into compliance by 2015; the 2013 KCC Technology Plan, which supports the SP and calls for ensuring that the College maintains, at the minimum, basic IT resources; and the CPRs from Arts & Sciences ([live link](#), [link](#)).

Concerns with student learning outcomes assessment drove the creation of an ad hoc Student Success Center Committee of the Faculty Senate (an authorized governance organization of the College), tasked with developing recommendations for the creation of a center to promote improved student learning. Title III funds were allocated to support travel by this committee to study student success programs at other college campuses, and several site visit reports summarize their observations ([live link](#), [link](#)). An extensive student survey was conducted to learn what helped and what hindered student success ([link](#), [link](#)). The Committee’s report ([link](#)) was presented to the Faculty Senate and approved on April 7, 2014. It was presented to the Administration Staff Council and then to the Board of Regents on April 17.

As the result of the Student Success Committee Report, the Chancellor approved the creation of a new committee to research and implement the recommendations within that report. The Queen Kapi‘olani Student Success Campus-wide Initiative was created June 2014 and a Student Success Council was formed to lead the initiative. During the summer 2014, in response to the student survey, an additional $125,000 was allocated from Title III carryover funds to improve campus signage and to buy furniture for collaborative spaces across the campus. In the latest Title III grant proposal submitted for funding effective October 31, 2014, support was requested to fully implement the Student Success Campus-wide Initiative.

The following table shows how, since 2012, changes have been made to improve the reporting of course and program student learning outcome assessment in ARPDs and CPRs and to improve the use of these documents in planning and resource allocations at the program and institutional level.
Table 2. Integrating Learning Outcomes Assessment with Institutional Planning and Resource Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 2012</th>
<th>October 2012</th>
<th>October 2013</th>
<th>October 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Six-year strategic plan**, aligned with UH system, focused on student achievement (2008-2015).
- **Annual Report of Program Data (ARPD)** focused mainly on health indicators (demand, efficiency and effectiveness). Student achievement data used to determine effectiveness.
- **Three-year Comprehensive Program Review (CPR)** based on analysis of the three previous years of ARPD, including progress in achieving planned improvements.
- **Three-year departmental tactical plans**, aligned with College strategic plan, allow for inclusion of evidence of student learning.

- **Fall 2011**: Program Learning Outcomes Assessment added to ARPD, but with mixed results due to a lack of standardized reporting format; more structure projected to be added to 2012 ARPD.

- **Implementation of standardized reporting** of program learning outcomes in Annual Report of Program Data (ARPDs).
- **Revision of College’s policy on Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) (K5.202)** in progress.
- All programs developed tactical action plans for improvement in their CPRs due March 31, 2013.
- **2012**: ARPDs completed by all instructional and student support programs. All programs report results of program learning outcomes assessment and steps for improvement based on the results.

- **2013**: The revised policy on CPR (K5.202) is approved and implemented.
- CPRs require reporting assessment of program learning outcomes, results of the assessment and plans for improvement based on these results.
- CPRs completed by all academic and student support programs.
- CPRs require tactical plans that are based on program learning outcome results and aligned with the strategic plan.
- CPRs require steps for improvement based on program learning outcome results.

- **December 2013**: ARPDs completed by all instructional and student support programs. Programs report results of program learning outcomes assessment and steps for improvement based on the results.
- The revised planning and budgeting cycle is implemented. The Allocation Request Form (ARF) used by the revised cycle ties allocation requests to improving program outcomes and the institution.
- **Title III carry-over fund allocation decisions** are based on improvement plans in ARPD, CPRs, and ARFs.
- **Student Success Committee’s 2014 student survey and faculty/staff survey** identified common learning support needs, resulting in many open meetings discussing implications for instructional programs, instructional support programs, and student services. Recommendations required institution-level resource allocation of $125,000 from Title III carry-over funds.
Based on the information provided above, and that provided to the ACCJC in 2012 and 2013, the College meets the Standards, i.e., the College utilizes student learning outcomes assessment to support institutional planning decisions.
Recommendation 5. In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends the College: 1) identify student learning outcomes for all student services programs, 2) assess student attainment of these outcomes, and 3) conduct dialogue to use assessment results to implement program improvements. (Standards II.B.4, II.C.2)

The 2013 site visit concluded that:

“The counselors at the College have demonstrated a significant effort in developing outcomes, measuring those outcomes, and using the results to improve their services. The college has contributed resources for training and supported requests growing out of the comprehensive review. The college recognizes the need to expand student learning outcomes to other areas that serve students. In order to fully meet the standards, Kapi`olani Community College needs to engage all aspects of Student Services and other unit services in assessment of student learning outcomes.”

I. Student Learning Outcomes for Counseling

A. Identify student learning outcomes for all student services programs.

At the time of the comprehensive site visit in 2012, the College reported that 11 units completed one cycle of assessment. For the purposes of this current report, the Culinary Arts, Hospitality, and Business, Legal, and Technology cluster have been separated into three reporting units; thus we are reporting the number of units as 13 and not the 11 as reported in 2012:

Academic Program Counselors
   1) Business, Legal, and Technology (BLT)
   2) Culinary Arts (CULN)
   3) Health Sciences/EMS and Nursing
   4) Hospitality (HOST)
   5) Honda International Center (HIC)
   6) Kahikoluamea Counselors (Developmental education for math and English, and First Year Experience)
   7) Maida Kamber Center for Career Exploration, Transfer and Graduation Services (MKC, serving the Arts and Sciences Program)

Targeted Populations Counselors/Coordinators
   8) Disability Support Services Office (DSSO)
   9) Kuilei Outreach Program (High School Outreach Program)
  10) Military Veterans Program (MVP)
  11) Native Hawaiian Career and Technical Education (NHCTE)
  12) Single Parent-Displaced Homemaker (SP-DH)
  13) TRIO Student Support Services (TRIO)
The above units had completed the first cycle of assessment for all SLOs in academic year 2011-2012 (link 1) (link 2). First-Year Experience and Kahikoluamea (developmental education for math and English) have been revamped into one collaborative reporting unit. In academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, DSSO, Kuilei, BLT, Culinary and HOST completed SLO assessments (link 3).

