Following an extensive self-review process conducted during the 2005-2006 academic year, students, staff, faculty and administrators formed a consensus agreement that our campus needed a better sense of community around a set of core values and educational objectives that defined the Mānoa Experience. They further saw the need to support this vision through changes in how we plan and manage the physical environment of our campus. Finally, in consideration of the recent establishment of the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office, they felt that creating a sustaining governance system would be necessary to achieve these results. This proposal lays out the background and institutional context that has led to this stage of our evolution, identifies our strengths and the challenges we face, and offers an interrelated set of thematic initiatives that will guide us through our next round of WASC accreditation, including the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the Educational Effectiveness Review, and attendant visits. Most importantly, this proposal arises from our belief that these initiatives are what our campus needs now to better support student learning and success, as measured by improved retention, improved learning outcomes, and improved student and faculty engagement.

A. SETTING THE INSTITUTION’S CONTEXT AND RELATING THE PROPOSAL TO THE STANDARDS

1. Institutional Context Statement
   i. Background
   A research university of international standing, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (Mānoa) is the flagship of the University of Hawai‘i System, the state’s sole public university system governed by a 12-member Board of Regents. A land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant institution, Mānoa creates, refines, disseminates, and perpetuates human knowledge; offers a comprehensive array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees through the doctoral level; carries out advanced research; and extends services to the community.

   Located in Mānoa valley on the island of O‘ahu, our university was founded in 1907 under the auspices of the Morrill Act as a land-grant college of agriculture and mechanic arts. With the addition of a College of Arts and Sciences in 1920, the college became the University of Hawai‘i, and in 1972, it became the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa to distinguish it from the other campuses in the growing University of Hawai‘i System.

   As we approach our centennial anniversary, more than 20,000 students are enrolled in Mānoa courses, on campus or via distance delivery. Classified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University-Extensive institution, Mānoa offers 87 bachelor’s degrees, 87 master’s degrees, and 51 doctorates as of fall 2006. We also offer first professional degrees in law, medicine, and architecture. Approximately 69 percent of Mānoa students are undergraduates, 57 percent are of Asian or Pacific Islander ancestry, and 56 percent are women.

   The University of Hawai‘i was first accredited by the Western College Association in 1952. The Mānoa campus is currently accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Fifty-four degree programs are also accredited by appropriate professional agencies.

   Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#background.

   ii. Strengths and Challenges
   Mānoa’s special distinction derives from its Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific orientation and unique location. Together, these attributes foster unique opportunities for study in tropical agriculture, tropical medicine, marine sciences, astronomy, volcanology, botany, evolutionary biology, comparative philosophy, education, languages, urban planning, cultural studies in Pacific/Oceania, performing arts, second language studies, and international business. As evidence of the high level of scholarship at Mānoa, we have four faculty in the National Academy of Sciences (up from one in 2004), one member of the National Academy of Engineering, and our extramural funding places us in the top 25 of U.S. public institutions with annual extramural funding in excess of $400 million.

   Nearly all of the units at Mānoa have developed strengths in Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific studies, which have created an international reputation for the University. We are widely recognized as the best university in the U.S. in these areas, and we have recently been invited to become a Confucius Institute by the Chinese Ministry of
Education. Mānoa also offers instruction in more Asia-Pacific languages than any other U.S. institution of higher learning and is home to five Title VI Centers: a National Foreign Language Resource Center, three National Resource Centers (East Asian, Pacific Islands, Southeast Asian), and a Center for International Business Education and Research. As a result, students are provided special opportunities for research, service learning, and co-curricular activities in Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific studies, as well as unrivaled opportunities for investigating language acquisition and language use in diverse cultural settings. The beauty of the verdant Mānoa valley provides a backdrop for a unique and inviting campus, and Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific traditions are well represented throughout the campus. An authentic Japanese tea house and garden grace the campus, as do a replica of a Korean king's throne hall and a Hawaiian taro patch. Off-campus facilities include the Lyon Arboretum, the Waikīkī Aquarium, several marine facilities, numerous agricultural research centers and cooperative extension offices, and the world-famous telescopes atop Mauna Kea and Haleakalā.

Despite our many advantages, Mānoa has been challenged in recent years by leadership turnover, fiscal challenges, significant facilities problems, and an academic support infrastructure that needs staffing after years of budget cuts. We face a host of related problems arising from our relatively recent separation from UH System, which left little support or capacity for central administration and governance on our campus. These challenges have been formally recognized in previous WASC letters to our campus and have been identified as significant issues by faculty, students and staff in our campus planning activities, through a self-review and through an extensive student, faculty and staff interview process conducted in the Spring of 2006. The collective impact of these challenges is that we do not retain students as well as our peer and benchmark institutions (as found in our Retention Assessment Report), and we need to restore a sense of community to our campus (as evidenced through National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) surveys) by addressing key governance, campus planning and educational concerns.

As a result of a downturn in the State's economy during the 1990s, Mānoa struggled through years of budget cutting. As the State's budget has grown, Mānoa has received increased state funding, but we recognize the need to become more fiscally independent. With one of the lowest annual tuition levels in the country, we recently worked with UH System administration to increase Mānoa tuition to peer averages over a six-year period. While this moves us toward firm financial ground, the increase in tuition means we must be totally committed to doing a better job of engaging our students and promoting their success, or we run the risk of losing enrollment. We need to focus our resources on the basics of student support, like housing, financial aid, advising, and class availability, while we continue to work to improve capacity in student learning and other needed areas.

The WASC process has catalyzed this awareness, and this proposal represents an integrated approach to address these issues by building a better sense of the "Mānoa Experience," core infrastructure support, and sustainable governance for our campus – all focused on improving student learning and engagement. This proposal is an extension and implementation of our widely supported strategic plan, "Defining our Destiny: The Mānoa Strategic Plan, 2002-2010."

Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#strengths.

iii. Current State of the Institution’s Approaches to Identifying and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes Across the Institution

Overview

Almost all degree programs have implemented assessment plans incorporating a variety of measures that assess the specialized content or skills of the discipline or field of study. Student learning outcomes typically encompass the following: the information-accessing and information-processing methods of the program; the inquiry and analysis methods; and communicative demands associated with the area of study. Many departments have been collecting data for a long enough period of time that the results of their efforts are feeding back into departmental decision-making, effectively “closing the loop” in their assessment efforts.

Student learning assessment at Mānoa runs the gamut from assessment of student attitudes and perceptions of their classes to assessment of content, competencies, and other direct performance indicators. A sampling of some of the assessment methodologies used by the undergraduate programs of various departments includes the following: senior theses and culminating projects; presentations of theses and projects or before faculty committees; capstone courses; exit surveys; group comparisons; standardized tests; expert ratings; portfolios; self assessments; internship supervisor evaluations; and traditional course/instructor evaluations.
Graduate programs rely on several methods of assessment: exam performance in required classes; comprehensive exams; oral defenses of comprehensive exams before faculty committees; written theses and projects; oral presentations of theses and projects before faculty committees; faculty reviews; presentations at professional conferences; scholarly publications; and professional placement post degree completion.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting
Programs report on their assessment efforts annually to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA). Summaries from these reports are posted online. The general collection of departmental summaries has itself proven a learning process for OVCAA. As program assessment efforts improved and stabilized, OVCAA in turn expanded and standardized its annual reporting methods in order to provide the programs with better guidance in preparing their reports. In this manner, programs developed a better sense of what data are expected from them, where their assessment efforts need to improve, and how their efforts compare to other programs. In turn, OVCAA is receiving comprehensive summary reports. This year, OVCAA has eliminated paper reports and moved directly to a web-based reporting methodology.

OVCAA has become more directly engaged with college and program assessment efforts by meeting independently with each program’s assessment coordinator and the dean of the respective school/college. Discussions with deans focused on how their offices might play a more influential role in coordinating and supporting programs’ assessment efforts. OVCAA meetings with program assessment coordinators focused on how departments could improve their assessment efforts and make better use of their assessment data. An additional goal of these meetings was to help programs see their assessment efforts as more than just a regular pedagogical health report. Assessment was presented as part of a larger plan designed to achieve five goals: 1) help programs maintain their status within their disciplines; 2) keep their curriculum current within their discipline’s knowledge base; 3) help their students stay current with the demands of the professional world; 4) maintain contact with their alumni; and 5) establish mutually beneficial relationships with their alumni. These latter efforts were intended to facilitate the enculturation of assessment practices. Departments are finding value in assessment to the extent that they are learning about their programs through their efforts, and as the results help them see how to better their practices, assessment becomes a valuable tool. Moreover, departments are also learning to value assessment through the benefits that come about from trying to monitor and contact alumni and their employers.

Faculty Involvement
In 2005, the Mānoa Academic Assessment Council (MAAC) was instituted. The Council consists of faculty with experience developing assessment programs in their own departments and schools/colleges, faculty from disciplines that make extensive use of psychometric practices, and faculty who understand program evaluation, experimental design, and data analysis – in short, faculty best equipped to help our campus achieve our assessment goals. MAAC was asked to serve in three capacities: 1) as liaisons to departments and schools/colleges in need of assessment help; 2) as reviewers of departmental assessment efforts; and 3) as designers of our General Education assessment efforts.

MAAC has met multiple times in the past year. The members have spent a considerable amount of time reviewing the 2005 assessment reports and producing written feedback to each department on their efforts, using a model based on the peer review process of scholarly publication. The review of the 2006 assessment reports will begin early in 2007. We intend to post the results of the assessment reviews online to accompany the departmental assessment reports.

Assessment of General Education
Data relating to the assessment of student learning as a function of General Education coursework currently is collected primarily at the class level. Instructors collect self-reports of students’ experiences with perceptions of, and attitudes toward, their General Education classes. These data provide direct feedback to instructors; they also provide baseline data that can be put to later use. Examples of instruments used for this purpose can be found at https://www.hawaii.edu/gened/assessment.htm.

Assessment of performance outcomes related to General Education experiences is a topic that has generated extensive discussion. While the discussions have involved a wide range of opinions, there is an emerging consensus: much more needs be done in order to assure that assessment findings can be used to improve the overall General Education program. To this end, the Mānoa Faculty Senate, in late 2006, formed a Task Force to recommend specific ways in which the faculty and OVCAA’s developing Institutional Research and Assessment Office, working in collaboration, can design and implement meaningful assessment of General Education. Policies and practices relating to such assessment, involving both local and standardized instruments, have to inform both departmental and Faculty Senate efforts to improve student experiences in the General Education program.

Mānoa’s Proposal to WASC
iv. Issues Raised by Recent Commission Action Letters

Our last special visit concluded with a report by the visiting team in March 2003 and a letter to then Chancellor Peter Englert in July 2003. The report and visit were requested by the Commission following a comprehensive visit in 1999 and focused on issues of leadership and communication, planning and priority setting, student and educational program quality, and assessment. The institutional report for the 2003 visit was remarkably optimistic. A new president had recently been named for the UH System, a new chancellor had been appointed as the chief executive officer of the Mānoa campus, and a new strategic plan had just been formulated as the result of a highly successful campus-wide planning initiative. The visiting team concluded that “there appears to be significant operational and, indeed, cultural change since the 1999 WASC action,” and further confirmed the university’s statement that “our capacity to . . . manage change has increased greatly.” The team also concluded that “the change at the Mānoa campus has resulted from: 1) a new attitude; 2) new leadership; 3) organizational and institutional reform; and 4) a commitment to becoming a self-learning institution.” Thus, Mānoa’s accreditation was reaffirmed, and the campus was given a clean bill of health until the next round of accreditation consisting of a preparatory review in spring 2009 and an educational effectiveness review in spring 2010, with a proposal for the two-stage review due in 2006. The only caveat to this scheduling was that we produce a progress report on the issues raised in the 2003 visiting team report and 2003 letter to the Chancellor. Those issues included the following: 1) a concern that planning priorities be established and aligned to the budget and that the momentum gained from the planning exercise be continued; 2) a request to define the roles and relationships of the new mid-level management (vice chancellor) positions and the role of the UH System versus Mānoa leadership, along with the need to have campus lines of authority for internal appointments; 3) concerns that UH System-Mānoa resource allocation be better described and rationalized and that a transparent and timely budgeting process be aligned to campus goals; and 4) that assessment become more embedded within the campus to create a “culture of evidence” to improve student learning.

