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Who is the guide for?
This guide is to be used by faculty, staff, administrators, and students as a resource for basic information about the upcoming accreditation team visit.

What is Accreditation?
Accreditation is a voluntary system of self regulation developed to evaluate overall educational quality and institutional effectiveness.

The accreditation process of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) provides assurance to the public that accredited member institutions meet the Accreditation Standards of quality, and that the education earned at the institutions is of value to the student who earned it; and that employers, trade or profession-related licensing agencies, and other colleges and universities can accept a student’s credential as legitimate. The federal government requires an institution to be accredited in order to award federal financial aid.

Special Note: Find the three (3) secretly stashed stars (✪) somewhere in this document and win a prize! When you find all three, contact Donna Matsumoto at donnamat@hawaii.edu to redeem your prize. Prizes are limited, so don’t delay!
Steps in the Accreditation Process
ACCJC member institutions agree to undergo an Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Review every six years to determine whether they are meeting the established Accreditation Standards, including the federal requirements, Eligibility Requirements, Commission policies, and that they are engaged in sustainable efforts to improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. The review process includes four steps:

1. internal evaluation (that is, institutional self evaluation)
2. external evaluation
3. Commission review and accreditation action
4. continuous institutional improvement

**Internal Evaluation:** The accreditation process starts with an institutional self-evaluation process where the institution conducts an evaluation of itself against the requirements stated above and in terms of its stated institutional purposes. The outcome of the institutional self-evaluation process is a written analysis, a Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness (Institutional Self Evaluation Report), which Leeward CC submitted to the ACCJC in August 2012.

**External Evaluation:** The Commission appoints a team of trained, external, peer reviewers from its database of evaluators. The evaluators are accomplished professionals from institutions within and outside the region who are responsible for the external evaluation of an institution. Members of the evaluation team are selected on the basis of their professional expertise in higher education and areas of specialization.

The accreditation team:
- examines the Institutional Self Evaluation Report,
- visits the institution,
• writes an External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness that determines the institution’s compliance with the Accreditation Standards and other requirements,
• makes recommendations for improvement, and
• commends excellent practice, when appropriate.

The team also makes a confidential recommendation to the Commission on the accredited status of the institution.

Commission Review and Accreditation Action: The evaluation team submits its External Evaluation Report to the Commission after the institution has been given an opportunity to correct errors of fact.

2. The Commission may also provide the institution with additional recommendations and direction for improvement. The Commission meets in January and June of each year.
3. The Commission decisions are communicated to the institution via an action letter and are made public through Commission announcements.
4. When the institution has received the Commission action letter, it is required to release and share the External Evaluation Report together with the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, and the Commission Action Letter with the college community and the public.

Continuous Institution Improvement: The last and continuous step in the Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Review is that of improvement. Each institution is expected to continuously assure the quality of its educational programs and services, supporting institutional structures as well as address the recommendations provided in the External Evaluation Report.
What is a site visit?

An accreditation evaluation team, made up of professional peers who volunteer their services, will offer independent insights based on careful analysis of our Self Evaluation Report and on-site evaluation. The team will:

• Evaluate us using the Accreditation Standards
• Confirm and find evidence for the assertions in our Self Evaluation Report
• Call attention to problem areas inadequately recognized in the Report
• Assure the Commission that the college continues to meet Eligibility Requirements
• Assure the Commission that we has been responsive to the recommendations of previous visiting teams
• Assure the Commission that we have developed sound evaluation and planning procedures to foster improvement of student achievement and student learning outcomes
• Reinforce and extend the college’s commitment to its continuing pursuit of excellence

Quality assurance to the public and institutional improvement for institutions can only be achieved through the commitment of all who participate.

When is the site visit?
The external evaluation team will be on our campus on Tuesday, October 16, 2012, through Thursday, October 18, 2012.
Who is on our evaluation team?