As is evident from the above list, Kapi‘olani Community College utilizes a decentralized model of counseling/advising and reporting. The Targeted Populations counselors report to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, while Academic Program counselors report to either department chairs or to the Academic Dean of their unit. Academic Program counseling assessment data are accessible and visible at the Office of Institutional Effectiveness’ web page on program review (live link, link 4).

B. Assessment

The College was able to engage all aspects of Student Services and other unit services in assessment of student learning outcomes through the development of an Assessment Team starting in spring 2013. In mid-November 2013 the Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) was designated to support this assessment work. Consequently, OFIE has been working with Student Affairs to gather achievement data and develop assessment and analysis strategies for SLOs and SLO data (link 5, p. 3). The College supported this institutional improvement by releasing a counseling faculty member who now serves as a 0.25 full-time-equivalent Counseling Assessment Coordinator.

The College also allocated resources to provide three Assessment Coaches, assigned by the Chancellor and Faculty Senate, to support the assessment activities of department chairs, student learning outcomes coordinators, and individual faculty members. Over the spring 2014 semester, one of the Assessment Coaches worked with the Counseling Assessment Coordinator to complete the following:

- Development of a coordinated SLO matrix (link 6)
- Calibration of a common rubric for all counseling SLOs (link 7)
- Development of a SLO reporting schedule (link 8)
- Updating of templates (e.g. the Counseling Learning Assessment (CLA) report template was revised to accommodate more information and CLAs were resubmitted in May 2014) (link 9)
- An assessment Laulima site (Laulima is the college learning management system and collaborative resources tool)
- Individual and group training sessions (link 10, link 11, link 12, link 13)

A discussion of the assessment of SLOs and dialogue about improvements follows in the next section.
For the 13 counseling units, SLOs (link 14) were assessed and programs analyzed their assessment data to determine if students were attaining the outcomes. Table 3 below contains a summary of the assessment data.

Table 3. Summary of assessment work by counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Means of Assessment</th>
<th>Criteria Met</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Advisors/Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Legal, Technology</td>
<td>Post Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100% student attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary</td>
<td>Post Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100% student attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences/EMS/Nursing</td>
<td>Pre &amp; Post Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100% student attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>Post Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100% student attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda International Center</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100% student enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahikoluamaea</td>
<td>Pre &amp; Post Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maida Kamber Center</td>
<td>STAR Audit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50% of sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Populations Counseling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Support Services Office</td>
<td>Completion of process; Quiz; Post Survey</td>
<td>Students &amp; Student Notetaker: Yes</td>
<td>Student Notetaker: 100% of hired Faculty: 97 faculty members who were sent Disability Notices that semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuilei Outreach Program</td>
<td>Enrollment &amp; financial aid disbursement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100% of new students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Veterans Program</td>
<td>Completion of application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100% of military veteran students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian Career &amp; Technical Education</td>
<td>Used STAR to check student enrollment in fall 2013 and spring 2014 (grant target is 83% of students); (link 15)</td>
<td>SLO 1: Did not meet grant target. 79% re-enrolled.  SLO2. Did not meet grant target. 94% of the students completed a service learning, work experience, coop, or internship.</td>
<td>SLO 1: Eligible Native Hawaiian students who continued in the program from fall 2013 to spring 2014 SLO 2: Native Hawaiian students who successfully completed a service learning, work experience, coop, or internship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent/Displaced Homemaker (SP/DH)</td>
<td>Completion of plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SP/DH students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO Student Support Services</td>
<td>Completion of module; Completion of FAFSA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Online financial literacy: 23% TRIO students 100% student attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Conduct dialogue to use assessment results to implement program improvements

The Targeted Populations counselors as a group conducted dialogs about the assessment work referred to in Table 3 above and how this will be used for improvement of student learning (see Table 4 below). A few examples of improvement from Disability Student Services Office (DSSO) include re-staffing and retraining the front office to emphasize the importance of employment documents, improving the training for the notetakers by requiring those who score low on the quiz to retrain and retest, revising and improving the faculty notification letter, and providing workshops and online training modules for instructional faculty.

The academic program counselors completed the process of analyzing and discussing the data referred to in Table 3 and then using the data for improvement in their respective units. The Health Sciences/EMS/Nursing cluster held monthly meetings. This group included dialogue on assessment as a standing agenda item (link 16). Their assessment dialogue has produced several improvements, including revisions to the selective admissions application form, creating a “Health Careers at a Glance” handout, and requiring students to complete a narrative to describe their readiness and preparedness for the programs that the students have chosen.

Based on assessment results, programs have started applying improvement plans. Almost half of these programs planned new or continued collaborations with other campus entities which they will continue this academic year. These collaborations vary from relationships with peer mentors, program coordinators, department chairs, faculty members, and other Student Affairs programs or offices. One program, Kuilei, continues its partnership with feeder high schools and some middle schools (link 17). Disability Student Support Services (link 18), is improving its application processes, utilizing or improving the use of technology, improving student workers’ training, refining communication methods, and developing new program interventions.

Lastly, based on their analyses of their assessment processes and meeting their criteria for success, all programs have developed either new SLOs or improved SLOs in order to develop more robust and coordinated assessments. These coordinated assessments led to the development of 5 Counseling Learning Goals and 14 Counseling Student Learning Outcomes (link 19). All of the programs are updating and developing their assessment tools to better measure these new SLOs.