Despite the generally optimistic tone of the Mānoa visiting team report and the feeling on campus at that time, the cautionary issues concerning leadership raised in the report soon came to the fore. Owing to an unprecedented move in February 2003, then UH System President Evan Dobelle requested and received WASC review of the UH System (just prior to Mānoa’s special visit). This decision opened additional review of the operations and interactions of the UH System with the campuses in general and with the Mānoa campus in particular. Based on their concerns from the UH System visit, WASC conducted a follow-up special visit to the UH System in March 2004. At that time, the relationship between the UH System President and the Board of Regents (BOR) had grown contentious. There were also systemic communications and governance problems among UH System, the campuses and the BOR. Thus, the special visit team found that Mānoa was “stymied in its ability to truly manage the Campus,” that the conditions on the Mānoa campus were not as reported during the last Mānoa special visit, and most significantly, “that the campus may, itself, no longer be meeting Commission expectations under the Standards of Accreditation with respect to these matters.” Thus, the Commission acted to change the Mānoa progress report scheduled for March 2005 to a special visit in the fall of 2005 (since postponed to March 2007). Subsequent discussions with WASC indicated that the focus of this special visit should address issues raised in the 2003 special visit report and additionally review four issues: 1) the relationships among the campus, the President, and the BOR over lines of authority, resources, and staffing issues; 2) the progress of the Mānoa reorganization; 3) the Board’s involvement in daily management issues; and 4) the relationship between the Mānoa campus, the Medical School and the Kaka’ako complex. Changes in leadership and the BOR since that time have gone a long way towards addressing issues 1 through 3 listed above. The reorganization of the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office has been approved, the BOR and UH System offices have recently delegated a great deal of hiring and human resources authority to the Chancellor, discussions on the “devolution” of UH System functions to Mānoa have begun to bear fruit, and the Kaka’ako campus has been returned to Mānoa authority with a search for a dean currently underway. While we continue to address these issues, the general operating environment and level of collegiality in UH System/BOR/Mānoa relationships have improved significantly over the past three years.

In addition to the changes and challenges described above, Mānoa experienced a devastating flood in October of 2004. Initially, the whole campus was shut down, but emergency efforts and access to state civil defense resources allowed us to support student housing and other critical activities. Approximately 35 buildings were affected and damage has run about $100,000,000. While rebuilding efforts are still underway, this event was a major test of the new administrative structure and the ability of the UH System and Mānoa to confront change and manage campus affairs. Despite the tactical problems created by lack of staffing and a number of infrastructure challenges, the UH System and Mānoa worked well together to put the campus back into operational order in a shorter than expected manner.
time frame. The Mānoa Chancellor and the UH System President quickly laid out their areas of focus, staff from the UH System provided expertise in working with state and federal authorities and in cutting through red tape, while Mānoa leadership restored the educational and operating environment. Owing to remarkable efforts by hundreds of dedicated staff and faculty, only two days of classes were missed. Life safety issues were handled promptly and effectively, and in most cases, the support needed to protect critical research activities was quickly brought in. Thus, through this distressing situation, it became clear that we worked well as a team, and that together we had the leadership and staffing capacity to respond to challenges.

Our responses to the recent WASC letters will be detailed thoroughly in our upcoming Special Visit Report, but in brief, the campus has made significant progress in all areas of concern.

Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#issues.

2. Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards of Accreditation

In the Spring of 2006, we conducted a self-review under the standards of accreditation with a web-based survey to faculty, students, staff, and administration. Department chairs and deans were required to complete the review. While we received a reasonable response (over 200 respondents) to the self-review questions, many faculty and staff expressed that it was too tedious and obscure for them to provide simple feedback on the areas that most concerned them. Thus, we also conducted a series of campus-wide meetings inviting all faculty, staff and students from all academic and research programs to provide us with direct feedback and discussion on the challenges faced by our campus and what they felt we needed to do to address them. Over 300 participated in these direct discussions with the WASC Steering Committee, and results of these meetings are posted online. The direct discussion format proved most useful and generated remarkably similar concerns from the campus community, which ultimately formed the basis for the current proposal.

3. Process for Proposal Development and Leadership Involvement

This report was prepared by the staff of OVCAA and the WASC Steering Committee. The Steering Committee comprised representatives from the Mānoa Faculty Senate, Academic Deans and Directors, administrative staff, Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (ASUH), and Graduate Student Organization (GSO), as well as a number of other faculty and staff members representing the Council on Program Reviews, the Assessment Council, General Education and other concerns, all of whom acted as the data gathering and consensus forming body guiding the process. In addition to regular meetings with the Steering Committee, briefings on the special visit were provided to the Mānoa Leadership Team/Mānoa Executive Team and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. In preparation for the proposal, we conducted planning meetings including town hall meetings to discuss special visit topics (November 2004), a Strategic Plan Implementation Workshop (April 2005) to review our progress toward “Defining our Destiny,” and a Campus Planning Day (November 2005) to better integrate our fiscal and planning activities for faculty and student constituencies. The next Campus Planning Day is scheduled for December 4, 2006. Input from these meetings provided supportive material for this report. The Mānoa Executive Team and vice chancellors were regularly apprised of the process, and they provided critical input into the development of the proposal. The final draft of this proposal was circulated with the Faculty Senate, Ku‘ali‘i Council, ASUH, GSO and the administrative team before approval by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Mānoa Chancellor.