Dr. Erlinda Martinez (Chair)
President, Santa Ana College

Ms. Kennethia Vega (Assistant)
Assistant to the President, Santa Ana College

Mr. Carl Bengston
Dean of Library and Special Programs, Cerritos College

Dr. Mary Kay Rudolph
VP of Academic Affairs/Asst. Superintendent, Santa Rosa Junior College

Dr. Benjamin Duran
Superintendent/President (Retired), Merced College

Mr. Daniel Peterson
English Instructor, Hartnell College

Dr. Charles Duffy
Director of Institutional Research, Mendocino College

Ms. Teresa Scott
Executive Vice Chancellor, Yosemite Community College District

Mr. Bart Hoffman
Dean of Human Services and Technology, Santa Ana College

Dr. Pamela Walker
Vice President of Student Services, American River College

Dr. Cynthia Napoli-Abella Reiss
Art History Professor, West Valley College

Dr. Ian Walton
Faculty (Mathematics Emeritus), Mission College
Leeward CC’s Progress Since 2006

In January 2007, the ACCJC took action to reaffirm the college’s accreditation status. In a letter dated January 31, 2007, the ACCJC President Dr. Barbara A. Beno commended the college for having made significant progress since its last comprehensive review but underscored the importance of fully responding to the evaluation team’s five recommendations.

The team’s findings focused on having the college
1) maintain and evaluate its assessment, planning, and program review processes;
2) complete the identification of student learning outcomes (SLOs) for all courses and programs and initiate or continue the process of assessing SLOs;
3) implement a student leadership program;
4) implement a disabilities access plan; and
5) implement and evaluate the administrative reorganization approved by the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents (UH BOR) in 2006.

Recommendation #1: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The team recommends that the college maintain the newly approved Leeward Community College Assessment, Program Review and Planning Process, standardize the terminology used in the process, and evaluate the effectiveness of the process after several cycles of full implementation. The evaluation should also include an assessment of the effectiveness of resource allocations in achieving their desired outcome. (Standards I.B.2., I.B.6., III.D.1.c., III.D.2.g., III.D.3., IV.A.2., IV.A.2.a., IV.A.3.)

Maintaining Assessment, Program Review, and Planning Processes

At the time of the college’s most recent comprehensive review in 2006, the college had recently developed an assessment, program review, and planning framework. At that time, only one cycle of program review had
been completed using this new framework for instructional divisions and for the AA degree.

In 2006, the college proposed a second phase to its assessment, program review, and planning processes, which would add an Executive Planning Council (EPC) and five standing committees on space allocation and use, staffing, information technology, external issues, and equipment (Diagrams A and B). The Program Review and Annual Review processes merged into the Annual Program Review (APR) process (Diagram C).

When the college submitted its Midterm Report to the ACCJC in 2009, modifications had been made to the APR process and to the APR template with the goal of continual improvement. At that time, dialogue about the results of program review existed but needed to be more widespread and focused on the identification and analyses of data.

Since 2009, additional modifications were made to the APR process.

1. The responsibilities of the EPC were given to the Campus Council.
2. Five standing committees were reduced to two committees.
3. An administrative review was added (Diagram D).
4. The APR template was modified. For example, the APR template was revised to show clearer alignment of budget requests to the college’s strategic plan.
5. A common rubric was created by an APR working group to provide systematic criteria for prioritizing decisions regarding resource allocation.
Currently, APRs are ongoing and systematic for:
- All instructional divisions
- AA, AS, and AAS degrees
- OCEWD
- Leeward CC Wai’anae
- International programs
- Native Hawaiian programs.

In addition to APRs from the four instructional divisions that comprise the AA degree, the UH system’s Annual Report of Program Data is used to evaluate the AA degree.

APRs are also ongoing and systematic for:
- Student Services,
- Academic Services,
- Administrative Services,
- Institutional Support.

Their prioritized plans are also combined into the college’s institutional plan.