The following table summarizes examples of program improvements resulting from dialogue about assessment results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>SLOs Assessed</th>
<th>Program Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Advisors/Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer mentors have been assigned to BLT Kopiko Learning Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Legal, Technology (BLT)</td>
<td>• Students will be able to increase their understanding of resources available and increase their comfort level in college.</td>
<td>• Academic program coordinators and department chair will assume coordination and marketing of the welcome reception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary (CULN)</td>
<td>• Students will be able to increase their understanding of resources available and increase their comfort level in college.</td>
<td>• Continue work with CULN 111 instructors to have peer mentors assist in STAR usage presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences/EMS/Nursing</td>
<td>• Students will be able to synthesize information and make an informed decision toward a specific career pathway.</td>
<td>• The “My Plan” narrative has been included within the application process for all Health Sciences and EMS programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Surgical Technology Program (within the Nursing Department) has included the “My Plan” narrative within its application process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>• Students will be able to increase their understanding of resources available and increase their comfort level in college.</td>
<td>• Coordinate with the Honda International Center faculty to eliminate activities scheduled simultaneously to improve student participation and lessen scheduling conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinate with the New Student Orientation and other activities that may be scheduled during the week prior to the start of school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda International Center</td>
<td>• Students will be able to increase their awareness of campus resources to accomplish career and educational goals.</td>
<td>• Clearly communicate the SLO of developing a first semester academic plan to both students and program advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students will be able to understand their responsibilities in maintaining their F-1 student status.</td>
<td>• Utilize more technologies and visual aids such as Powerpoint to improve student learning about the US college system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students will be able to develop a first semester academic plan.</td>
<td>• Introduce web resources and office visits to increase awareness of campus resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students will be able to increase cultural awareness for successful transition to US college system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahikoluamea</td>
<td>• Students will be able to identify what they have learned as a result of meeting with the counselor for their CSI interpretation.</td>
<td>• Develop new strategies for counseling such as more structured advising. Counselors will map out the courses for the first year for entering students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students will be able to identify what they</td>
<td>• For AY 2014-2015, a one-year student success pilot course, IS 109,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will now be able to do (next steps) with their awareness.

- Students will be able to be aware of how to fund their college education.
- Students will be able to be aware of how to get involved in Hawaiian cultural activities on campus.
- Students will be able to be aware of their vision and goals and how to get there.
- Students will be able to be aware of their values, skills, and interests.
- Students will be able to be aware of some of the careers and majors that might be a good fit for them.
- Students will be able to be aware of the support services and resources at KCC.
- Students will be able to create social connections with others at KCC.
- Students will be able to stay motivated in college.
- Students will be able to use ‘Imiloa – MyPlan for college planning.
- Students will be able to use STAR and other resources to successfully plan.
- Students will be able to feel connected to “the land, my spirit, and myself.”
- Students will be able to maintain balance in their life.
- Students will be able to know where to go for their academic and learning needs.
- Students will be able to know how to connect with their program/major advisor.
- Students will be able to know how to develop/maintain positive study habits.

is offered to full time first-year students who have placed into Math 24. It will include a Native Hawaiian cultural immersion and an integrated service-learning project.

- Students will be able to identify necessary

- Partnered with First Year Experience (FYE) at mandatory

Maida Kamber
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>requirements for graduation.</th>
<th>orientation and mandatory academic advising.</th>
<th>Attended annual all-day training on degree requirements with largest transfer partner, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted Populations Counseling Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Disability Support Services Office | • Student notetaker will be able to complete all requirements for employment as a DSSO notetaker.  
• Student notetaker will be able to comprehend the duties and responsibilities of note taking.  
• Students will be able to identify their Disability Notice (DN).  
• Students will be able to identify the accommodations they will receive through their DN.  
• Students will be able to comprehend their responsibilities and duties related to their accommodations.  
• Faculty will be able to identify DN.  
• Faculty will be able to comprehend Disability Notice DN.  
• Faculty will be able to comprehend their responsibilities and duties related to their DSSO students’ accommodations. | • Improve by re-staffing, training front staff on importance of employment documents and created phone reminder.  
• Require notetakers, if quiz score is low, to repeat training to emphasize missed quiz items.  
• Improve letter to faculty and provide workshops or online modules for faculty.  
• Highlight faculty responsibility in fulfilling the accommodations at the New Faculty Orientation (NFO). | |
| Kuilei Outreach Program | • Students will be able to identify the steps to transition to their next educational goal.  
• Students will be able to effectively register for courses applicable to their educational goal.  
• Students will be able to identify campus and community on-site and on-line resources. | • Build broader network.  
• Continue good relationships with the College’s Admissions, Records, and Financial Aid offices, First-Year Experience, feeder high schools and some select middle schools. | |
<p>| Military Veterans Program | • Students will be able to successfully complete the U.S. Department of Veteran | | • All students were assessed. However, not all the students were able to complete the U.S. Department of Veterans application. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affairs application, 1990 paper version, or online version (VONAPP) to receive Certificate of Eligibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 268 students were served. 90% of these students completed the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hired student help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitored and updated student files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hosted information sessions for prospective and current students and developed a support group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Created checklist with VONAPP website and application instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used social media to share information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Hawaiian Career &amp; Technical Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 1. Students in the NHCTEP who complete their first semester in fall 2013 will persist to the spring 2014 semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 2. Students in the NHCTEP will successfully complete a service learning, work experience, co-op or internship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 1. The hiring of an educational specialist will assist in the efforts of student follow-up and engagement, thereby hopefully impacting retention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 2. No improvements need to be made in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Parent/Displaced Homemaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students will be able to identify their next step(s) as a result of attending a SPDH info session (Sep 2014 CLR, <a href="#">link</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing comprehensive and consolidated plan sheet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIO Student Support Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 1. Students will be knowledgeable about financial literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 2. Students will be able to complete FAFSA prior to KCC’s Priority deadline of March 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 1. Combine the roles of tutors and mentors and only have tutors as student staff. In addition to tutoring, they will lead USA Fund workshops, facilitate college success seminars, as well as perform everyday office duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLO 2. Offer workshops on personal statements and resume writing as well as how to write a professional cover letter to better prepare them for the scholarship writing process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Service Area Outcomes for Services for Students

