

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

November 8 - 12, 2021

Team Roster

Howard Gillman, Team Chair
Chancellor
University of California, Irvine

Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair
Interim Assistant Dean, Summer Sessions
University of California, Los Angeles

Anita Borja Enriquez
Senior Vice President and Provost
University of Guam

Jason Johnson
Associate Vice Provost and Senior Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs,
University of Washington

James T. Minor
Assistant Vice Chancellor and Senior Strategist
California State University System

Barbara Gross Davis, WSCUC Staff Liaison
Vice President
WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

| | |
|--|---|
| A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History..... | 3 |
| B. Description of Team’s Review Process | 5 |
| C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence..... | 7 |

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions | 8 |
| B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements | |
| 1. Standard 1 | 10 |
| 2. Standard 2 | 12 |
| 3. Standard 3 | 16 |
| 4. Standard 4 | 21 |
| 5. Federal Requirements | 26 |
| C. Component 8: Institution-specific themes | |
| 1. 8(a): Becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning | 26 |
| 2. 8(b): Transformational Student Success..... | 32 |
| 3. 8(c): Academic Innovation and Engaged Learning | 37 |
| D. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement..... | 44 |

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 46

APPENDICES 50

| | |
|--|--|
| A. Federal Compliance Forms | |
| 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review | |
| 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review | |
| 3. Student Complaints Review | |
| 4. Transfer Credit Review | |
| B. Off-Campus Locations Review | |
| C. Distance Education Review | |

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

The University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UH Mānoa), a land-, sea-, space-, and sun-grant university with "Very High Research Activity" under the Carnegie Classification framework, is located on the island of O'ahu in the Mānoa Valley just outside downtown Honolulu. The institution was conceived through legislative action of the Hawaiian constitutional government and the law signed by Queen Lili'uokalani to establish the Bureau of Forestry and Agriculture less than two weeks before the Hawaiian government was overthrown. The University of Hawai'i system evolved during the succession of administrations imposed upon the Native Hawaiian people, with UH Mānoa's current College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources embodying many of the original intentions for the institution.

In fall 2021, UH Mānoa enrolled 19,098 students: 14,120 undergraduates sought bachelor's degrees from among the 100 programs offered, and 4,978 graduate students studied in 89 master's degree programs and 57 doctoral degree programs, including a total of 780 professional degree students studying in the fields of law (343) and medicine (437). Three-fifths (60%) of the students at UH Mānoa were Hawai'i residents, 34% were out-of-state residents, and 6% were international. Forty percent of the undergraduate population transferred into UH Mānoa, and 60% enrolled as first-year college students (frosh). The student population was noted for its racial and ethnic diversity, with 33% Asian, 27% White, 18% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (breaking into 17% Native Hawaiian or Part Hawaiian and 1% Other Pacific Islander), 2% Hispanic, 2% African American, less than 1% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 17% Multiracial, and less than 1% unknown. The team notes that Native Hawaiians were underrepresented among the UH Mānoa faculty; they accounted for approximately 8% of the general faculty body (i.e., their proportion of representation among faculty was approximately half of the proportion of Native Hawaiians among enrolled students).

Following its reaffirmation of accreditation for an interval of 10 years by WSCUC in 2011, the campus received substantive change approvals from WSCUC for two doctoral degrees (the Doctor of Education in Professional Education Practice in 2011 and the Doctor of Nursing Practice in 2012). In response to the Commission action letter of July 5, 2011, UH Mānoa submitted an Interim Report in spring 2015, which focused on the following: articulating undergraduate student learning outcomes; raising undergraduate retention and graduation rates; reflecting on changes resulting from the 2011-2015 strategic plan; and continuing to enhance the university as a Hawaiian Place of Learning.

The panel from the Interim Report Committee praised the quality of the Interim Report and the advancements made at UH Mānoa since the prior review. In particular, the panel noted the robust assessment infrastructure that had been introduced, and the approach to build central capacity for assessment and then to build assessment capacity in the faculty. The panel was also impressed by the “substantive involvement of senior leadership in issues of student success” and the “innovative strategies to strengthen student success resulting in higher completion rates.” UH Mānoa established undergraduate Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), to which the WSCUC Core Competencies, General Education outcomes, and Program Learning Outcomes were mapped, and the panel cited the involvement of faculty in “developing, aligning and assessing student learning outcomes.” UH Mānoa’s activities related to the four goals of its strategic plan were noted by the panel, with an account of the new strategic plan to be introduced in 2015. Progress in implementing the 2012 task force report recommendations supporting UH Mānoa as a Hawaiian Place of Learning was noted by the panel, alongside an accounting of the greater representation of Native Hawaiian students on campus, the persistence of an achievement gap between these students and others, and the modest gains the campus achieved in the size of its Native Hawaiian faculty. No further interactions with WSCUC were required until the Mid-Cycle Review that UH Mānoa submitted in spring 2016. In November 2017, UH Mānoa was approved by WSCUC to participate in the newly adopted Thematic Pathway for

Reaffirmation (TPR). The university identified three themes as the focus of its self-study: Becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning; Transformational Student Success; and Academic Innovation and Engaged Learning.

At the time of the visit, UH Mānoa had 18 distance education programs (fully online) and offered educational programs at off-site locations in American Samoa, Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City in Vietnam, and Maui. As part of this review, the Maui off-site location is reviewed in the Off-Campus Locations Review in the appendix, and distance education programs (fully online) are reviewed in the Distance Education Review in the appendix.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

At the beginning of September 2021, the team received UH Mānoa's Institutional Report and access to the supporting materials. The team members individually prepared worksheets that evaluated the self-study, identified questions to pursue during the visit, proposed visit schedule changes, and suggested additional materials for the team's review. During the team's two conference calls – held on September 24 and October 5 – the team discussed the worksheets, the report, the evidence, and approaches to the visit, as well as WSCUC policies and procedures. In response to the team's request for additional materials, UH Mānoa promptly supplied every relevant document and hyperlink. The team's chair met with the University of Hawaii president in advance of the visit, on October 19. Immediately prior to the initial meetings of the visit on November 8, the team held an executive session for final preparations.

During the remote visit, the team met with the following individuals and groups: the president; the provost; the vice provosts and the chief business officer; deans and organized research unit directors; administrative/fiscal officers; representatives from the faculty senate leadership; representatives from the board of regents and the UH Foundation; assessment and institutional

research personnel; information technology personnel; faculty and staff representatives from offices, programs, committees, teams, and institutes involved in work related to the self-study themes; Student Excellence, Equity, and Diversity Program coordinators; participants in the General Education assessment and redesign efforts; the Kūali'i Council; Aha Kuhina (School of Hawaiian Knowledge Advisory Council); the Native Hawaiian Place of Learning Advancement Office; and Native Hawaiian Student Services. The team also held open meetings with faculty, students, and staff, as well as separate open meetings with Native Hawaiian faculty and Native Hawaiian students. Meetings were held using Zoom, and a separate team conference room was made available for private team meetings hosted by WSCUC in Zoom. Both before and during the visit, the team also received and reviewed messages that were sent to the WSCUC confidential email account, which was provided to the UH Mānoa campus community, via a mass email announcement, for contacting the team. The team gathered, analyzed, and interpreted information collected through the interviews and meetings conducted, the institutional documents presented as part of the institutional report and as UH Mānoa's response to requests for additional materials, and messages sent to the confidential email account to confirm and corroborate the analysis and conclusions drawn during the institution's presentation of evidence and analysis.