**Standardizing Terminology**
In December 2011, a revised glossary of terms for the APR process was finalized and is included as an attachment to the APR template and to the “Policy on Annual Program Review,” L5.202, which makes clear the linkages between assessment, program review, planning, and resource allocation. The college’s new “Policy on Assessment,” L5.210, makes clear the linkage between assessment results and the APR. Both policies were approved by the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, and the chancellor in the spring of 2012 and became effective as of March 2, 2012.

**Evaluating the Effectiveness of the APR Process and Resource Allocation**
In 2009 and 2011, targeted campus leaders participated in the Community College Inventory, a survey intended to evaluate institutional effectiveness, which included questions about the APR process and about resource
allocation. Comparative analyses from the 2009 and 2011 survey results were used to evaluate the APR process.

In the fall of 2011, a subcommittee of the Campus Council conducted a campus wide survey to evaluate the APR process, and analyses of these survey results were included in the OPPA’s 2011-2012 College Effectiveness Report.

The Self Evaluation Steering Committee conducted an employee satisfaction survey in 2011, which included questions about the APR process, and these survey results were analyzed in the College Effectiveness Report as well.

**Conclusion to Recommendation #1**

Leeward CC has fully met this recommendation. The college maintains its APR process, which relies on standardized terminology. The APR process and the allocation of resources are regularly evaluated for effectiveness, and results of this evaluation are used to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness.

**Recommendation #2: Instructional Programs**

*The team recommends that the college, having completed student learning outcomes for all its courses and for most of the programs offered by the college, complete student learning outcomes for the remaining programs (some certificate programs and the academic support programs), and initiate or continue the process of assessing the outcomes and applying the results of that assessment to the continuous improvement of the instruction and services provided to its students. (Standard II.A.1.a., II.A.1.c., II.A.2.a., II.B.4., and II.C.2.)*

**Completing SLOs for Remaining Programs and Services**

The college has made substantial progress on completing SLOs. At the end
of the 2012 spring semester,
• 99.8 percent of all active courses have defined SLOs (401 out of 402 courses)
• 98 percent of all degrees and certificates have defined SLOs (67 out of 68 programs)
• 86 percent of all Student Services, Academic Services, Administrative Services have defined SLOs or outcome measures (25 out of 29 services)
The general education outcomes were revised in 2011, resulting in seven outcomes, each with accompanying academic skill standards.

Initiating or Continuing the Assessment of SLOs
Currently, SLOs for degrees and certificates are continually and systematically assessed through course-level assessment. Assessment of SLOs and outcome measures exists for Student Services, Academic Services, and Administrative Services. Mapping of SLOs for courses, degrees, and certificates, as well as for institutional learning outcomes, is being done using the software Tk20.

The college has also made progress on assessment of SLOs. At the end of the 2012 spring semester,
• 91.5 percent of all active courses had ongoing assessment (368 out of 402 courses)
• 98 percent of all active degrees and certificates had ongoing assessment (67 out of 68 programs)
• 86 percent of all student learning and support services had ongoing assessment (25 out of 29 activities)

Applying Assessment Results for Improvement
Currently, dialogue about assessment results is ongoing and pervasive at the discipline and program levels and among support areas, at which time gaps are identified. Assessment results are used to make improvements to student learning and achievement, which are specifically discussed in the APR template and are used to made budget requests.
Conclusion to Recommendation #2
Leeward CC has fully met this recommendation. SLOs are identified for courses, degrees, and certificates. SLOs and outcome measures are also identified for Student Services, Academic Services, and Administrative Services. SLOs are continually assessed, and assessment results are used to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness.

Recommendation #3: Student Support Services
The team recommends that the college implement a program for developing student leadership participation in the campus decision-making processes. (II.B.3.b., III.C.1.c., IV.A.2., IV.A.2.a., IV.A.3.)