A. Identify student learning outcomes for all student services programs.

Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) were developed in March 2014 for Admissions, Financial Aid and Graduation (link 21). The three SAOs were created using the template below:

| Students (could be a specific student population group) who (service or program) will be able to | demonstrate knowledge, behavior, or skills mastery. |
| Population Group + Service Provided = Change in knowledge, behavior, or skills. |

The SAOs are as follows:

- **Admissions.** Students who apply to KCC and who complete the online tutorial or in-person information session will be able to submit a complete application.

- **Financial Aid.** Students who are awarded financial aid and who review the financial aid policies will understand the Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) Policy.

- **Graduation.** Students who have earned 36 credits and who have created a STAR Academic Plan will be able to determine their graduation eligibility.

An SAO survey for Admissions, Financial Aid, and Graduation was administered in April 2014. Of the 2,338 students identified, 240 completed the survey. The data was analyzed in May 2014 (Admissions link 22, Financial Aid link 23, and Graduation link 24). The first dialogue about the results took place in June 2014.

B. Assess and conduct dialogue to use assessment results to implement program improvements

1. **Admissions**
   The SAO for Admissions was “Students who apply to KCC who complete the online tutorial or in-person information session will be able to submit a complete application.”

   a. **Background**
      In fall 2013, 6,074 students applied to the College and 2,882 applied for spring 2014 admission. Of the students who started the application for fall 2013 admissions, 4,510 were accepted and 912 (15%) had incomplete applications. For spring 2014 admissions, 2,123 were accepted and 510 (17.67%) had incomplete applications. Consequently, there were 1,422 incomplete applications in FY2014.

      The College’s Registrar Group (RG) decided it needed to discern why these students had not completed their applications. The RG proposed the SAO above, believing that additional information on the registration process will improve completion rates. Meanwhile, to better understand the reasons for incomplete applications, the Registrar Group sent a survey to students. However, only 240 students replied, and while the Admissions Office did glean some
information from the survey it could not use the results to make definitive conclusions as to student need. The RG then determined that processing procedures may have more to do with the incomplete applications than student satisfaction and realized that the College’s Kuilei High School Outreach Program and current student access to admission support services might be sufficient if other changes were made, including changes at the system level.

b. Improvements
Concurrently, the Registrars from the seven community colleges were meeting and discussing various issues, one of which was incomplete student applications. The Registrars found that the entire UHCC System is experiencing problems with online application processing, therefore the UHCC's Registrar Group has proposed a “centralized admissions” process to the Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs (VCSA). The proposal addresses the problems associated with multiple applications to multiple Community College campuses, residency determination, and major selection. The KCC Registrar is on the committee to discuss implementation, outcomes, and improvements to the current online application that would help address these concerns. The proposal is yet to be approved, with the next meeting scheduled with the Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs in September 2014 to present more data before submitting the proposal to the Vice President for the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC). While the number of incomplete applications is higher than desired, it is difficult to know the exact reason that students fail to complete the application. However, the proposed centralization of admissions is expected to reduce the number of incomplete applications, if students are no longer required to complete multiple applications for more than one UHCC campus, as is current practice.

The next step in this process, once the proposal is approved, is to create a new SAO, e.g., “Students will be able to complete the college application process due to implementation of a centralized admissions application.” This SAO will be measured by comparing incomplete application rates across over the previous 3 years.

2. Financial Aid

The SAO for Financial Aid was, “Students who review the financial aid policies understand the Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) Policy.”

a. Background
The following data from AY 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 was used to assess this outcome. For AY 2012-2013, 4,194 financial aid applicants registered at the College; 66.67% of those applicants were awarded financial aid. For AY 2013-2014, 4,039 financial aid applicants registered at the College; 72.59% of those applicants were awarded financial aid. For the 2013-2014 applicants, a link to the Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy (SAP) was sent in the email award notification letter they received.

In AY 2013-2014 a survey was conducted to determine if there was a connection between understanding the SAP policy and student success. Of the 240 students that completed a survey, 56.73% indicated they reviewed and understood the SAP Policy; 149 students answered the survey question asking if they knew the number of Financial Aid eligibility credits they had used thus far; 102 of those students gave an answer that was reasonable, indicating that 68.46% could
calculate their eligibility. A comparison between the two years under discussion showed that 21.67% of those that were awarded and registered in AY2012-2013 did not meet Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) standards while 19.71% did not meet SAP standards in AY2013-2014. It was concluded that informing students about the SAP in the award email may have had a positive effect on ensuring that students awarded financial aid meet the requirements of the SAP. However the numbers of students affected is not large enough to make this result statistically significant.

b. Improvements
The number of students not meeting SAP standards is still of concern. In AY2014-2015, there will be a focus on the SAP policy with all first-year new students at New Student Orientation. First-year students who withdraw from classes in the first semester and those that are not meeting SAP standards at the end of the first semester will be identified and required to meet with the FYE Financial Aid Specialist. While this will not target all students at the College on financial aid, it will expose new students to the policy earlier and should decrease the number of students on SAP in the first year, a critical point in the students’ academic career. Some of the data analyzed did not specifically address this SAO, however the number of students who receive financial aid but do not register for classes is of concern. More information is needed to determine why students are not registering.