A website containing information from the previous visit, data generated for this proposal and from the self-review as well as reports related to the upcoming special visit is available at http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc. In addition to our preparations for our upcoming special visit and for the Institutional Proposal, the website includes basic data, stipulated policies, exhibits and data displays, and other evidence centered on addressing WASC issues, as well as a set of web maps of WASC issues to various planning and assessment activities.

Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#process.
B. FRAMING THE REVIEW PROCESS TO CONNECT THE CAPACITY AND EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEWS

Following the advice of the WASC Commission, Mānoa has chosen to use the accreditation process to address critical issues as identified by campus constituents and leadership, focused on the ultimate goal of improving our educational effectiveness and sustainability. Through our information gathering and proposal writing process, a strong consensus of areas of campus concern came to light. Virtually all constituents expressed a need to improve the academic experience of our undergraduate students and to establish a better sense of community for students, faculty and staff. A great deal of discussion was focused on what unique attributes our campus had that could be brought into sharper focus, what basic values, overarching competencies, and learning outcomes we expected our undergraduate students to receive, and how our infrastructure, environment, and governance systems needed to be “tuned” to achieve these outcomes. All elements of this proposal support an emergent plan focused on creating a better learning community and a unique Mānoa Experience, with educational effectiveness elements supported by and articulated to our institutional capacity through planning and infrastructure improvements and sustaining governance structures and processes. The conceptual anchor of the proposal addresses the Mānoa Experience, a work in progress. The themes and initiatives arising from this process are derived from the notion of a Mānoa Experience and create an interrelated framework connecting educational effectiveness and institutional capacity.

The Undergraduate Mānoa Experience

Mānoa has spent the better part of the last decade improving undergraduate education. Program review has been strengthened; student learning assessment has expanded considerably. Nevertheless, as we surveyed, examined, and assessed the educational experience of our undergraduate population, it became clear to us that we needed to expand our focus beyond the educational contributions the University offers its students. Questions were raised about the social and cultural aspects of the lives of our students, particularly the social and cultural contributions stemming from their affiliation with the Mānoa campus community and the larger community of Hawai‘i. It was apparent that a full understanding of the role the University plays in the lives of our students goes beyond the educational experience, beyond even the generalized university experience. We needed to ask what it means for a student to be part of the collective Mānoa Experience.

Defining the Mānoa Experience

What makes the Mānoa experience unique relative to other university experiences? In what distinctive and fundamental manner should students be changed by virtue of their experience with Mānoa? What core values and competencies should students develop by way of the Mānoa Experience? The answers to these questions are as multi-faceted and broad-ranging as the State of Hawai‘i itself and include a consideration of the historical uniqueness of Hawai‘i’s incorporation into U.S. society. What makes the Mānoa Experience unique is the confluence of geographical, cultural, and historical characteristics of Hawai‘i and, by extension, Mānoa. Consequently, the social, cultural, and educational experiences provided by Mānoa should incorporate values and competencies that reflect the unique characteristics of our State and University, and the people who make up the diverse population of the State.

Values and Responsibilities

Our unique geographical, cultural, and historical heritage suggests that Mānoa values and the responsibilities inherent in embracing those values include the following:

- **A focus on developing an awareness of and sensitivity to diversity and commonality.** The Mānoa campus is culturally rich and complex, providing a perfect social setting for frequent interactions with persons from cultures other than one’s own. We at Mānoa need to make certain we have incorporated and celebrated intercultural experiences and understanding into our social and educational environments in a comprehensive fashion. Mānoa is also a place where historic political, economic and social conflicts between Native Hawaiian people, settlers and working immigrants have contributed to the diverse perspectives, beliefs, values and even conceptual frameworks of our islands’ people. Growing out of the core Hawaiian value of ʻāloha, an essential component of the Mānoa Experience, are insights that both bond us and simultaneously express the variations that collectively enrich us.

- **A focus on global awareness and local responsibility.** These values are consistent with a uniquely Hawaiian place of learning. Hawai‘i is a place where the strength of identity is important to Native Hawaiian people struggling to maintain traditional connections while establishing new global relationships. Their struggle for cultural distinction forms a significant part of the story of human history and change. Hawai‘i is also a place where the peoples from Asia, Europe, and the Pacific regions gathered, formed communities, and built lives together. The pluricultural children of Hawai‘i are global citizens, a true pan-ethnic population. Hence, our
pedagogical, social, and cultural environments should be infused with a global perspective and with questions and issues of global significance. Moreover, engaging and acting upon local questions and issues during their educational experience at Mānoa engenders in students a sense of responsibility toward future generations.

- A focus on sustainability and renewability. These values are also a reflection of our unique Hawaiian cultural history, as voiced in the Hawaiian core value of malama i ka 'āina, malama i ke kai (caring for the land and sea that sustain us). The Hawaiian culture teaches us to see Mānoa as part of an ahupua'a extending from mountaintop to ocean, emphasizing an ecosystem understanding of our home. Hawai'i’s unique geographical status as the most isolated, populated land mass on the planet makes it incumbent upon us to develop research, technologies, economy, and a way of life based on sustainability and renewability, as Polynesians did over thousands of years of voyaging, discovery and settlement. Fostering a pedagogical, social, and cultural environment that reflects these values and the knowledge developed by Native Hawaiians over millennia should be central to our efforts. Cultivating, practicing, and communicating these values are our University’s gifts and obligation to the rest of the world.

Competencies and Skills
Essential to the undergraduate Mānoa Experience is the acquisition of knowledge and ability. A Mānoa undergraduate should, by the time of graduation, have acquired a set of overarching (or core) competencies.