Implementing a Student Leadership Program
At the time of the college’s comprehensive review in 2006, only a half-time faculty (counselor) position was allocated for student government and for student activities, and there was no active student government on campus. In 2008-2009, one full-time faculty position, the student life/student government coordinator, was allocated. This individual carried out a successful campaign to raise awareness about student activities and student government. During this time, an online election was held for the Associated Students of UH-Leeward CC (ASUH-Leeward CC) Student Government.

Since 2009 the student government has consistently had a full senate of nine senators. Regular retreats are held for student government members to develop team building and leadership skills and to maintain a strong foundation for new members.

Ensuring Student Leadership Participation in Decision-Making Processes
Currently, members of the student government sit on many campus committees and participate in decision-making processes. Student leaders have also served on the UHCC strategic plan committee.
**Conclusion to Recommendation #3**
Leeward CC has fully met this recommendation. Student leaders actively participate in decision-making processes at the college and system levels.

**Recommendation #4: Physical Resources**
_The team recommends that the college develop and implement a plan for ensuring that campus facilities are accessible to students, staff, and community members with disabilities. (Standard III.B.1.b.)_

**Developing and Implementing a Disabilities Plan**
Using the UHCC’s Disability Access Transition Plan, the college’s vice chancellor for administrative services convened a working group in the spring of 2008 to develop a comprehensive disability access plan for the college. The college’s plan included all completed and current access-related projects. Future projects were also identified with an acknowledgement that such projects were dependent upon the state legislature’s capital improvement program fund and/or repair and maintenance fund.

The college continues to improve accessibility to the Pearl City campus facilities for persons with disabilities through the framework of repair, maintenance, renovation, and major construction projects. Current projects that comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) include elevator upgrades, restroom renovations, and ADA-compliant assisted door openings.

The college has an equal employment opportunity/affirmative action coordinator to ensure that ADA-related complaints are dealt with accordingly and in a timely fashion. Students with disabilities have access to instruction and academic services through the Kāko‘o ‘Ike (KI) program. Lastly, an administrator is designated as the college’s ADA 504 coordinator to address specific student ADA-related issues.
Conclusion to Recommendation #4
Leeward CC has fully met this recommendation. The college has in place an access plan for ensuring that campus facilities are accessible to students, staff, and community members with disabilities.

Recommendation #5: Administrative Organization
The team recommends that the college fully implement the Leeward Administrative Reorganization which was approved by the Board of Regents in October of 2006 and, after several years of full operation, evaluate its effectiveness in addressing the college’s problems with administrative instability. (Standard IV.B.2.)

Fully Implement the Leeward Administrative Reorganization
In 2006, the UH BOR approved the reorganization of the college’s administration, providing defined roles and responsibilities. The college’s newly structured administration consisted of eight positions:

1. chancellor
2. vice chancellor for academic affairs
3. vice chancellor for administrative affairs
4. director of planning, policy, and assessment
5. dean of arts and sciences
6. dean of career and technical education
7. dean of student services
8. dean of academic services

A permanent chancellor was appointed to the college in June 2008. By the time the college submitted its Midterm Report in 2009, the two vice chancellor positions were filled with permanent appointments. Two interim dean positions and an interim director position were filled.

Assess the Effectiveness of the Leeward Administrative Reorganization
Currently, the administrative team is stable with only one interim position. The chancellor has been in place for five years, and the two vice chancellors have been appointed for six and seven years, respectively. All dean positions are filled with permanent appointments, with years of service varying from
three months to seven years for an average of three years. The interim director of planning, policy, and assessment retired in 2011, and a new interim appointment was made in 2012. The director position will be advertised for a permanent appointment during the 2012-2013 academic year.

**Conclusion to Recommendation #5**
Leeward CC has fully met this recommendation. The administrative reorganization has been operational since 2006, and all administrative positions are filled. Seven out of eight administrative positions are filled with permanent appointments. The college has demonstrated effectiveness with the stability in administrative appointments and by meeting or exceeding its measurable strategic goals.