One team member reviewed the selected off-campus location (Maui) and prepared the Off-Campus Locations Review located in the appendix. The off-campus location review process included meetings with the administrator in charge, staff and administrators providing services to students onsite, faculty, and students. These meetings were conducted on November 5, prior to the beginning of the accreditation visit, and this review included visual confirmation of the off-campus location and its facilities. Another team member conducted the Distance Education Review and prepared the attached report located in the appendix. The review of fully online programs included a comprehensive examination of online courses for three major/degrees that included one bachelor's level program and two master's level programs. Syllabi, courses, and assignments were reviewed in the UH Mānoa learning

management system, *Laulima* (supported on the Sakai platform). Briefings were provided by UH Mānoa to prepare the team for each of these reviews.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The team finds the UH Mānoa institutional report to be clearly written, effectively organized, self-reflective, and supported strongly by evidence presented among its hyperlinks and appendices. The report offered an accurate portrait of UH Mānoa and the campus's most pressing concerns, and it focused the team during the visit on confirmation and corroboration of the information and analysis found in the self-review. Guiding the team's review with its exploration of challenging topics, the report provided the team a detailed examination of both institutional progress thus far and challenges ahead.

Prepared by UH Mānoa's WSCUC steering committee, the report was the collaborative product of faculty, students, staff, and administrators. During the visit, the team learned about the steering committee's approach to the self-study process. To create a strong foundation of knowledge, the committee focused on the WSCUC Handbook and engaged in analysis individually. The meetings of the committee were described as "very well organized," at which there were open discussions among well-prepared participants. To craft the institutional report, the 38-member steering committee divided into subgroups for writing the component sections. Once the committee's members self-selected into their component working groups, they introduced iteration in their process. The groups generated report drafts in their component teams and then met together in the larger group to critique their work. The team learned that all individuals and groups whose contributions to UH Mānoa were highlighted in the report were provided drafts of the document for review and the opportunity to respond with feedback. The entire campus also had an opportunity to review the institutional report before it was submitted to WSCUC. The committee responded to criticism and feedback and recognized the need to embody the

values of their community and employ appropriate vocabularies. The committee also sought evidence to support its analysis and identified where more data were necessary to better understand the issues and challenges. Among the consequences of this review was an enhanced commitment at UH Mānoa to an evidence-based culture, including – for example – an effort to gather more data to describe learning in the campus’s civic engagement opportunities. The evidence presented in the institutional report enabled the team to concentrate this review on the programs and initiatives that are central to the themes selected for the review.

Throughout the visit, the team appreciated the alignment between the institutional report and the campus’s strategic plan, particularly in how both documents articulated the key issues facing UH Mānoa. Such coherence suggests that the effort invested in this process was organic to the highest priorities and needs of the institution. The team observes how, following this review, the campus gained insight into the areas where it made initial strides and the areas where it aspired to accomplish more.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The team notes the issues cited in the Commission action letter (2011) and how they correspond to the themes that were chosen by UH Mānoa for the review. The Commission identified the following areas for improvement:

1. Defining the undergraduate degree, which is explained in the letter as an effort “to articulate the learning outcomes that that define the expectations for an undergraduate degree from UHM.”
2. Fostering student success, in the form of increasing the number of degrees awarded and working to raise the campus’s retention and graduation rates, with benchmarks established

against similar institutions and special attention to closing achievement gaps among student subpopulations.

3. Enhancing the University as a Hawaiian Place of Learning, specifically by continuing “to articulate the measurable attributes of a Hawaiian Place of Learning and promote this as a core distinction of education at UHM.”

UH Mānoa responded to the previous Commission action within the themed areas of their 2021 institutional report. This was apparent to the team, given the congruence of two of their report’s theme components with the Commission’s prior recommendations. The campus’s approach to the first area of improvement (“Defining the undergraduate degree”) was addressed in the 2015 interim report through the university’s account of establishing institutional learning outcomes for undergraduate study, enhancing participation in assessment, and engaging in systematic assessment of the WSCUC Core Competencies. Otherwise, the progress made by UH Mānoa since the last WSCUC review is described below in the following sections of this report: “Transformational Student Success” and “Becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning.”

Substantial changes in the structure of the campus leadership have occurred at UH Mānoa since the last WSCUC visit in the structure of the campus leadership, with the systemwide president now serving as the CEO of the UH Mānoa campus and with the provost being delegated considerable responsibility. Further, the UH Mānoa response to financial pressures after revenue loss by the State of Hawaii because of COVID-19 is discussed in the institutional report. These matters are explored at greater length in the Standard 3 section of the team’s report.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institution's mission and vision were embodied in its strategic plan. Its processes and policies were both appropriate and consistent with its institutional purposes, and all relevant documents were made public and were readily available for review. UH Mānoa demonstrated transparency and integrity regarding its sound business practices, its programs and their associated costs, and student opportunities for educational success, fair treatment, and equity.

Institutional Purposes (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)

UH Mānoa published mission and vision statements appropriate for a public research university with a wide range of baccalaureate, comprehensive graduate, and professional programs of study. Its mission and vision statements gave clear expression to the institution's values, which were consonant with its institutional priorities in its current strategic plan. (CFR 1.1)

The institution maintained well-established processes for regularly reviewing and advancing articulations of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes it aimed to inculcate at course and program levels. Through its centralized office for institutional research, it publicized, in both aggregate and disaggregated forms, enrollment figures, analyses of graduation rates and efficiencies, and counts of degrees and other credentials awarded. Program-level assessments of student learning were in continuous development and in broad circulation among appointed faculty leads and academic governance-related offices and committees. (CFR 1.2)

UH Mānoa affirmed its commitment to academic freedom for employees and students through a series of publicly available statements and policies (e.g., student catalog, faculty collective bargaining agreement, regents' policy), with due-process rights, responsibilities, and procedures explicated throughout. (CFR 1.3)

The institution demonstrated a commitment to the WASC Equity and Inclusion Policy through a range of policies and practices. The campus has continuously sought to diversify its student and faculty populations, including not least special emphases on Native Hawaiians, and to support their academic and professional success. The institution maintained an array of nondiscrimination and affirmative action programs and policies, each contributing to mitigating bias and fostering a more inclusive campus climate. (CFR 1.4)

Integrity and Transparency (CFRs 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8)