Overarching competencies were implicit in the General Education hallmarks developed by the Mānoa faculty during the late 1990s General Education review and revision process. These hallmarks influence education in the larger UH System: as of November 2006, five UH System campuses in addition to Mānoa have adopted these hallmarks as the foundations of their General Education curricula. The hallmarks involve six areas: 1) global and multicultural perspectives, 2) symbolic reasoning, 3) varying methods of inquiry and validation, 4) written and oral communication, 5) Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific issues, and 6) contemporary ethical issues and deliberation processes. The six areas all relate to both problem solving and information processing, areas of learning that are to be addressed in a student's major.

In conjunction with Initiatives described later in this proposal, the Faculty Senate’s General Education Committee and its constituent Faculty Boards will draft specific core/overarching competencies that are implicit in the hallmarks of the General Education curriculum. These competencies will be key components of the assessment effort that is discussed at various points in this proposal.

Expected Outcomes from the Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review Processes:
- Establishment of a Mānoa-based Institutional Research and Assessment Office with development of online resources for assessing institutional performance
- An improved sense of community identity for faculty, staff and students through defining the Mānoa Experience
- Improved processes for faculty engagement in assessment and improving student learning outcomes through understanding overarching competencies and how to assess them on a campus-wide basis
- Creation of the institutional capacity needed to allow our fiscal and physical resources to better support a sense of community and student learning
- Improved student success and engagement as measured by improved retention and graduation rates and responses to NSSE and Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) surveys
- An increased reliance on assessment of student learning to drive curricular change at the departmental level
- An atmosphere that supports innovative approaches to improving learning

Expected Outcomes from the Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review Processes:

Approach for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR)
Following acceptance of the Institutional Proposal, the WASC Steering Committee will form a subcommittee charged with preparations for the CPR. This committee will include representatives from the new Office of the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Services, representatives from the Mānoa Executive Team, representatives from all consultative groups including the Faculty Senate, ASUH, GSO, the Kuali‘i Council, the new Campus Master Planning Office, the Mānoa Budget Advisory Group, and representatives from enrollment management.
undergraduate education, advising and the developing Institutional Research and Assessment Office. The Accreditation Liaison Officer will provide overall leadership for the CPR and will provide staffing as needed for the evidentiary portions of the process. The CPR Committee will produce the Preparatory Review Report, develop the institutional portfolio, and draft the analytical essays.

The focus of the CPR Committee will be to track our progress in hiring personnel, to initiate planning and management activities focused on improving our physical infrastructure and improving our data gathering capabilities, and to track theme progress. While assembling the Preparatory Review Report and Institutional Portfolio, administrative staff from the vice chancellors’ offices will provide the evidentiary portions required to support the proposal and review. Essays and theme authors and groups will be selected by the committee. The Preparatory Review will include a series of exhibits arranged to address progress of the three themes presented in this proposal, crossed referenced against the Commission Standards. A short timeline of milestones for each initiative has been provided, and timelines that are more detailed are included in the Workplan and Milestones section.

Specific outcomes of the Preparatory Review include:
- Development of better institutional data gathering and analysis capability using information technology tools that can deliver data to every desktop
- Enhanced staffing, fiscal support and functionality of the academic and physical infrastructure in support of student learning
- A deeper understanding of student learning at the institutional level
- A better departmental and campus-wide assessment process
- Development of core competencies and methods of assessing campus wide learning outcomes
- Establishment of community building infrastructure including first year programs, better advising support, a student success center and realigned faculty development office
- Significant progress towards our campus master plan, expansion of dorm space, classroom renovations

Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)
The WASC Steering Committee will form the EER Committee, which will conduct the review and be responsible for assembling the Educational Effectiveness Report. Membership of the Committee will include OVCAA staff, members of the Assessment Task Force, the new Institutional Research and Assessment Office, the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support, members of Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Planning as well as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, representatives from the undergraduate and graduate student organizations, the Kuai’i Council, the Council of Chairs, representatives from the vice chancellors’ offices, committees charged with development of the initiatives listed in the special themes, key staff members, and others as needed. The committee will begin its work through sponsorship of special reviews, talks provided by nationally-recognized authorities in learning, assessment, first-year programs and community building, and campus workshops. We will continue to use the Special Themes approach as the model for the EER, but through expanded data-generating capabilities, we hope to enhance our ability to use performance measures and a more audit-like approach to improving educational effectiveness as time goes on. The special themes represent integrated concerns with capacity issues in the service of educational effectiveness as well as objectives and initiatives that directly address critical educational issues on our campus. The three special themes we will develop are explained below.

Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#approach.
Theme 1 – Building a Mānoa Community in Support of Student Success

The development and initial implementation of a strategic plan has laid the foundations for Mānoa to fulfill its destiny as a uniquely Hawaiian place of learning and a top-flight research extensive institution. However, the realities of the recent administrative reorganization, substantial enrollment growth, and simultaneous budget cuts have challenged the campus to maintain a focus on this plan. Indicators of where we stand include a decline in the retention of first- and second-year “first time full time” freshmen (as outlined in the recent Retention Assessment Report), unacceptable levels of student and faculty engagement (as measured on the NSSE and FSSE, and via internal campus surveys), and a continued lack of awareness among all campus stakeholders regarding Mānoa’s local, national, and international identity. At the same time, many of our programs continue to deliver excellent, often one-of-a-kind, educational opportunities to undergraduate and graduate students. Key to the realization of our strategic plan at this point is a renewed focus on building community and shaping identity, coupled with practical mechanisms for enabling student success in our diverse and high-quality educational programs. We feel that we are now in a good position to pursue both short- and long-term action plans in achieving two priority objectives: 1) fostering the development of a Mānoa identity, and 2) enabling and ensuring student learning success.