In addition, the Financial Aid office will work with institutional research to identify all financial aid students and track financial aid SAP (Satisfactory Academic Progress.) This list would be narrowed to first year students. The entry term will be identified. Students will then be tracked on an annual basis. Tracking will begin with 2013-14. The following year 2014-15 will be used for comparison and tracked annually in future years.

3. Graduation
The SAO for Graduation was, “Students who have earned 36 credits and who have created a STAR Academic Plan will be able to determine their graduation eligibility.”

a. Background
STAR is an online tool where students can place their courses into their academic planner and track their progress towards their current degree program. Graduation data for summer and fall 2013 and spring 2014 were used to assess this outcome. Of the 240 students who completed the survey, 93.81% had accessed STAR, 87.34% had created a STAR Academic Plan, and 89.96% knew how to navigate STAR. 95.22% indicated that they knew their graduation requirements for their program, although only 70.74% had met with an advisor or counselor to discuss the eligibility requirements for graduation. These results seem to indicate that students know how to access and use STAR. Also, 2,110 students petitioned to graduate in summer and fall 2013 and spring 2014. Of those, 5.12% were denied due to ineligibility, suggesting that more can be done to assist students in using the STAR Planner and STAR Academic Pathway to determine graduation eligibility. Approximately, 20 to 25 students each semester are enrolled to another term for the same reason. Each year, there are also approximately 200 students who need to request a Graduation Exception Request Form (GERF) due to ineligibility. After reviewing student concerns about their STAR Academic Planner, it was evident that the lack of “pre-
majors” in the STAR Planner is confusing for students, in particular those students completing the prerequisites for special admittance programs such as the College’s health programs.

b. Improvements
Dialogue determined that the SAO needed revision because it does not help us determine if students can calculate their graduation eligibility using the STAR tool. The revised SAO is:

“Students who attend a STAR Workshop who use My Course Planner and run the Academic Pathway will be able to determine their expected graduation date or when to transfer.”

In partnership with the First-Year Experience (FYE) Program, which requires students to attend a STAR Workshop in the first semester, Admissions can assess students’ ability to use STAR and ultimately ensure all students will be provided this service. Admissions, Pathways, Transfer-Year Experience and FYE are currently working with the STAR Development Team to create “pre-majors” in the STAR Academic Planner, which should assist students in special admittance programs and those transferring to one of the 4-year Institutions within the UH System to use STAR more effectively. It should also be noted that Admissions recommends that the College establish a policy that mandates graduation checks (advising) at certain milestones. This policy would reduce the number of students needing a Graduation Exceptions (GERF) and would prevent students from petitioning to graduate if they are ineligible.

III. Conclusion

Based on the information provided above, and that provided to the ACCJC in 2012 and 2013, the College meets the Standard, i.e., the College 1) identifies student learning outcomes for all student services programs, 2) assesses student attainment of these outcomes, and 3) conducts dialogue to use assessment results to implement program improvements. In addition, the College has provided evidence to illustrate that it engages all aspects of Student Services and other unit services in assessment of student learning outcomes.
**Recommendation 8.** In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a technology plan to identify technology needs and inform the budgeting process (III.C.)

The 2013 site visit concluded that:

“While this document represents a beginning of addressing the technology needs of the college, it does not include an actual plan, which would include action items, responsible persons, dates, and processes for decision-making.....(The plan) does not include planning information or even clear recommendations. This is an area the College needs to develop much more and to tie technology to the planning process.”

The College has met this recommendation in full. The technology plan ([link](#)) has been revised and reviewed by the Chancellor’s Advisory Council Workgroup on Technology, and the Chancellor’s Advisory Council.
The Commission also requires Kapiʻolani Community College to demonstrate that it has adopted, implemented, and is adhering to the UH Policy on faculty (full- and part-time) evaluations to include, as a component, effectiveness in producing learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c).

The college has adopted, implemented and is adhering to the UH Policy on faculty (full- and part-time) evaluations to include, as a component, effectiveness in producing learning outcomes.

After consultation with the University of Hawaiʻi Professional Assembly (the faculty union), the University of Hawaiʻi Community College (UHCC) System promulgated the Faculty Five-year Review and Lecturer Evaluation Policies, which include, as a component, effectiveness in producing learning outcomes. The College then based its procedures on these UHCC policies. These policies have been implemented and procedures followed, effective spring 2014.

I. The UHCC Faculty Review and Lecturer Evaluation Policies

On November 21, 2013, UHCCP #9.104 and UHCCP #9.203 were promulgated (link 1). These policies refer to lecturer evaluations and five-year faculty review, respectively. The policies explicitly refer to the role of learning outcomes in the evaluation of both lecturers (UHCCP #9.104) and full-time faculty (UHCCP #9.203) in the following manner:

UHCCP #9.104 (link 2, p. 2) states:

“Lecturers are expected to follow the course, program and institutional student learning outcomes and assessment methodologies as adopted by faculty members for the courses they teach.” “Minimally, the lecturer evaluation submittal must include one peer evaluation, results of student evaluations for all classes taught, and a self analysis of: (a) Degree of attainment of student learning outcomes in the classes taught. It is understood that the lecturer is not solely responsible for the attainment of student learning outcomes by all students.” (emphasis added)

UHCCP #9.203 (link 3, p. 1) states:

“… in accordance with Board of Regents policy, all community college faculty are evaluated at least every five years. These evaluations are based on the faculty classification plan which documents faculty expectations at each rank”

The stated SLO-related expectation according to the “Primary Responsibilities of Faculty” in the Faculty Classification Plan (link 4, A-3 in Tenure/Promotion Guidelines) is:
“Community College faculty members should strive for excellence in the performance of their primary responsibilities. Where appropriate, they design measurable or observable learning outcomes and assess and provide evidence of student learning” (emphasis added).