UH Mānoa exhibited administrative and governance structures and norms which preserved its autonomy in such ways that are characteristic of public universities with comparable missions, resources, and state contexts. However, the review team observed from a distance recent actions and proposed actions taken up by the state legislature and governing board regarding faculty job classifications and levels of protection, prompting questions about the nexus between the two entities and what, if any, influence may be coming from without. These remained open questions, and the review team advises a continuity of care regarding non-interference in substantive decisions or educational functions (e.g., faculty hiring and retention) that are core to the integrity of any institution of higher learning. (CFR 1.5)

UH Mānoa made readily available facts and figures concerning the nature, structure, associated costs, etc., of its programs, as well as information concerning any related matters over which community members and other stakeholders could seek remediation or adjudication. (CFR 1.6)

The institution provided all indications of maintaining policies and practices that sufficiently supported its organizational and fiscal vitality. The review team was satisfied with the evidence provided regarding the quality of the auditing procedures of independent accountants. (CFR 1.7)

UH Mānoa made publicly available documents prepared for accreditation purposes as well as its responses to recommendations and other feedback received by former review teams. The current review team could not have been more pleased with the straightforward and effective manner in which the ALO, other institutional officers, and staff prepared and shared materials and information in anticipation of its visit. (CFR 1.8)

Conclusion

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution offered a robust array of undergraduate and graduate programs that were taught by qualified faculty who produced scholarship and creative academic activities that facilitated student learning. The academic programs were supported by a commitment to continuous improvement and valid, reliable assessments of student learning.

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7)

The institution had a broad array of well-established academic programs that conformed to professional and disciplinary standards. The academic programs were subject to extensive internal and peer review. UH Mānoa provided sufficient evidence of systematic program review. The academic programs were delivered by qualified faculty considering the type and level of curriculum offered. (CFR 2.1)

The UH Mānoa admissions website set forth entry requirements and a full list of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs. The published institutional catalog also clearly outlined the undergraduate general education requirements. Approximately 91% of degree programs have curricular maps, and the institution articulated a coherent educational philosophy that expressed the meaning and importance of academic degrees offered.

The UH Mānoa General Education program expressed with fidelity the institutional learning objectives: to Know (breadth and depth of knowledge), Do (intellectual and practical skills), and Value (personal and social responsibility). The general education curriculum was sufficiently flexible and interdisciplinary. The core curriculum included foundational written communication, quantitative reasoning, and global and multicultural perspective requirements. The diversification of requirements promoted exposure to the arts, humanities, social and natural sciences. The institution also established graduation requirements to ensure integration across upper division courses. Graduate programs offered at UH Mānoa also employed sufficient numbers of faculty who held relevant terminal degrees in specific disciplines required to develop and evaluate academic policies, instruction, and student progress. (CFR 2.2)

The institution provided many opportunities for students to connect their in-class learning to communities and industry at the undergraduate and graduate levels. One example is the Pacific Communities in Hawai'i course that listed explicit learning outcomes and included a service-learning component that required a minimum of 15 contact hours within the community. Another example was a second-year practicum in a graduate level Social Work course. This course also outlined explicit learning outcomes and advanced practice behaviors to be observed by a practicum supervisor. Equally interesting was a College of Education graduate level Ethnomathematics course that focused on culturally responsive mathematics education in alignment with the College's mission that:

"...envisions a community of educators who provide innovative research, teaching, and leadership in an effort to further the field of education and prepare professionals to contribute to

a just, diverse, and democratic society. The College aims to enhance the well-being of the Native Hawaiian people and others across the Pacific Basin.”

Each degree program offered at UH Mānoa had an assigned faculty member responsible for coordinating assessment in collaboration with faculty colleagues. Program assessment was supported by the Assessment and Curriculum Center that offered workshops to facilitate understanding of various assessment rubrics. The General Education Office convened faculty to systematically assess learning outcomes that included questions of where and how student learning outcomes were published. The resulting reports were also reviewed by the Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Effectiveness that also provided feedback. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7)

Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)

The institution had clear accessible board and institutional policies that governed research and scholarship. These policies covered ethical standards and defined “principal investigator” in ways that conditioned the ability to serve in such a capacity. The institution required compatibility between research activity “with the mission of the respective academic or research unit.” The right to investigate and disseminate research findings was protected, and there were clear guidelines for the possible inclusion of human subjects in research activities. The institution embraced, promoted, and demonstrated the intersections that bring together research, scholarship, teaching, service, and service learning. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)

Student Learning and Success (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14)

In 2015 UH Mānoa established a 10-year strategic plan. One goal of the strategic plan was enhancing student success. The institution demonstrated that students indeed make progress toward the completion of their degree and had taken steps to make disaggregated student outcome data available to those seeking it. The institution's four and six-year graduation rates increased over the last decade as noted in the self-study. At the time of the visit, the UH Mānoa four and six-year graduation rates were 37% and 62% respectively. However, the review team did not observe an institutional urgency to address equity gaps resulting from clear and transparent data points that highlighted the six-year graduation rate for African American students or the six-year graduation rate for Native Hawaiian students. While these groups are small, the recent six-year rates for African American students were below 50%, and the six-year rates for Native Hawaiian students were just above 50%. The team did not observe expanded data collection categories to include students with disabilities. The team did not observe clear benchmarks by which the institution could measure progress against its own aspirations for improving retention or degree completion, especially for student populations currently experiencing lower success rates.

The institution published clear, accurate, and discernible information concerning admission, degree requirements and the cost of various degree programs. UH Mānoa demonstrated a commitment to providing students timely and effective advising that facilitated progress towards degree. The team also observed a clear commitment by the institution to improve the integration of student support services by leveraging technology and rethinking the structures that deliver a range of student affairs services. The institution had an extensive range of co-curricular programs and activities that were aligned with degree programs or intended for personal and educational development. UH Mānoa was a member institution in a larger ten-campus system that included seven community colleges. The policies that governed articulation were clear. The UH system provided a website that offered general transfer

information including a transfer credit database. These resources did not ensure that articulation works well in every instance as prerequisites and degree requirements evolve. UH Mānoa as a part of the system was considering a general education curriculum revision that, among other things, aimed to “ease student transfer across institutions.” (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14)

Conclusion

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

UH Mānoa supported the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These elements helped promote the achievement of institutional purpose and created a high-quality environment for learning. Some members of the campus community expressed concerns about some of the senior leaderships’ dual responsibilities at the campus and system levels, and about recent efforts by the board of regents to reconsider some faculty classifications and associated protections. The team concludes that these issues do not put at risk the institution’s compliance with accreditation standards and have not put at risk the achievement of quality and sustainability. However, the team encourages the university to be mindful of potential areas of concern and to communicate effectively with the campus community about future proposals for change.