Objective 1. Foster the development of a Mānoa identity: Faculty, students, staff, and the broader Hawai‘i community will understand, engage with, and contribute to the unique identity of the Mānoa campus. The values and competencies at the core of the Mānoa Experience will define and connect all educational and co-curricular activities.

In order to achieve this objective, two major initiatives will be undertaken. These initiatives put in place strategies proposed by students and faculty for building on existing strengths of the Mānoa community.

Initiative 1: Raise Awareness

On the basis of public imaging and outreach (recast web/media presence, campus town hall meetings), faculty and student induction (orientation, faculty development, first-year experiences), and improved communication (sustaining dialogues, interactive technologies), Mānoa stakeholders will interact with, contribute to, and come to value the Mānoa Experience.

Timeline of outcomes and indicators

2008: Personnel hired and trained in support of media presence and continuity; plans for faculty, student induction proposed and solicited; information and communication plans in place

2010: Robust web, media presence in development; faculty, student induction in place; information-communication campaign underway (participation figures, internal surveys, scope of media coverage)

2012: Web, media presence in place; Sustained increase in student and faculty engagement (NSSE, FSSE scores consistently surpassing peer institutions); campus identifies with the Mānoa identity in local surveys

Initiative 2: Practice Community

Through a combination of infrastructure improvement (building residential, learning, and community spaces), curricular innovation (cohorts, curriculum mapping, good practice symposia), and material or intellectual support (grants for community-initiated activities, identity-oriented faculty development), Mānoa stakeholders will invest in and act upon an emerging campus identity that revolves around the core values and competencies of the Mānoa Experience.

Timeline of outcomes and indicators

2008: Institutional commitment to community improvement activities (see Themes 2 and 3); budget, timeline, grant process in place

2010: Realization and utilization of a majority of community-building activities (indices of actual change in infrastructure, exemplars of new curriculum, 80% of community-initiated activities funded)

2012: Sustained increase in student and faculty retention (retention indices for key populations); ongoing infrastructure plan implementation, ongoing curricular innovation (tracked by the Institutional Research and Assessment Office)
Objective 2. Enable and ensure student learning success: With the ultimate goal of helping students benefit maximally from the Mānoa Experience, the campus will further develop its student academic support structure such that learners enter into, progress through, and graduate from Mānoa in deliberate, well-considered, personally enriching, and intellectually-expanding ways. To ensure the value and effectiveness of this experience, the campus will use a variety of assessment practices to understand the extent of student learning and to articulate needed educational improvements.

In order to achieve this objective, two major initiatives will be undertaken. These initiatives make real an institutional commitment to the sustained improvement of student learning processes and outcomes.

Initiative 1: Enhance student support
By improving advising (more advisors and bolstered coordination between central and departmental advising), instituting a Mānoa success center (to offer tutoring, course assistance, and a center for undergraduate technology research), establishing first-year programs (cohort classes and school/college and departmental programs), and building upon undergraduate research emphases (expanding current programs, awards, and support), we will enable students to persist in and make the most of the Mānoa Experience.

Timeline of outcomes and indicators
2008: Ten new advisors hired, early major declaration mechanism in place, proposals for first-year programs vetted; degree audit in place; inventory of undergraduate research emphases/programs/incentives completed
2010: 90% or more of early majors declared, communication index between faculty and central advising, mandatory advising in place; increase in success center participants; first-year programs in place; research support, events, awards recognition, undergraduate research colloquium
2012: Sustained increase in retention and graduation rates (see Theme 3), improved student perspectives/awareness of undergraduate learning experience, research, value of the Mānoa Experience (senior/alumni surveys)

Initiative 2: Leverage Assessment
In elucidating useful assessment practices (via faculty development, assessment forums, assessment website), coordinating assessment activities (across administration, faculty senate, assessment council, general education, alumni affairs), and helping campus constituents engage in assessment (direct outreach to faculty, departments, school/colleges, administrators, and other users), current support staff and a new Institutional Research and Assessment Office (IRAO) will help faculty, staff, and administrators collect meaningful evidence about the values, skills, and competencies that constitute the Mānoa Experience and use that evidence to evaluate and revise courses, curricula, and other educational programs in the service of improved student learning.

Timeline of outcomes and indicators
2008: Campus assessment forums put into place (number and participation indices); infrastructure changes planned and budgeted (IRAO staffing and administrative locus, faculty-elected assessment council); initial General Education assessment activities funded and implemented
2010: IRAO fully staffed and functioning; 100% of departments use student learning assessment data for program improvement; campus assessment web site functional; expanded General Education assessments used to track changes in core learning (freshman to senior) and alumni perspectives on core learning; faculty-elected assessment council initiatives funded and implemented
2012: Campus assessment web site receives daily use by constituents; sustained delivery of assessment development and outreach activities by IRAO; database of “useful assessment” exemplars completed and disseminated

Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#themel.
Theme 2 – Campus Renewal to Support the Mānoa Experience

During the self-review process, the faculty clearly stated that physical improvements of the campus were needed to support student learning and a better sense of community. The major issues that surfaced from the campus community and from campus leadership included the following: lack of a campus-wide master planning process; lack of design and building standards, high energy costs, a facilities management and budgeting process that did not appear to be well coupled to campus priorities; lack of transparency in budgeting, repair and maintenance projects, renovations and capital improvement projects; a need for improving old and deteriorating classrooms; lack of parking; lack of community gathering spaces; and most importantly, lack of suitable student and faculty housing.

In July 2006, the "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Facilities Management" was issued. This committee, appointed in 2005 by the Chancellor, requested review of current facilities management by the Facilities Management Program of the Association of Physical Plant Administrators. Their recommendations focused primarily on the need for a modernization of the management organization, a strategic vision, clarity of roles and responsibilities, and written policies, procedures, and standards. Building a better sense of community and improving student learning will require us to begin to address these issues in concrete ways.