Thus the official University of Hawai‘i Community College policies and faculty evaluation guidelines both refer to the role of faculty in assessing student learning outcomes and, in turn, the role of that assessment in the evaluation of the faculty. The following section outlines the College’s implementation of these policies.

II. Adopting, implementing and adhering to the UH Policies to include, as a component, effectiveness in producing learning outcomes

Since the promulgation of the policies, the College committed to adopting and implementing the policies and developed campus-specific procedures for review by the Faculty Senate as is documented below.

The policies were first discussed with the department chairs at the January 23, 2014, meeting of the Vice Chancellors’ Advisory Council (link). The focus of this discussion was on making sure that department chairs understood the implications of complying with the policy and their role in establishing internal timelines and procedures for submission of the necessary documents in compliance with the policies. Subsequently, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) followed up with a written notice to department chairs of the need to update or revise their internal procedures, forms, and guidelines for lecturer evaluation and five-year review in compliance with the new policies (email link). The departmental guidelines were submitted to the VCAA at the end of summer 2014. The VCAA reviewed the guidelines to ensure that they complied with the UHCC policies.

Implementation of the policy on five-year review required an initial inventory of eligible faculty. On February 15, 2014, the VCAA sent notices to academic administrators to identify faculty who had not submitted contract renewals or tenure and/or promotion documents in the previous five years, thereby making them eligible for five-year review (link). The information submitted by the departments was compiled into a single list of all faculty at the College and the current status of their five-year evaluation review. This information (link) was submitted to the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Human Resources Office. The information was uploaded to a password-protected database in order to better monitor and track the timeline for review of all faculty in the system (live link, link). This database will serve as the repository of evaluation cycles and will assist department chairs and administrators to identify faculty who are eligible for a departmental-level five-year review, to monitor the evaluation milestones for all faculty and to document their professional history in the UHCC system.

While the UHCC policies were first being implemented on the campus, the College also completed the process of creating the campus-specific implementation of the UHCC policies, as is required in those systemwide policies.
The first draft of the campus-specific procedures and guidelines for the implementation of UHCCP #9.203, the policy on faculty review was submitted to the Chancellor on April 27, 2014 (link 10). At their May 1, 2014 meeting, the members of the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) provided additional feedback on both the draft of K 9.104, the campus-specific procedures and guidelines for the implementation of UHCCP #9.104, the policy on lecturer evaluation and on K9.203, the campus-specific procedures and guidelines for the implementation of UHCCP #9.203, the policy on faculty review. The members of the CAC gave their endorsement of K9.104 and K 9.203 at the meeting on June 24, 2014 (link 11).

On July 1, 2014, the Chancellor completed the process by distributing the approved procedures to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the deans and the department chairs (link 12).

After many discussions and open forums among the faculty over the course of the spring 2014 semester, in a formal resolution to the Chancellor dated May 5, 2014, the Faculty Senate submitted “guidelines for presenting evidence of involvement with assessment and improvement of student learning as a component in faculty self-evaluation documents such as Contract Renewal, Tenure & Promotion, Lecturer Assessment, and Post-Tenure Review” (link 13). This document includes questions adapted from the section addressing Standard III.A.1.c. in the ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Institutions, July 2013 to guide the faculty in developing their self-assessment documents:

1. What is your role in producing student learning outcomes?
2. What deep thinking have you, as an individual and with your colleagues, engaged in about how well students are learning? What measures have you, again individually and collectively, created or selected to measure that learning?
3. What discussions have you had about how to improve learning? What plans have you made?
4. What changes have you made in your methodologies to improve learning?
5. If you teach, what changes in your course content or sequencing have resulted from analysis of how well students are mastering course content?
6. How have you engaged in professional development toward the development and assessment of student learning outcomes?

III. Ongoing Implementation

To implement the new policy on lecturer evaluations, department chairs prepared timelines for the evaluation of lecturers (Arts & Humanities and Business, Legal, & Technology samples are available - link 14, link 15) and received the lecturer self-evaluation documents on April 1, 2014. Sample assessments and responses are attached (Arts & Humanities link 16, link 17, and Business, Legal, & Technology link 18, link 19).
In compliance with the new policy on five-year review, in this first iteration of the policy, eligible faculty members were notified of their scheduled five-year evaluations by May 1, 2014. These faculty members will submit a review document to their Department Chairs (or equivalent) by February 1, 2015. A completion report outlining the faculty who underwent review and the reviewer’s evaluation of the submitted document will be due to the Chancellor by February 28, 2015. Subsequent years will follow this same timeline as established in the UHCC policy and campus-specific procedures.

Based on the above information, the College has demonstrated that it meets the Standard and has adopted, implemented, and is adhering to the UHCC Policy on faculty (full- and part-time) evaluations to include, as a component, effectiveness in producing learning outcomes.
**UHCC System Recommendation 4. Resources.** In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that a comprehensive UH system wide technology plan that includes and supports distance education be developed and implemented and is integrated with institutional planning (Standards II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.c, III.C.1, III.C.2)

The development of University of Hawai‘i system technology planning has involved three separate but related activities.

1) UH System Information Technology Planning Website

   The University of Hawai‘i System Office of Information and Technology Services (ITS) has responsibility for inter-campus technology infrastructure including Internet access, all enterprise applications, and University wide academic applications and tools.

   Under the leadership of Steven Smith, Interim Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, ITS has developed an online site that includes the UH system strategic plan. The site will be continually updated to reflect IT strategies, changes in the technology environment, application development, and timelines of any projects in active development. Colleges will use this site to inform their own technology planning.