Faculty and Staff (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)

The institution employed faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff were, in general, sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered. The institution acknowledged that achieving the educational objective of becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning requires the recruitment of additional Native Hawaiian faculty and staff and those efforts continued. (CFR 3.1)

There were well-documented policies and practices for the hiring and ongoing evaluation of the institution's faculty. Policies and procedures pertaining to the employment relationships were documented in the collective bargaining agreements, the processes of the UH System Office of Human Resources, the Search Advocate Program, the New Faculty Orientation, various Tenure and Promotion procedures and faculty workload policies, and collective bargaining agreements including the 2021-23 faculty agreement (see especially Articles IV, IX, X, XII, XIV, and XVIII), the Unit 8 contract, the Unit 3 contract, and the Unit 1 contract. (CFR 3.2)

There were appropriate professional development programs for both staff and faculty, and these were designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes. (CFR 3.3)

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources (CFRs 3.4, 3.5)

Fiscal, physical, and information resources were in place and generally aligned with educational purposes and objectives. In recent years the institution faced a constrained budgetary environment which required hard decisions about prioritization and innovative thinking about organizational structures. In response to state revenue losses during the COVID-19 pandemic, the provost initiated a post-pandemic planning process which led in June 2021 to the release of Performance Indicators for

Prioritization that will form the basis for future budget and hiring requests. These indicators arose from a working group of faculty, staff, students, and administrators and reflected the mission, vision, and goals identified in the campus Strategic Plan, Mānoa 2025. The plan anticipated a regular revisiting of campus priorities, indicators, and metrics to ensure alignment with institutional goals.

Campus leadership acknowledged that, as this process continues, it will be necessary to allocate additional resources to the achievement of the strategic priorities described in the institution's self-study. The team recommends that the campus initiate a process to align resource allocation with the thematic priorities of the institution over the course of consecutive budgets in order to replace an overreliance on soft money and volunteerism with higher levels of permanent institutional resources. (CFR 3.4)

The institution also maintained a technology infrastructure that met the needs of instruction, research, public service, and administration. The UH Information Technology Services (ITS) provided a broad range of IT services to meet these needs, including the creation and maintenance of enterprise-wide IT systems (including high performance computer and research data storage), dissemination of information relating to the use of IT in higher education, provision of informal workshops, seminars, training, and documentation in the effective use of various technologies, and consultation and support services. The STAR project in particular is to be commended for the way in which it facilitated campus planning, enrollment management processes, and student support intervention. (CFR 3.5)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9)

The institution also had an independent governing board that exercised oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer. Some members of the campus community expressed the view that the board's recent efforts to reconsider some faculty classifications and protections was prompted by a State Senate

Resolution and thus conflicted with the requirement that the institution be free from improper government interference. The team finds that an independent governing board's acknowledgment of legislative concerns does not violate any WSCUC standard, especially when the institution's board itself proceeds as it sees fit on how to assess issues such as faculty classifications. (CFR 3.9)

The institution had well-defined policies and procedures in place to select, appoint, and review all university-wide administrators. Board of Regents Policy 2.203 outlined the annual process of evaluating the president which included consultation with the broader campus community. Executive Policy 9.212 outlined the evaluation process more generally for campus executives and managers, which included the solicitation of written comments from those who regularly interacted with the executive as well as a 360-survey conducted by the Office of Human Resources. (CFR 3.6)

The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes were outlined in a set of organizational charts that comprehensively spanned the entire institution. The UH Mānoa Faculty Senate operated as the embodiment of faculty academic leadership on campus, with an appropriate infrastructure of committees for active participation in shared governance. Some members of the academic community expressed concern that certain administrative positions have both UH Mānoa responsibilities and systemwide responsibilities and that some systemwide officials had supervisory responsibilities over certain campus offices. (CFRs 3.7, 3.10)

The team spent a good deal of time exploring whether its distinctive chief executive structure satisfied standard CFR 3.8's requirement that "the institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution." The team was provided extensive documentation on the background of the UH Mānoa's approach to institutional reorganization, which demonstrated serious challenges with the history of the separate Mānoa chancellor position.

From 2001-2018, when the system leader was separate from all campus leaders, Mānoa had seven chancellors, four of whom were interim. With an average time in office of less than three years, those chosen to lead UH Mānoa were not in office long enough to see the graduation of the undergraduate class that entered with them. These turnovers also made it difficult for the UH Mānoa chancellor to establish effective working relations either with colleagues inside the system (including the regents) or key constituencies in the community (such as business leaders, legislators, and donors).

In 2017 a design team was appointed to recommend a structure that would provide stronger and more stable leadership for the campus. They proposed a president-provost model, which under an initial phase would have the UH System President serve as the CEO of the Mānoa campus with specific authority over athletics, Native Hawaiian place of learning, and offices charged with ensuring compliance with federal regulations regarding protected classes. Within this structure the provost as chief academic officer would have full responsibility for the integration and success of academic, enrollment management, research, and student success operations on the campus. More generally, the provost would serve as a deputy for the president and provide an independent and fully dedicated voice for Mānoa among all the officers of the UH system.

In April 2021 the board of regents approved a second phase, which reconfigured existing vice chancellor offices into four vice provost offices and a chief business office that would create a collaborative and coordinated approach to campus administration.

After lengthy conversations with the senior leadership team, and input from many other campus constituencies, the team concluded that UHM's president-provost model was consistent with CFR 3.8's requirement that the institution have a full-time chief executive officer. CFR 3.8 was not intended to restrict how an institution allocated responsibilities among otherwise full-time academic leaders, and UHM's model provided the Mānoa campus with representation and advocacy within the system cabinet more proportional to its size and impact and was more likely to ensure stable leadership and

appropriate oversight of campus operations. However, because there were potential conflicts of interest given the president's dual obligation to advance the interests of the Mānoa campus and to advance the interests of the system as a whole, the institution needed a clear conflict of interest policy, including conflict definitions and resolution process provisions.

Conclusion

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

The team recommends that the campus engage in a systematic and concerted effort, over the course of consecutive budgets, to align resource allocation with the thematic priorities of the institution. The team consistently heard frustration about the overreliance on soft money and volunteerism in the implementation of programming and services, particularly those in areas that otherwise should be supported with permanent institutional resources. (CFR 3.4)

The team recommends that the UH Mānoa CEO make a request of the board of regents to develop an executive leadership conflict of interest policy, including conflict definition and resolution process provisions, given the unique executive structure under which the UH Mānoa CEO also serves as the UH system president. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7)

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

The institution's efforts in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection were apparent particularly, in supporting its mission and educational objectives. The institution was responsive to the changing needs in its environment, its pivot to respond to the global pandemic

situation, and the need to sustain its purpose and goals in a responsive manner post-pandemic. The institution generated data and reports to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.