Objective 1. Construct a more responsive approach to Campus Master Planning and facilities management that fosters community engagement and student learning. The development of a Campus Master Plan will engage the campus community, embed sustainability in capital improvement program (CIP) planning and projects, and embody a Hawaiian sense of place. Improvement in facilities management will make the process of facilities repair and maintenance more responsive to the needs of the campus community.

Initiative 1: Develop a Campus Master Plan
By improving the quality of learning spaces and building community, while meeting our needs for growth through development of a cogent CIP plan, Mānoa stakeholders will be able to establish the infrastructure support for a Hawaiian place of learning envisioned in the Strategic Plan. Create a Campus Planning Office to offer continuity and support for the planning process.

Timeline of outcomes and indicators
2008: New Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Services hired, web-based facilities management program and task queue completed. Begin classroom renovations
2010: Classrooms renovation completed, regular maintenance cycle for information technology, etc., established
2012: Learning technology available for all classrooms, sustainability retrofits in place

Initiative 2: Improve facilities management
By implementing a more transparent facilities management process that has priorities aligned to campus needs in a transparent fashion, improving qualities of the classroom and learning spaces on campus, and developing a teaching technology upgrade program in collaboration with the campus technology group, Mānoa stakeholders will regain trust in administration priorities and increase participation by providing necessary feedback to ensure priorities are aligned with the needs of the campus.

Timeline of outcomes and indicators
2008: Campus Planner hired, Campus Planning office staffed, Campus wide Master Planning group convened
2010: Campus Master Plan completed for production of a Campus Planning Guide, Initial projects underway, addition of at least one more community space comparable to the sustainability courtyard
2012: Enhanced Hawaiian sense of place through landscaping and community spaces, all construction projects meet planning, sustainability and design guide criteria
Objective 2. Expand and renovate student and faculty housing and improve areas for student interactions.

More student and faculty housing is a priority that will improve campus life and enable us to better recruit and retain faculty and students. To improve campus life, foster communication among units of centralized student services and build a stronger sense of linkages among students, areas for student interactions must also be developed.

Initiative 1: Build or locate more faculty and student housing, renovate student housing

By incorporating faculty and student housing into master planning, continuing dormitory building programs, initiating renovations of older dorms, and expanding faculty housing availability, the size of the campus will increase, eventually resulting in a more vibrant campus community.

Initiative 2: Expand the Campus Center

By expanding the campus center to meet student needs, increasing on-campus activities, creating more opportunities for faculty/staff and student interactions, and building a stronger set of linkages for student organizations, students' on-campus extra-curricular options will be significantly enhanced.

Initiative 2: Build a one-stop center for student services

By creating centralized student services areas that provide increased services more efficiently through redesigned existing space, students' experiences obtaining necessary services will be significantly enhanced. Improve cross-services communication by utilizing adjacencies and shared facilities.

Timeline of outcomes and indicators

2008: Have facilities cited on a long-range development plan and begin dormitory construction
2010: Add one new dormitory and begin renovation of existing dormitories, begin construction of new faculty housing
2014: Provide 5400 beds for students in renovated dormitories, provide approx. 200 more faculty with housing. Provide graduate student housing and housing for visiting faculty

Timeline of outcomes and indicators

2008: Develop a plan to house the majority of academic support student services in one location or adjacent areas
2010: Complete the relocation of academic support services and cross-train staff to provide multiple services at central locations. Link student services with academic advising and student enrollment services

Timeline of outcomes and indicators

2008: Develop a plan to renovate the Campus Center
2012: Complete renovations of the Campus Center and create new student activities including recreational activities. Create new opportunities for student leadership

Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at [http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#themell](http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#themell).
Theme 3 – Reform Campus Governance to Promote Communication and Student Success

Identifying and articulating vision and core values that can meaningfully bind the Mānoa community requires active engagement of students, staff, faculty and administration in communication processes through which all stakeholders know that their voices are heard. The University's preparation for its centennial has encouraged reflection on our progress toward the Mānoa goals and benchmarks adopted in the Mānoa Strategic Plan: Defining Our Destiny, 2002-2010. Student learning, community building, resource development, long-range planning, and infrastructure support are key concerns shared by campus constituencies, by stakeholders involved in the 2006 self-review, and by the Mānoa administration. Yet progress toward benchmarks set in 2002 has been hampered by governance challenges, including serious fault lines in communication systems. The fault lines have led to expressions of concern over the administration's ability to steer the campus on the path set by the Strategic Plan with the unique interests of this rich and diverse campus community in mind. So while the campus is united on the importance of strengthening campus governance to ensure that improved educational effectiveness is a sustainable function of the Mānoa Experience, this goal can be achieved only through development of communication processes that increase access to information and regularize its flow such that meaningful participation of stakeholders is achieved.

Objective 1. Forge meaningful and long-term relationships among stakeholders: As lines of authority on campus have been clarified, core concerns relating to the quality of life on campus outlined in Theme 2 and lack of adequate communication and meaningful stakeholder participation in planning have taken hold. A key governance objective has become capitalizing on the moment and engaging stakeholders in discussions about Strategic Plan Benchmarks crucial to our continuing evolution as a campus.

