

Annual Program Review  
Proposed Draft Modifications  
2/3/09

Proposals:

**1) Modify the Annual Program Review (APR) process by assigning the responsibilities of the Executive Planning Council (EPC) to the Campus Council.**

Rational: The EPC currently consists of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council Executive Committees, DPPA, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Dean of Career & Technical Education, Dean of Academic Support, Dean of Student Services, VC of Academic Affairs, VC of Administrative Services, a representative for Native Hawaiian programs, a Staff Representative, the Chair of the Assessment Team, and the President of Student Government/representative. As stated in the “Phase Two Planning Standing Committee Guidebook”

<<http://emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/cs/planning/documents/StandingCommGuidebook.pdf>>, the EPC will serve as a recommending body to the Chancellor for finalizing planning and budgetary matters, including but not limited to program reviews, area plans, budget restructuring and reprioritization of the college’s operational plan. The EPC reviews the major area Planning Lists generated from the APR process and reviews the recommendations of the appropriate Standing Committees. The EPC makes recommendations on overall prioritization, based on institutional parameters (e.g. Leeward CC Strategic Plan, UH system directives, budget ceilings, etc).

According to the “Leeward Institutional Self Study Report (2006)”

<[http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/userfiles/file/accreditation/leewardcc\\_selfstudy2006.pdf](http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/userfiles/file/accreditation/leewardcc_selfstudy2006.pdf)>, the EPC will be responsible for the overall assessment/review of the planning process (p.89); determine to what extent assessment was used to make decisions (p. 96); assess whether data is being housed in a manner that makes decision making transparent (p. 96); evaluate the annual process to assess the quality and usefulness of the planning process and the data collected (p. 107); and review results of the planning process to insure that quality data has emerged from assessment processes, that changes were instituted, that budget items were put forward as a result, and that information & modifications are provided to campus (p. 108).

The purpose and functions of the Campus Council (see attached Campus Council Charter & By-laws Revised September 28, 2000) provide many of the same functions as the EPC. In addition to this duplication of purpose and function, the Campus Council, an existing governing body, includes some of the same members as the EPC.

Deans and Division Chairs are intimately involved with the APR process and the data that substantiate planning/budgeting requests. Therefore, these two groups would be invaluable in discussions regarding prioritizations and implementation plans. If this proposal is adopted, it would be necessary to review/modify the CC membership.

**2) Modify the number of standing committees currently included in the APR process. Maintain two of the standing committees Information Technology (IT) and Space Management & Facilities Planning (Space)); discontinue three of the standing committees (Equipment, Staffing, and External Factors & Environmental Scanning (EFES)).**

Rational: The standing committees were designed to provide broad participation in the planning and resource allocation process and to respond to the findings of the APRs in major planning areas. Two of the committees have specific requirements for membership due to the purpose and functions of their committees (IT and Space). In addition to the review of requests generated through the APR process, these two committees serve as ongoing advisory committees that involve day-to-day IT and Space utilization operations and policies. Therefore, these two standing committees should be continued.

On the other hand, the Equipment and Staffing committees should be discontinued because the main focus of these committees was to respond to the findings of the Annual Program Reviews. These responsibilities are redundant because the planning process provides for reprioritization at several levels as the planning/budget requests move up from Divisions and Support Areas to the College Plan.

Also, the EFES Standing Committee should be discontinued. The EFES committee was formed for “researching and communicating information gleaned from environmental scans for use in planning.” At the time, the Office of Planning, Policy & Assessment did not exist. The need for the EFES committee was due to the lack of pertinent data for use in the annual review process. The EFES committee met on 11/10/08 to discuss its initial charge and recommended that the intended responsibilities of the EFES Standing Committee be handled through the data and information provided by the Office of Planning, Policy & Assessment. (See attached EFES committee report.)