Quality Assurance Processes (CFRs 4.1, 4.2)

The institution had a substantial assessment infrastructure that included the Assessment & Curriculum Support Center, Faculty Senate Educational Effectiveness Committee, Faculty Senate General Education Committee, Mānoa Institutional Research Office (MIRO), and relevant policies. Processes existed to support course and program level needs. Through the MIRO, aggregated and disaggregated data were publicized for general consumption. Program-level assessments of student learning were disseminated accordingly, although the institution acknowledged it needed much more systematizing in program reviews for student support. For its goal of becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning, assessment of progress was not as clear given the lack of qualitative and quantitative goals and lack of corresponding financial resources. (CFR 4.1)

The institutional research capacity was sufficient and consistent with its purposes and characteristics, to include support by MIRO and the UH System Institutional Research & Analysis Office, and Executive Policy E5.210 for Institutional Accountability and Performance. The institutional research office was focusing on developing tools to enable people and programs to be self-sustainable to access needed information. The institution's establishment of the Office of the Vice Provost for Student Success should position the institution to leverage retention and graduation efforts and resources for efficiency. (CFR 4.2)

Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)

Senior leadership was committed to tracking success metrics for underrepresented populations much better than in the past, to better understand the issues among different underrepresented student groups. The institution had an established system for producing a culture of evidence through its overall areas of support, including the Assessment Office, MIRO, and UH System Institutional Research & Analysis Office. MIRO provided sufficient central campus support to units. Data and information served as the basis for improvement and was incorporated into institutional planning and program review processes, including published reports on graduation rates. However, more could be done to set and publish achievement goals. This includes highlighting academic innovations that have been implemented successfully on campus directly related to the closing of achievement gaps.

To monitor progress toward becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning, the team recommends that UH Mānoa confirm the qualitative and quantitative goals that embody the greatest significance and meaning for the community and pursue them through the strategic allocation of resources. Goals to consider may include Native Hawaiian representation among the students, faculty, staff, and leadership, cultural development manifested on campus, and curricular adjustments across campus units to better incorporate Native Hawaiian knowledge, concepts, and approaches. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3)

There was significant faculty involvement in the use of assessment results to improve student learning. The institution's policies and academic structures were sufficient to foster significant faculty involvement. Relevant policies existed to guide faculty involvement in academic decision making and policy development. Academic governance committees such as the Faculty Senate General Education Committee, the Faculty Senate Educational Effectiveness Committee, and the Assessment & Curriculum Support Center, enabled full involvement of faculty. The Assessment & Curriculum Support Center provided key central support to faculty and other campus community members to enable improvement

of student learning and success through academic program assessment. (CFR 4.4) However, the institution lacked an assessment of the broader campus environment on issues relating to a supportive climate for the diverse campus community. (CFR 4.3)

Internal stakeholders and external advisory councils were sufficiently engaged in educational programs in different ways. Academic program reviews included participation by departmental faculty, the program's dean, an external review committee of program discipline leaders from peer and benchmark institutions, as well as faculty, staff, students, administration, and industry professionals. The process for establishing a new academic program drew participation by faculty, deans, the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence, and other appropriate officials. Performance indicators for prioritization were developed through a working group of faculty, staff, students, and administrators to guide budget and hiring requests. The Provost, Vice Provosts for Academic Excellence and Research and Scholarship, and the Senior Advisor/ALO met monthly with governance bodies for regular consultation. External advisory councils for professional schools were engaged with curricular changes and assess outcomes of student learning. (CFR 4.5)

The institution engaged stakeholders in the development of its five-year strategic plan (Mānoa 2025), with articulated goals that responded to issues and strategic direction. It responded accordingly during the global pandemic through the development of the UH Mānoa Planning for Post Pandemic Hawai'i led by the provost. Senior leaders used the pandemic as a model for evidence-based decision-making and created a website devoted to planning during the pandemic and collective efforts to post data and information.

The review team learned during its meetings with campus stakeholders that some have a general distrust of senior leadership's commitment to the goal of becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning, with a call for sufficient representation or inclusion of Native Hawaiian officers at senior level discussions on the strategic allocation and prioritization of institutional-level funding. This included the

desired engagement by Native Hawaiian faculty, council, staff, and students in a broader discussion to address their view of the tenets of the Native Hawaiian Place of Learning aspiration and to generate with senior leadership a mutually agreeable vision with adequate institutional resource support for related goals and initiatives. (CFR 4.6)

Overall, the review team observed senior leaders were committed to responding to the changing environments through effective planning, aligned resources, and financial models that will sustain its purpose, vision, and strategic goals long-term. This was evident through the recent UH Mānoa Campus Reorganization (Phase 2) efforts, the UH Mānoa Planning for Post-Pandemic Hawai'i report, and the development of Performance Indicators for Prioritization document that identified the framework and metrics to guide the evaluation of future budget and hiring requests. All aligned with the institution's mission, vision, and goals in Mānoa 2025. (CFR 4.7)

Conclusion

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

To recognize progress toward becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning, the team recommends that UH Mānoa identify the qualitative and quantitative goals that embody the greatest significance and meaning for the community and pursue them through the strategic allocation of resources. Goals to consider may include Native Hawaiian representation among the students, faculty, staff, and leadership, cultural development manifested on campus, and curricular adjustments across campus units to better incorporate Native Hawaiian knowledge, concepts, and approaches. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3)

The team recommends that UH Mānoa regularly survey the broader campus environment on issues relating to a supportive climate for the diverse campus community. (CFRs 2.10, 4.3)

Federal Requirements

UH Mānoa provided evidence of its compliance with the four federal requirements, and a review with the team's commentary is presented in an appendix to this report. The following forms constitute the Federal Compliance Forms Appendix: Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form; Marketing and Recruitment Review Form; Student Complaints Review Form; and Transfer Credit Policy Review Form.

Component 8: Institution specific themes

Component 8(a): Becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning:

From the previous WSCUC action letter to the institution, the Commission recommended that the institution "articulate the measurable attributes of a Hawaiian Place of Learning and promote this as a core distinction of education." The Commission also acknowledged the institution's progress in implementing the 2012 task force recommendations supporting UH Mānoa as a Hawaiian place of learning and increasing the proportion of Native Hawaiian students and numbers of degrees granted, although graduation rates lagged other groups. Finally, the Commission noted that despite the number of Native Hawaiian faculty increasing and expanding to new departments, the representation was marginal at six percent.

The institution responded by incorporating guiding values and measurable goals in its strategic plan, which reflected the history and values of Hawai'i and the institution's commitment to becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning (NHPoL). Guiding documents and principles in part stemmed from

recommendations in the 2012 *Hawai'i Papa O Ke Ao* and 2016 *Ka Ho'okō Kuleana* implementation reports for the *Ke Au Hou* Recommendations by the Hawaiian Place of Learning Implementation Task Force intent to establish UH Mānoa as a Hawaiian Place of Learning. The 2012 task force established guiding principles as the basis for planning to create a model indigenous-serving institution at the University of Hawai'i. The subsequent 2016 implementation plan addressed four thematic areas of focus that were captured in its *Mānoa Our Kuleana to Hawai'i & The World Strategic Plan 2015-2025* (Mānoa 2025): (1) Native Hawaiian Student Success, (2) Native Hawaiian staff and faculty development and support for all staff and faculty to engender a campus environment that embraces aloha 'āina, (3) Cultivating a Native Hawaiian Environment, and (4) Native Hawaiian Community Engagement.