   The site is available at [www.hawaii.edu/technology/strategicplan/](http://www.hawaii.edu/technology/strategicplan/)

2) Modification to the UH System Strategic Directions

   The UH system strategic plan covering the period 2008 – 2015 is undergoing revision to address the planning period 2015 – 2021. The broad strategic directions include a goal of becoming a high performing system of higher education and includes the following action items related to distance education:

   **University of Hawai‘i Strategic Directions Report**
   **Action Strategy 2:**

   *UH increases opportunity and success for students through leveraging system resources and capabilities. Integrated academic planning across disciplines, levels and campuses, and collaborative/shared student services prevent unnecessary duplication and efficiently provide students throughout the State with access to educational opportunity and the support they need to succeed*
Tactics
• Employ best practices in student-centered distance and online learning using technology and by leveraging University Centers
• Develop degrees and certificates as part of integrated pathways for students enrolled throughout the UH system
• Ensure that transfer and articulation policies are student-centered, transparent, and well communicated in order to support student mobility and success throughout the System.
• Review academic offerings for unnecessary duplication and opportunities for improved collaboration
• Standardize and collaborate to increase consistency for students and improve operating efficiency in student support areas such as (but not limited to) transcript evaluation, financial aid processing, admissions, and monitoring of student progress, early alerts and intervention strategies
• Reduce cost of textbooks and ancillary needs
• Modify financial aid policies and practices to maximize access and success of underserved and underrepresented populations in cost-effective ways.

The current draft of the UH strategic directions for 2015-2021 can be viewed under the System Priorities and Initiatives section of the System Academic Affairs web site: [www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/).

3) The UH Community College System is also updating its strategic directions for the period 2015 – 2021. One of the major components of that update is the identification of and creation of a strategic use of distance education.

Distance Education has been a significant component of community college delivery of instruction with 1,626 completely online classes offered in AY2013-2014 with 28,015 registrations. An additional 481 Distance Education mixed media classes with 4,974 registrations were offered in the same time period. However, the planning group has recognized that much of the current distance education is driven by individual faculty initiative and not as a strategic component of addressing student access to programs and degrees across the state. Given that the geography of Hawai‘i does not permit easy access to campuses other than on the home island of students, the use of distance technology is essential to ensuring student access.

As part of the planning effort, the community colleges are approaching the development of distance education in several areas.

a) Identifying which courses not currently offered through distance education should be offered to ensure that students on small campuses or in remote sites are able to remain on a degree pathway in a timely fashion. All University of Hawai‘i baccalaureate programs have been mapped to create four-year sequential courses of study. Using these maps, the community colleges have developed an overlay project that examines which courses within the first two years of these pathways are available to students on
each of the seven campuses. The mapping project revealed that courses may not be available because upper division courses not offered by the community colleges are identified as being in the first two years, major courses may not be available to students on a particular campus, or student demand for courses may be too small to justify an in-person class. The identification and monitoring of these degree pathways is now automated within the system.

Based on the pathway mapping project, the highest demand courses are being identified for development in a distance delivery format. While this planning is ongoing, the preliminary list of courses to be considered for development includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICS 215</td>
<td>Introduction to Scripting</td>
<td>Required for BS degree in ICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE 271</td>
<td>Applied Mechanics</td>
<td>Required for BS degree in Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy 230</td>
<td>Introduction to Psychobiology</td>
<td>Required for BA, BS in Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol 265</td>
<td>Ecology and Evolutionary Biology</td>
<td>Required for BS in Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biol 275</td>
<td>Cell and Molecular Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan will establish the resources, training, and support necessary to assure the student that the pathway is available to the student on a consistent basis.

b) Identifying which degree or certificate programs should be offered, in whole or in part, through distance education and what resources, training, and support systems would be necessary. The planning approach is to identify workforce needs both from economic and geographic views. In other words, what are the workforce needs on each of the islands and what are the related student and employment demands? The planning is being informed by analysis of data obtained through EMSI views of historical employment information, EMSI analysis of real time job searches, State and County planning documents on economic development trends, and community college enrollment, job placement, and earnings information.

Since populations and employment opportunities on the neighbor islands are often small but critical, the development of a strategy that uses shared resources and distance technology across the seven colleges is essential to meeting the workforce needs. The specific programs to be developed have not yet been identified, but as with the distance education course development, the plan will identify the resources, training, and support to assure the student access to and success in these programs on a consistent basis.

c) Developing and providing a systemwide program of professional development and certification for faculty teaching online or hybrid classes. Review of the seven colleges revealed that all colleges offered, and in some instances, required faculty to participate in training prior to teaching on-line. One college also required regular continuing education for its distance education faculty.

The professional development programs being offered by the colleges varied considerably in length, content, and method of delivery. Some focused on the
technical aspects of teaching online while others included more content on pedagogy and student learning.

As part of the strategic planning effort, a group of instructional developers and experienced online faculty will be creating a professional development program that may include:

i. minimum set of content that a faculty member must master before teaching online courses;
ii. additional content focusing on pedagogy and student success in online instruction;
iii. structured program of continuing education for online instructors;
iv. the development of multiple formats for delivery of the content including online and face-to-face modalities;
v. certification for faculty completing the training.

The design of the professional development program is planned to be completed by summer 2015.

d) Adoption of Open Education Resources

The University of Hawai‘i is planning to move to open educational resources (OER) for as many courses as possible in an effort to reduce textbook costs for students. Textbook costs are a significant part of the student cost of attendance. Eliminating this expenditure could significantly lower the out-of-pocket expenses for students and avoid the negative consequences of students opting not to purchase costly textbooks. Distance education students would especially benefit from OER materials that could be easily delivered via digital technologies.

The OER effort is in the early stages of development with the identification of open education librarians and repositories and the identification of a mechanism to match interested early adopter faculty with available content.

The revised plan setting the community college strategic directions, goals, and metrics for 2015-2021 is still in development and will be shared with the UHCC Strategic Planning Council in September 2014 and with the broader campus community in a series of meetings in November 2014. The intention is to adopt the plan in spring 2015.