In order to achieve this objective, two major initiatives will be undertaken, each with short-, intermediate-, and long-term expected outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative 1: Institute Long-Range Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through long-range planning (Theme 2) that includes constituency groups and stakeholders and a consultation process mirroring that of the Strategic Plan, students, staff and faculty will interact with, and come to value, the relationship between long-range planning, issues of sustainability, and the Mānoa Experience. Planning and consultation processes will include documented evidence of broad and meaningful constituency and stakeholder participation at every stage of its development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline of outcomes and indicators

**2008**: Long-range planning process initiated with two primary outcomes: full documentation of broad campus participation of organized campus groups and individual/organization stakeholders; and responsible efforts to shape units that are viable for the long term

**2010**: Substantial participation in and valuing of Mānoa planning activities evident through participation figures, internal surveys, and media coverage, and increasing program success

**2012**: Sustained increase in student and faculty engagement via NSSE, FSSE and internal surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative 2: Foster Broad Stakeholder Participation in Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By regularizing town hall meetings, student forums, and faculty forums throughout the Mānoa campus, communication between and among constituency groups and stakeholders on key governance issues articulated in Themes 1 and 2 will be significantly enhanced. A key goal is to institutionalize these forums.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline of outcomes and indicators

**2008**: Implementation of monthly town hall meetings, student forums and faculty forums with goal of significantly increasing representation of stakeholders at meetings

**2010**: Realization of success of communication and governance participation building activities as shown by NSSE scores surpassing peer institutions by 2010 and steady participation rates in campus forums

**2012**: Sustained increase in student and faculty participation in governance as shown by consistently high NSSE scores and evidence that stakeholder participation in campus governance has been regularized, i.e., institutionalization of town hall meetings, student and faculty public forums with broad organized group and ad hoc participation, media coverage of governance issues, etc.
Objective 2. Foster student success through enhanced student/faculty engagement. The educational effectiveness and community building initiatives outlined in Theme 1 and linked to the Mānoa Experience mirror strategic imperatives laid out in the Strategic Plan. Providing faculty and students with opportunities for increased engagement and with crucial infrastructure support for the evolving assessment and evaluation expectations will create unique opportunities for changing the assessment and evaluation culture at Mānoa.

Initiative 1: Enhance Student Learning/Assessment Through expanded capabilities of the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support (OFDAS) and support programs for faculty, with emphasis on approaches to teaching, mentoring for junior faculty, and broad training and support for technology-enhanced classroom instruction, faculty will have significantly improved access to resources necessary to support their efforts in this arena. OVCAA will work with the Assessment Council to promote student learning improvement by sponsoring research on student learning and discipline appropriate assessment/evaluation.

Initiative 2: Improve Student/Faculty Retention Through culture and values communicated by and between constituency groups and stakeholders regarding recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff at Mānoa, the base of involvement of stakeholders in meeting benchmarks for recruitment and retention will be expanded. Mānoa stakeholders will create a comprehensive retention plan that reflects retention as a core value of the campus and involves stakeholders in all stages of planning and implementing of retention activities.

Timeline of outcomes and indicators
2008: Development and initial expansion of OFDAS support and student learning and assessment research programs as shown by number of trainings, number of projects funded, and overall participation figures
2010: Expanded use of OFDAS programs: number/range of trainings to increase annually, new projects funded to increase by $100,000 annually and annual increases in overall participation figures
2012: Sustained increase in faculty engagement: participation to increase annually, grants funded at $100,000 annually

Timeline of outcomes and indicators
2008: Comprehensive Student/Faculty/Staff Retention Plan and expanded system of information gathering fully implemented by Fall 2008
2010: Realization and utilization of charted retention activities and data tracking
2012: Sustained increase in student and faculty retention: undergraduate student retention increase goal of 20% over 2006 data, average graduation rates increased by 2% annually; increased enrollment of Native Hawaiian to 15%, increased financial aid by 10%, faculty pre-retirement turnover decreased by 2%, rates of tenure denial decreased by 20%

Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#themeIII.

C. DEMONSTRATING A FEASIBLE PLAN OF WORK AND ENGAGEMENT OF KEY CONSTITUENCIES

1. Workplan and Milestones
The preceding section outlines timelines and milestones for each of the special theme initiatives. The overall workplan is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sem/Mon</th>
<th>Workplans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Submission of Institutional Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Campus Planning Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Special Visit Report Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Launch of Student Success Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Campus-wide meeting/workshop on student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Special Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>CPR review to insure compliance with the standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

After the Mānoa campus and UH System separated, Mānoa was left with little capacity for data gathering. The UH System Institutional Research Office served the campus then and continues to serve the campus now. With a small staff and increasing data demands, however, this organizational structure is no longer adequate to meet the growing needs of an autonomous campus. In addition, structural barriers with human resources and finance information systems have made it difficult to have ready access to data combining staffing, finances and students that have not been addressed with system resources. OVCAA began to address this structural deficit two years ago with the formation of an automated information technology data mining system (STAR Correspondent) that provides comprehensive services: an automated degree audit system, a class management system, fundamental performance data for all departments, an advising support system, retention tracking, and a financial aid and scholarship management component. While these systems are widely used and growing in capability, they are not yet solely adequate. Thus we use a mix of approaches and depend upon the UH System for “official” data. We are also using system-provided data for ad hoc data requests. Staffing has been problematic, and we currently have no full-time staff devoted to Mānoa institutional research. Funding was secured in the last budget period for four staff members to support academic computing and institutional research functions, and we are in the process of hiring three more staff members for the Institutional Research and Assessment Office. We are also expanding our academic computing infrastructure to further support institutional data acquisition. All of the major initiatives described are incorporated into our biennium budget request, or will be funded from tuition revenue. Thus, these initiatives have already been established as priority items in our budgeting process.

Reference materials in support of this section of the proposal may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/proposalappendices.htm#demonstrating.

3. Commitment of Resources to Support the Accrediting Review

The locus of support for the WASC two-stage process will be OVCAA, overseen by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who is also the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). The WASC Steering Committee and ad hoc members supporting each phase of the review have been mentioned above. In addition to the ALO, a staff of four currently supports accreditation activities, and we are in the process of hiring three more staff members for the Institutional Research and Assessment Office. We are also expanding our academic computing infrastructure to further support institutional data acquisition. All of the major initiatives described are incorporated into our biennium budget request, or will be funded from tuition revenue. Thus, these initiatives have already been established as priority items in our budgeting process.

D. PRESENTING APPENDICES CONNECTED TO THE PROPOSAL

1. Data Tables are available online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/.

2. Off-Campus and Distance Education Degree Programs are available online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/.