The review team applauds the inclusive efforts by the institution's Native Hawaiian community to provide a strategic action plan. In its strategic plan, the institution identified several ambitious outcomes to accomplish by 2025. These included having a data and evaluation system in place that maps and measures campus and college-wide progress in each of the four Native Hawaiian place of learning strategic focus areas. Other desired achievements included 100% of deans and other executive managers utilizing a common knowledge set of key data points regarding each of the four Native Hawaiian place of learning strategic focus areas, and 100% of schools, colleges, and other similar non-academic units making the five-year strategic plan relevant to their respective units.

The review team observed that senior leadership was committed to the institution's intent to becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning. Its *Mānoa 2025* strategic plan captured the history and strategic intent of Mānoa, its unique sense of place, purpose, and vision:

"We will be locally and globally recognized as a premier student-centered, Carnegie Research 1, community-serving university grounded in a Native Hawaiian place of learning that summons our rich knowledge systems to help mā'lama Hawai'i and the world for future generations."

The review team appreciated the institution's candor in its strategic plan that it lacked a track record of embedding Native Hawaiian values, worldviews, and knowledge systems to guide decision making. It

acknowledged the controversy surrounding the planned Thirty Meter Telescope on Maunakea among other issues and recognized the need to reconcile past and current decisions considering the controversy. The university believed its designation as a Truth, Racial Healing and Transformation Campus Center could be a way to help guide its reconciliation process.

Becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning served as one of four high-level strategic goals and aloha 'āina as the guide for the theme of achieving this goal. However, in meeting with Native Hawaiian constituents, the team heard comments regarding the misappropriation of culture in the way the institution applied "aloha 'āina." In the perspective of some, the institution's representation of addressing Native Hawaiian concerns was superficial due to the disregard for preserving sacred lands such as Maunakea and the Thirty Meter Telescope development.

Within the past several years, the institution committed to the achievement of the strategic implementation of recommendations from all the Native Hawaiian reports culminating since 1986, which included the creation of a Native Hawaiian Affairs Program Officer position, the NHPoL Advancement Office, and the official recognition of the Kūali'i Council as an advisory body to the chancellor (now president). The Hawai'inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge, established in 2007, collaborated with these relatively new entities, leveraging activities from its Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies, Kawaihuelani Center for Hawaiian Language, Ka Papa Lo'i 'o Kānewai (taro garden), and Native Hawaiian Student Services.

In 2017, the Native Hawaiian Affairs Program Officer position was filled and made responsible for the strategic implementation of the recommendations from all the Native Hawaiian reports. New initiatives unfolded including a dedicated website, a monthly newsletter and other services for Native Hawaiian faculty and students at the institution. Further, the NHPoL Advancement Office led the efforts to establish UH Mānoa as a Truth & Racial Healing Transformation Center. Other activities stemmed from the Hawai'inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge's Contributions, and the Native Hawaiian

Student Success (Logic Model) Plan. The Search Advocates Program was established to provide advisory support to faculty search committees and the Wayfinding Project to support the campus's sense of place tied to Native Hawaiian history and the land.

Although the institution successfully established the Native Hawaiian Affairs Program Officer position and the NHPoL Advancement Office, the institution may have underestimated how much work needs to be done to make progress in this area. Additional funding requests and a lack of institutional funding support seemed to persist despite the institution's professed commitment to this area. The team learned that some people viewed senior leadership's support as more rhetoric than commitment considering the articulated gap of institutional resource support, reliance on overtaxed personnel, and over-reliance on grant soft funding to support Mānoa's institutional intent.

The review team observed improvements to this area and alignment to the Mānoa 2025 strategic plan. Senior leadership identified the institution as a model indigenous serving institution. The five-year strategic plans required by all units by 2025, with connection and guidance by the Native Hawaiian Advancement Office, lend promise to continuous improvement as part of the overarching goal. There were commendable efforts by key units to pull in competitive USDOE Title III grants, approximately \$30 million brought in to support Native Hawaiians and others. Senior leadership proposed shifting the funding narrative to compel the federal government to support these areas. Schools and colleges launched varied initiatives to reflect becoming an NHPoL either in curriculum, student recruitment, faculty recruitment, or professional development. These units are in the process of developing five-year strategic plans to incorporate these and institutionalize them further.

The team applauds the efforts established to support becoming an NHPoL. Recognized formally as an advisory body to senior leadership, the Kūali'i Council provided strong advocacy to advance Native Hawaiian people, culture, and language, in areas of funding and permanent positions for staff and faculty across campus. The Native Hawaiian Student Services, which was a part of the School of

Hawaiian Knowledge, provided programs and services to support the 2,600 Hawaiian students at the University. The Associated Students of the University of Hawai'i provided free Hawaiian classes. The Center for Teaching Excellence workshops and training introduced participants to Mānoa and Hawai'i in a Native Hawaiian way and raised awareness about the Native Hawaiian reports. Guiding principles were identified in the strategic plan. Some structures had been in place, and what was common across these, including the Native Hawaiian Advancement Office and the Native Hawaiian Student Success unit, was the lack of committed institutional funding to support these efforts. While the institution received significant federal funds for Native Hawaiian student success activities, it had yet to support their most successful programs with institutional funding, which senior leadership hoped to provide in the near future.

The review team also observed there was a tremendous desire among Native Hawaiian faculty to volunteer and contribute to the effort of supporting Native Hawaiian students and advancing the recommendations from the 2012 and 2016 reports. The Native Hawaiian Advancement Office and the Kūali'i Council recognized the need to provide additional support to the initiatives. As captured in the institutional report,

"In some units a single NH faculty or staff member may face significant levels of stress, anxiety, and burn-out due to their burden of advancing UH Mānoa's goal of becoming a NHPoL. NHs are underrepresented among the faculty in many units and on the campus as a whole. Some students lose out on mentorship opportunities because there are so few faculty who can support their growth in their area. While the increases are helpful, UH Mānoa needs faultier, staff and leaders who are committed and able to advance the campus as an NHPoL." (p. 28)

Within the context of becoming an NHPoL focused on Native Hawaiian faculty and students, the institution as an indigenous place of learning can be a leader in assuring diversity, equity and inclusion across all faculty and students. As the institution navigates through its NHPoL journey, it needs to be mindful of the pulse of other faculty and students who have historically been marginalized and address this comprehensively. Senior leadership acknowledged there were other underrepresented groups, and there was promise of a system to provide transparency and overall support. The work of the Truth and

Racial Healing Transformation Design Team proved successful and can be broadened to foster optimal inclusion.

The review team appreciated the institution's ongoing intentional efforts, but it appeared that much reconciliation is needed as the institution advances its goal. The team heard concerns that there was a misalignment of the strategic level intent to become a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning, that the intent appeared performative, and that stressed the university's efforts needed to be institutionalized, including open avenues for Native Hawaiian representation in senior leadership discussions to articulate these concerns.