Leeward CC has met and continued to improve on the recommendations made by the evaluation team in January 2007. This October, an evaluation team will visit the campus to assess our efforts at maintaining best practices and make a recommendation report to the Commission. The results of the self evaluation process will be reported in January 2013.
Highlights of the 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

• Revised College Mission Statement
• Student Success Initiative
• Office of Planning, Policy & Assessment
• Annual Program Review

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

• Developmental Education Initiatives
• Expanded degree offerings aligned with mission
• Maka‘ala Program & Mandatory New Student Orientation (NSO)
• Learning Commons opening this semester

Standard III: Resources

• Conscientious Stewardship
• Increase in Extramural Funds
• Renovations & Groundbreaking

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

• Engaged & Active Student Government
• Stability of Administrative Positions
**Self Evaluation Steering Committee**

Barbara Hotta, Professor, Information and Computer Science
Accreditation Liaison Officer (2009-2010) and Steering Committee Co-Chair (2010)

Donna Matsumoto, Associate Professor, English
Accreditation Liaison Officer (2010-present) and Steering Committee Co-Chair

Della Anderson, Interim Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment
Steering Committee Co-Chair (2011-present) and Chair, Standard II

Susan Wood, Professor, English
Editor

Joseph (Kepa) Badis, Instructor, Hawaiian Language
Hawaiian Language Consultant

Leanne Chun, Professor (Coordinator), Educational Media Center
Co-Chair, Standard I (2010-2011)

Roberta (Bobbie) Martel, Assistant Professor (Coordinator), Teacher Ed Program
Co-Chair, Standard I (2010-2011)

Helmut Kae, Instructor, Biology
Co-Chair, Standard III

Cindy Martin, Professor (Coordinator), Innovation Center for Teaching and Learning
Co-Chair Standard III

Kay Ono, Associate Professor, Business Technology
Chair, Standard IV

**Campus Representatives**

Therese Nakadomari, Information Technology Specialist
Representative, Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) Group

Janice Ito, Professor, Microbiology; Division Chair, Mathematics and Sciences
Representative, Campus Council (2010-2011)

Laurie Lawrence, Associate Professor (Coordinator), Leeward CC Wai’anae
Chair, Campus Council (2011-present)
Cheryl Mokuau, Private Secretary, Office of the Chancellor Representative, Administrative Support Group (2010-2011)

Evelyn Kamai, Secretary, Language Arts Representative, Administrative Support Group (2011-present)

Paul Lococo, Professor, History Chair, Faculty Senate

Dorothy (Dottie) Sunio, Lecturer, Business and Information and Computer Science Representative, Lecturer’s Group

William (Bill) White, General Laborer Representative, Operations and Maintenance Group

Genai (U’ilani) Keli’ikuli, Instructor, Hawaiian Studies Representative, Pūko’a no nā ‘Ewa Council

Michael Moser, Associate Professor and Senior Workforce Coordinator Representative, Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development

Sandy Hoshino, Professor (Coordinator), Job Prep Services Representative, Student Services

Student Representatives, Associated Students of the University of Hawai’i—Leeward CC (ASUH-Leeward CC)
  Tracey Imper, President
  Bernadette (Bernie) Mack, Treasurer (2010-2011)
  Gene Tijing, Senator (2011-present)

Kathleen Cabral, Marketing Officer Office of the Chancellor

Kathy Hill, Interim Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment (2010-2011)

Guy Nishimoto, Institutional Effectiveness Officer Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment (2011-present)
Actionable Improvement Plans for the 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report

1. The OPPA will facilitate the publication and communication of the revised mission statement to the campus community and the public by fall of 2012. (Standard I.A.2.)

2. The OPPA will facilitate the integration of the revised mission statement into the 2012-2013 planning process and align it with the strategic plan by fall of 2012. (Standard I.A.4.)