As part of the plan, funds will be made available from the Innovation Fund for the development of the targeted online courses and programs, for the development of the professional development program, and for the development of OER materials.
UH Recommendation 5. Board and Administrative Organizations.
In order to meet the Standards, it is recommended that the UH Board of Regents (BOR) adopt a regular evaluation schedule of its policies and practices and revise them as necessary. In addition, the UH BOR must conduct its self-evaluation as defined in its policy and as required by ACCJC Standards (Standards IV.B.1, IV.B.1.g)

1. Board Revision of Policies

The Board of Regents (BOR), as a follow-up to recommendations of the Advisory Task Group report to the BOR, continues to review and update its policies. Within the past year, BOR action has been taken to review and update the following policies or procedures:

**August 22, 2013 – Interim Modification of Personnel Committee Procedures**

New interim procedure requires that the BOR personnel committee approve all salaries in excess of $150,000.


**September 19, 2013 – Chapter 9 – Amendment to Allow Internal Recruitment for Managerial Positions**

Modifies the recruitment policy for academic managerial appointments to allow internal recruitment as an alternative to national recruitment.


**October 17, 2013 – Modification to BOR By-Laws on Committee Quorum Requirements**

Clarifies that all BOR members may attend any committee meeting as a non-voting member but that quorum remains based on the committee membership only.

November 21, 2013 – Chapter 10 – Amendment Clarifying the Role of the BOR in Land and Real Property Transactions

Establishes the broad policy purposes for land and real property transactions and the role of the BOR in approving such transactions. Directs the creation of a related executive policy.

Reference:  
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201311210000.regular.pdf

November 21, 2013 – Chapter 8 – Amendment to establish an University reserve policy

Establishes a University-wide targeted reserve policy for all funds with regular reporting to the BOR on campus reserve levels.

Reference:  
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201311210000.regular.pdf

November 21, 2013 – Amendment to BOR By-Laws – Hiring of Outside Counsel

Clarifies that in the event of any legal matter involving a conflict between the UH executive and the BOR that the BOR shall be empowered to hire outside counsel.

Reference:  
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201311210000.regular.pdf

January 23, 2014 – Amendment to the UH Mission and Chapter 4-1 related to Sustainability.

Modifies the UH mission to reflect the commitment to sustainability and incorporates related language into Chapter 4, Planning.

Reference:  
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201401230000.regular.pdf
January 23, 2014 – Modification to the By-Laws of the BOR related to Community Colleges

Establishes a clearer responsibility for the oversight of the community colleges through the community colleges committee with an emphasis on strategic directions and outcomes.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201401230000.regular.pdf

February 20, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 8 on Investments

Allows the use of non-traditional instruments as a part of the portfolio for UH endowment and other investments.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201402200000.regular.pdf

February 20, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 6 on Student Fees

Clarifies that all student fees must have an approved expenditure plan prior to the time the fee is first assessed.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201402200000.regular.pdf

March 20, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 10 – Land and Physical Facilities

Clarifies language on the purpose and intent of land development and the overall goals of the University and the campus responsible as caretakers of the land asset.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201403200000.regular.pdf

April 17, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 9 on Faculty Housing

Changes the name of the program to the University Housing Assistance program, modifies the purposes and priorities for housing assistance, and clarifies the enforcement procedures for the program.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201404170000.regular.pdf
April 17, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 9 – Executive and Managerial Compensation

Updates the guidelines for establishing executive and managerial compensation and terms of employment

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201404170000.regular.pdf

April 17, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 9 – Faculty Tenure

Establishes the conditions under which tenure upon hire is granted for new executive/managerial personnel and establishes that the faculty fallback salary should be established at the time of initial hire.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201404170000.regular.pdf

May 15, 2014 – Modification to Chapter 9 – Emeritus/Emerita Title

Clarifies the guidelines for the granting of emeriti titles to retiring faculty and other personnel.

Reference:
http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/bor/regular/minute/201405150000.regular.pdf

2. Modification of BOR Policies and Update of Related University Executive Policies

The University President established a systemwide committee of twelve members to undertake a systematic review of the overall University policy environment, including:

a. Common format for all policies;
b. Future review dates for each policy,
c. Date of last review/update,
d. Archive of updates for each policy,
e. Designation of the owner/responsible office for the maintenance, and interpretation of each policy.

Among the accomplishments of the task force to date are:

- New policy templates have been adopted for Board of Regents Policies, Executive Policies and Administrative Procedures. The templates contain elements recommended by the Advisory Task Group. These elements include:

  a. 3-year scheduled review dates with automatic review alert notices to be issued and tracking of completed periodic reviews,
• Policies have been reorganized into parallel 12 Chapters (current Chapter titles) of BOR Policies, 12 Chapters of Executive Policies and 12 Chapters of Administrative Procedures

a. To date, 17 obsolete Executive Policies have been abolished.
b. To date, 59 Executive Policies (61% of non-abolished Executive Policies) have been converted and posted for review by the task group with additional converted policies being received daily.
c. All 12 Chapters of Board of Regents policies have been redrafted and are pending technical review.
d. A new Policies and Procedures Information System web page has been created and is being tested.
e. An automated system-wide staff notification system is being tested to provide notices whenever new policies are created or existing policies are amended or abolished.

The revised policy environment is expected to be completed by September 2014, and when completed can be found at http://www.hawaii.edu/policy/.

3. BOR Self Evaluation

The Board of Regents had originally planned a tentative retreat in spring 2014 that included a self evaluation. This retreat was postponed because of the heavy workload of the BOR in conducting and managing the Presidential search and in implementing its new committee structure. This presidential search was completed in June 2014 and new BOR leadership was elected at the July 2014 meeting. The BOR retreat/evaluation session is now scheduled for November 2014.