Conclusion

The institution acknowledged it made progress in the right direction, but there was still much to do to address concerns raised by its Native Hawaiian faculty, students, and staff regarding the genuine higher-level institutional commitment they still desire, including recruiting additional Native Hawaiian faculty, honoring values related to sacred ancestral lands, and elevating its program officer position to support their efforts. The team recommends above, in its evaluation of UH Mānoa's compliance with Standard 4, that the institution identify specific, meaningful, and high-priority goals to pursue through the strategic allocation of resources. This includes an institutional commitment to support already positive and impactful initiatives underway to support Native Hawaiian faculty, students, and staff. UH Mānoa's journey towards becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning is ongoing, and the next visit should yield continued promising results.

The team recommends that UH Mānoa continue the journey of becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning through greater transparency, inclusion, higher levels of clarity and consensus about defined initiatives, and parallel high-level resource support. (CFRs 1.1, 4.6)

Component 8(b): Transformational Student Success

The UH Mānoa institutional report acknowledged that this particular theme was selected to directly address the 2011 Commission recommendation regarding student success. The team spent a considerable amount of time speaking with various university constituents about student success efforts and which aspects were particularly transformational. Some referenced the university's strategic plan, Mānoa 2025. Others focused on particular programmatic efforts like the Learning Assistant program. The team carefully reviewed documents and probed about the effectiveness of such programs. Overall, there was an obvious institutional commitment to student success; however, the team struggled to identify programs or coordinated institutional efforts with the power to transform student outcomes with equity. UH Mānoa made steady progress over the last decade increasing four-year graduation rates from 18% to 37%. The six-year graduation rate increased from 51% to 62%. The team notes that in the 2011 WASC visiting team report, the team commented that: "Worrisome as well, Native Hawaiian students while retained at a comparable level, have a six-year graduation rates of 48.5% (2001) and 39.3% (2003)." At the time of this visit, the six-year graduation rate for Native Hawaiian students was 54%, approximately six percentage points higher than it was 20 years ago (and four points higher than it was in 2011). The team did not observe a sense of urgency, a plan with numerical goals, or sufficient resource allocations to address this issue as part of a transformational student success agenda.

The UH System established measurable student success targets for each campus, described in "UH Strategic Directions 2015-2021," and has awarded performance funding based on achievement of these goals. However, the end date of the document is 2021. When reviewing the Mānoa 2025 plan and in speaking with campus leaders, the absence of measurable goals associated with a claim of transformational student success was perplexing. Fluid statements in the strategic plan like *"Increase 4-year graduation rates by reviewing and modifying academic policies and ensuring parity for Pell grant*

recipients” do not establish clear, quantifiable improvement targets for the university to measure progress with accountability. During the visit it became clear that various student success efforts across the campus could benefit from the establishment of clear institutional goals and specific targets for divisions or various student service units. The team observed considerable communal fogginess regarding what level of progress (in various areas) would constitute success.

Learning Assistants

The Learning Assistant (LA) program employed undergraduates to provide additional learning support for students in introductory courses like Physics, Chemistry and Biology to improve the likelihood that students earn passing grades and achieve the learning outcomes. The program began in 2016 and expanded in the following two years. The LA program was well-received by faculty, with an evaluation of the program’s first three years presented to the team. Learning Assistants provided critical instructional support, a feedback loop for faculty, and opportunities for students to receive support in small groups. In some cases, courses had a faculty member, teaching assistants, and LAs. It not surprising that the success rates in courses supported by LAs were higher than those without such a resource, and the emerging data were encouraging. Continuing assessment of the program will be helpful for maximizing and more strategically targeting LAs.

The team inquired about the problem of low success rates in some courses. It was not clear if lower pass rates in some courses were being attributed to perceived preparation deficits among students, less effective pedagogical approaches among faculty, or some combination of the two. Still, faculty development efforts were being incorporated into the program, something that the team considered a positive development. The review team also inquired about the criteria that determined which courses were assigned LAs. At the time of the visit, faculty participation was based on a proposal process. Courses currently offered with consistently high enrollment and a high percentage of students

earning non-passing grades could be assigned LAs if the instructors of record developed a plan to incorporate LAs appropriately into the course via their proposals. The review team appreciates the power of voluntary adoption built upon a flourishing faculty learning community and demonstrated success.

Native Hawaiian Student Success

UH Mānoa enrollment of Native Hawaiian students (undergraduate and graduate) was 17.7% at the time of the visit. For the 2014 entering cohort, the four-year graduation rate was 32%, and the six-year graduation rate was 54%. Just under half of Native Hawaiian students who enrolled at UH Mānoa did not earn a degree after six years. These figures helped situate the institutional efforts associated with Native Hawaiian student success. The team does not pretend to know every historical, cultural, or institutional factor that influences Native Hawaiian student outcomes. Listening carefully to campus leaders, faculty, students, and staff, the team attempted to understand how UH Mānoa responded to the ambition to improve Native Hawaiian student success. Native Hawaiian faculty, students, and staff expressed great dissatisfaction with the resource investment and what were considered marginal programmatic efforts focused on Native Hawaiian students. “My paper was marked down for using Native Hawaiian language,” reported one student underscoring the cultural tensions and questions of whether Native Hawaiian students truly feel a sense of belonging at UH Mānoa.

Native Hawaiian Student Services (NHSS) was the office charged with improving the experience and outcomes of Native Hawaiian students at UH Mānoa. The office provided programs from pre-K through doctoral studies. The range of services included recruitment, new student orientation, tutoring, summer bridge programming, and community outreach, among others. The office was located inside the Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge. Some individuals with whom the team met understood the location of this office as a sign of it being on the margins rather than a part of central

administration. Others understood the location as an attempt to protect the future viability of the office from central administration. The team found both interpretations troubling considering the theme of becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning. The team also observed that the philosophy in which NHSS programs were grounded emphasizes both the rich legacy of Native Hawaiian intellectual excellence, which was powerful, and a “de-occupied future” that may complicate the ability to find acceptable institutional cooperation in support of Native Hawaiian students.

The NHSS programming was heavily subsidized by extramural and federal funding rather than positioned as a major feature in the university’s operational base budget. The team reviewed the expenditures of NHSS, which amounted to approximately \$469K for fiscal year 2021 (\$459K covers personnel expenses). The level of financial support for NHSS signaled its importance. Still, NHSS has advanced a broad array of programs including what were referred to as “sheltered courses” designed to support students that was impressive while serving as a Native Hawaiian emporium of resources.

Academic Advising

Over the last decade, the practice of academic advising changed considerably across higher education. The infusion of technology, predictive analytics, and student demand for application-based information has led to the rethinking of advising systems and structures. UH Mānoa, like many institutions, was also taking intentional steps to improve advising, including recent participation in the multi-year Excellence in Academic Advising review and planning process in partnership with NACADA (the National Academic Advising Association). One result from participating in the Excellence in Academic Advising program was the report shared in November of 2019 about the quality and effectiveness of advising. The team determined that UH Mānoa was uncovering precisely where advising was working well and where improvements were needed. The institution received approval in April 2021

for the creation of a Director of Advising position that was not yet filled at the time of the visit because of a hiring freeze.