3. The OPPA will coordinate professional development opportunities for faculty and staff to learn how to interpret data and use data to make decisions through an inquiry-based process by spring of 2014. (Standard I.B.1.)

4. The Campus Council will work with administration to better communicate to the campus community the planning process and the resulting institutional plan on an annual basis. (Standard I.B.3.)

5. Tk20 will be fully implemented and utilized by fall of 2014. Once fully utilized, the college will focus on reporting and using assessment results for program and institutional improvements. (Standard I.B.5.)

6. The OPPA will include disaggregated data on SLO assessment and student achievement for distance education students and compare that data with those collected for traditional students by spring of 2013 and then on an annual basis. (Standard I.B.5.)

7. The OPPA will coordinate assessment-related training and workshops to further develop practices and the use of results to improve student learning by spring of 2014. (Standard I.B.6.)
8 The OPPA will review models for institutional effectiveness and make recommendations for a redesigned comprehensive planning process for the college by spring of 2013. (Standard I.B.6.)

9 The Faculty Senate and the Distance Education Committee will review the current process for evaluation of online and face-to-face courses and make recommendations to the vice chancellor of academic affairs to ensure comparable student learning in both delivery modes by spring of 2013. (Standard II.A.1.b.)

10 The dean of career and technical education will coordinate the development of a comprehensive assessment, review, and evaluation plan for OCEWD by fall of 2013. This plan will include publishing SLOs and assessment results for all courses and programs in a location that can be accessed by the campus. (Standard II.A.1.c.)

11 The OPPA will coordinate the design of indirect measures of assessment—specifically, exit surveys and focus groups—to gather more in-depth assessment data for the AA degree by spring of 2013. (Standard II.A.1.c.)

12 The OPPA will facilitate a review of the current APR process to improve resource allocation decisions related to the college’s revised mission statement by spring of 2013. (Standard III.A.6.)

13 To increase awareness and knowledge of budgetary and financial planning matters, the vice chancellor of administrative services will add additional resources to the college’s intranet by fall of 2012. (Standard III.D.1.d.)

14 The members of Campus Council will submit a plan to disseminate information to their respective constituencies by December 2012. (Standard IV.A.1.)
Major Developments since the Most Recent Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Review

Under-Served Populations
The UH system, in an effort to identify the state’s need for postsecondary education and to develop a set of priorities to plan for the next decade, developed the Second Decade Project. Of the top four under-served geographical regions in the state with the greatest postsecondary education needs, three regions are in the college’s service area (Central O‘ahu, ‘Ewa, and Wai‘anae), regions that are predicted to have the largest population growth in the state. In addition, the college currently has the largest number of Native Hawaiian students enrolled among all the community colleges in the UH system.

New Instructional Programs
Leeward CC introduced new programs to address workforce development needs, such as the Associate in Arts in Teaching and the Process Technology program. The college developed a new Associate in Science in Natural Sciences to address career paths and transfer options in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). In addition, the college was granted a substantive change approval from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) to offer degrees and certificates in which 50 percent or more of the courses offered are delivered through DE. Most recently, the Associate in Arts in Hawaiian Studies and the Associate in Science in Health Information Technology were approved by the UH Board of Regents (UH BOR) at its meeting on May 17, 2012.

Facilities and Infrastructure
Leeward CC was appropriated $23.2 million for the construction and furnishing of its new Education building, with groundbreaking having occurred on April 18, 2012. In addition, the college was appropriated $5.5 million for the construction and furnishing of a permanent facility for the college’s satellite campus, Leeward CC Wai‘anae.
The college finished a number of improvements to its facilities and infrastructure, including re-roofing and waterproofing projects, waterline replacements, fire hydrant and elevator upgrades, air handling improvements, bathroom renovations, and installation of ADA-compatible doorways. The college’s telephone system was replaced with a new Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) system, and a new campus wide wireless network was installed. In addition, the college began renovations to create the new learning commons for academic support services in the Library building and the new “one-stop” center for student support services on the upper floor of the Administration building.

**Focus on Student Success**

Leeward CC launched its Student Success Committee (SSC), a five-year commitment during which time the college will commit $1 million to initiate projects directed toward making its students more successful. The SSC’s goals, which were derived from the strategic plans of the UH system, the UH community colleges (UHCCs), and Leeward CC, as well as the Achieving the Dream initiative, are as follows:

- Increase the number of graduates and transfers in all programs by 25 percent.
- Eliminate “gatekeeper” courses.
- Improve student success rates by 10 percent in all courses where success rates are less than 70 percent.
- Decrease the time spent in remedial and developmental courses to one year or less.

An SSC initiative that has proven to be highly successful is the math emporium model, which promotes accelerated learning in a collaborative, interactive learning environment. This project involved the curricular redesign of several math courses and the creation of an “emporium” classroom requiring an upgrade to electrical connections and the purchase of computers and flexible furniture.
Expanded Staffing

Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment
The Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment (OPPA) was proposed through the 2005-2006 Annual Program Review (APR) process in an effort to institutionalize assessment processes and expand institutional research capacity. In 2009, an executive/managerial position was reassigned from the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development to the OPPA. In March 2009, the acting faculty director was appointed as interim director. Currently, the staffing at the OPPA is comprised of the following six positions including the director, institutional effectiveness officer, grants coordinator, IT specialist, institutional researcher, and policy analyst.

Leeward CC Waiʻanae
During the same 2005-2006 APR process, the need for expanded staffing and services at Leeward CC Waiʻanae was articulated. During the 2007-2008 academic year, the college added five positions for Native Hawaiian programs, with two positions located in Waiʻanae. Between 2007-2009, Leeward CC Waiʻanae received a total of eight faculty positions and four support area positions.

An expansion of staffing led to an expansion of the physical facility. In the spring of 2012, a temporary expansion to the first floor of the current building relieved some space issues. The college’s current plan is to purchase a 37,000 square foot, permanent facility in Waiʻanae, with negotiations in the final stages. This new facility will provide a multitude of opportunities. The student population is currently 68 percent Native Hawaiian; therefore, specific programs that target this population are being developed. One example is a Polynesian voyaging program that focuses on maritime trades such as boat building, maintenance, and repair. The intent of this program is to engage Waiʻanae youth, especially young men who are already involved in canoe paddling. With a current population of male students at 25 percent, attention is focused on attracting and retaining males in academic and applied pathways.
What You Need to Know About our Planning Process

Leeward CC has a well-established cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation for assessing all areas of operation and for supporting decisions made regarding educational quality and institutional effectiveness.

Each year, the cycle of institutional evaluation and planning at the college begins with a revisit of the mission and strategic plan.

**Leeward Community College Planning Process**


In 2011-2012, Leeward CC revised its mission statement. The new mission statement has three parts: vision, mission, and values. The mission provides direction for the campus and shapes the priorities of the college.
Vision, Mission, and Values

Vision: Leeward Community College is a learning-centered institution committed to student achievement.

Mission: At Leeward Community College, we work together to nurture and inspire all students. We help them attain their goals through high-quality liberal arts and career and technical education. We foster students to become responsible global citizens locally, nationally, and internationally. We advance the educational goals of all students with a special commitment to Native Hawaiians.

These core values shape Leeward Community College’s mission:

Community
We value cooperation, collaboration, social responsibility, and concern for others as crucial elements in building a sense of community inside and outside of the institution.

Diversity and respect
We value individual differences and the contributions they bring to the learning process. We believe that our students are enriched through a diverse intellectual and social environment, where learning occurs through exposure to world cultures, and through interaction with peoples of diverse experiences, beliefs, and perspectives.

Integrity
We value personal and institutional integrity by fostering a culture of continuous improvement to open pathways to student success. We hold ourselves accountable for providing a high-quality academic experience.

Open access
We value all students. We seek to meet their needs, as well as those of the community, by offering a diversity of courses, degree and certificate programs, and training opportunities, through traditional and distance education modes of delivery.

Approved by BOR in May 2012; http://www.leeward.hawaii.edu/mission
Assessment and the Planning Process
SLO assessment at the course and program levels is an ongoing process. SLO assessment data and comprehensive assessment reports are used to complete the Annual Program Review (APR) template. The campus has also identified Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

Institutional Learning Outcomes

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
✓ Examine, integrate, and evaluate the quality and appropriateness of ideas and information sources to solve problems and make decisions in real world situations

Written, Oral Communication and Use of Technology
✓ Use written and oral communication and technology to discover, develop, and communicate creative and critical ideas
✓ Respond effectively to spoken, written, and visual ideas

Values, Citizenship, and Community
✓ Interact responsibly and ethically through respect for others using collaboration and leadership
✓ Engage in and take responsibility for learning to broaden perspectives

All SLOs for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees are vetted and approved by the Curriculum Committee. Course and program SLOs are available in Curriculum Central, the UH online system for curriculum review. Program SLOs are published to students and the public in the College Catalog. Furthermore, all course syllabi include approved SLOs, which are consistent for all courses regardless of delivery method used.

Authentic assessments are ongoing, systematic, and used for improvement of student learning. The process to assess student achievement of SLOs at the course level has three distinct phases: Phase 1A, Phase 1B, and Phase 2. The general timeframe for completing Phase 1A and Phase 1B is during the
first semester, and the completion of Phase 2 usually occurs in the subsequent semester during which an improvement is implemented. Faculty and staff complete sections of the Leeward CC SLO assessment form, which are reviewed by each division or area by the division chair or support unit head and submitted to the OPPA. ✪

At the program level, assessment results are included in the APR template and analyzed for future changes and possible resource allocation requests.

**Annual Program Review and Institutional Plan**

The APR consists of a bottom-up review that leads to institutional planning, priorities, and resource allocation. The APR is a transparent and collegial process, resulting in an institutional plan that guides budget decision-making processes. In the APRs, quantitative measures are used to evaluate outcomes that are considered institutional outcomes, such as graduation and transfer rates.

Results of assessment are used in decision making to align institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning. Through the completion of the APR template, divisions, areas, and programs create a planning list and indicate priority items for resource allocations.

The administrative team, with recommendations from the standing committees, reviews the planning lists and prioritizes them into a draft of the institutional plan for the college. Prioritization is based on common criteria:

- alignment with strategic goals and outcomes,
- scope of impact,
- evidence of measurable outcomes, and
- impact on health and safety.

This institutional plan is presented to Campus Council for review, discussion, and re-prioritizing, if needed. The Campus Council approves a final institutional plan that is sent to the chancellor.
Resource Allocation

Each year, the operating budget is reviewed by the vice chancellor of administrative services. This vice chancellor prepares a proposed budget for the upcoming year based on planned increases in revenues and changes in expenditures.

In addition to informing the operating budget, the institutional plan is used to develop the biennium budget request.

Effectiveness Review

The 2011-2012 College Effectiveness Report provides a review of the institution’s progress on strategic plan goals. It also evaluates the effectiveness of our planning process and the resulting resource allocations and budget prioritizations. This report can be found on the OPPA website.

Following are some basic data charts that are produced regularly by the OPPA.
Institutional Research

Enrollment

Leeward CC Headcounts & FTEs: AY 2001-2010

Percent of Leeward CC Filipino & Hawaiian: AY 2006-2010
Completion

Degrees and Certificates Awarded: AYs 2005 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>AA DEGREES</th>
<th>AAS, AS, ATS DEGREES</th>
<th>CA CERTIFICATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance Education

Enrollment Percentages by Headcount
F2F and DE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>DE Courses</th>
<th>F2F Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>