As the campus navigates the advising structure, it had a number of assets to build upon. One asset was STAR, the constellation of user-friendly applications that provided members of the campus community actionable intelligence about registration, course taking behavior among students, and scheduling. Established 17 years ago, STAR was well-developed and effectively integrated various campus data systems to provide critical information to campus leaders. Although well-developed, the tool had not yet been fully integrated into the student service functions. For example, campus-wide early alert warnings had not yet been implemented. Empowering faculty with information and tools to support students more immediately based on classroom interactions was also in the development stages.

Conclusion

The team spent considerable time reviewing data, documents, and debriefing from conversations with a cross-section of university stakeholders about UH Mānoa's progress on improving student success. The team also considered the concept of transformational student success as discussed in the institutional report. The team determined that UH Mānoa made important progress over the last decade, most notably with improved four- and six-year graduation rates. Several promising efforts associated with Native Hawaiian student success were noted in the institutional report and were initiated in the last few years. The team was unanimous in its assessment that based on the UH Mānoa materials, transformational student success necessitates the pursuit of more equitable outcomes for all students. Transformational student success must include a campus-wide commitment to a discrete set of clear, quantifiable goals. Transformational student success requires advanced data systems that clearly reveal variations in student outcomes especially for critical milestones across the university. The

team acknowledges that achieving this level of transformation requires clear goals, time, sustained coordinated effort, adequate resource commitments and an institutional accountability framework. The review team asked in meetings about specific measurable student success goals and was not offered a detailed response.

The strategic plan, Mānoa 2025, was established in 2015 and used language such as *“Continuously improve first-year, full-time student retention rates through more inclusive student success strategies, including strategies that encourage major declaration for second-year students.”* The team asserts that the absence of clear, quantifiable goals compromised the ability of the campus to focus with synergy. During the visit, the team encountered hard working, dedicated, brilliant educators who could benefit from a visible goal post.

For transformational student success, the team recommends that UH Mānoa establish clear, time-bound goals for retention, degree completion, and equity. By pursuing student outcome data disaggregated by academic unit and demographics including race/ethnicity, UH Mānoa can guide resource allocation, institutional policy, and practice. UH Mānoa’s assessment and institutional research units stand ready to support this process. (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 3.4)

Component 8(c): Academic Innovation and Engaged Learning

The institution noted that the development of this theme had roots in a recommendation it received through its reaffirmation of accreditation a decade ago, namely, to further define the undergraduate degree through the establishment of learning outcomes beyond the departmental level. In the year that followed, faculty approved a set of Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) centered around “breadth and depth of knowledge,” “intellectual and practical skills,” and “personal and social responsibility.” The four initiatives advanced to give expression to the “academic innovation and

engaged learning” theme were each variously focused on one or more of the ten associated learning outcomes.

Strengthening Interdisciplinary Studies

One of the ways in which the institution looked to support academic innovation and engaged learning was by reinvesting energy and resources into its Interdisciplinary Studies program. Through this program, undergraduates pursued an interdisciplinary bachelor’s degree by selecting from one of a handful of pre-designed courses of study or proposing their own course of study with faculty support. To enhance visibility and coordination, the program was re-aligned organizationally to be closer to the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence. A new director was hired two years ago to bring strategic leadership in the areas of program expansion (e.g., new courses, new pre-designed course of study offerings, capstones, and internships) and student academic support (e.g., advising resources, academic planning technologies). A faculty council was constructed to strengthen program oversight and connections with other forms of academic governance. Finally, a teaching fellows program was established to enhance teaching, learning, and assessment throughout.

The review team is impressed with the rededication of efforts to make the Interdisciplinary Studies program a continued success. Along with the continuation of the aforementioned strategies, the offering of online in addition to in-person options is sure to be an asset to the program well beyond the pandemic as the institution recalibrates its modes of delivery. Moreover, the areas of focus developed and under development were as intriguing as they were current (e.g., environmental humanities, social sciences of oceans). Nevertheless, the review team wondered about the accelerated growth of the program relative to student interest to date (according to the institutional report, just under 50 graduates per year) and whether fiscal vitality – for the program itself if enrollments do not grow as

anticipated, or for other academic programs from which it may be drawing students away – will be a concern in the future.

Sustainability and Resilience Programs and Courses

Academic innovation and engaged learning were further advanced by the institution through its efforts to grow opportunities for students to develop knowledge, skills, and abilities with regard to civic participation and stewardship of the natural environment, two outcomes associated with the “personal and social responsibility” component of its undergraduate ILOs. The organizational anchor for this work was the Institute for Sustainability and Resilience, founded in 2018 following a 2017 landscape assessment that documented the status and activities of 50-plus relevant research and education endeavors to demonstrate the existing capacities and opportunities for synergy through more coordination and collaboration. Well-organized and administered, this initiative facilitated the cultivation of nearly 100 undergraduate and over two dozen graduate “Sustainability and Resilience (SUST)” courses cross-listed throughout the institution’s curricular offerings, all grounded in two overarching learning outcomes: “Understanding of the interconnectivity of human and natural systems,” and “Evidence-based reasoning on the implications of sustainability problems and/or proposed solutions.” Undergraduates and graduate students alike had the opportunity to deepen their engagement through a range of degree tracks and certificate programs, and if a current proposal were approved, undergraduates could satisfy multiple general education requirements through a “thematic pathway” focused on sustainability and resilience.

The review team finds the institution’s work to accelerate opportunities for student learning in the areas of sustainability and resilience to be exemplary in two notable ways. First, the growth of the effort from an initiative to an institute, per se, all with clarity of strategic purpose grounded in the institution’s mission, vision, values, and goals, was an accomplishment more difficult than it may appear

on the surface. And second, the approach to curriculum development, leading at once from a center and in a federated fashion drawing on faculty across campus, was a smart way to bring unusual agility to the task without compromising quality.

Attracting Highly Motivated Students to [UH Mānoa] Graduate Programs

Another curricular innovation that the institution established and scaled over a relatively short period of time was the “Bachelor’s and Master’s Degree (BAM) Pathways” program. Participating students could follow a specified course of study allowing them to begin taking graduate-level classes as they completed their baccalaureate and moved relatively seamlessly into a master’s program. The institution’s faculty senate approved the guidelines for BAM pathways, and the Graduate Council and the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence approved 13 BAM pathways at the program’s inception in 2017. Subsequently a dozen more pathways were approved, totaling 25 and counting at the time of the site visit. As suggested in the self-study report, the overarching goal was to facilitate the matriculation of more UHM undergraduates into UHM graduate programs than would happen under normal circumstances. A common structure of a BAM pathway was a straightforward continuity of study from foundational to advanced levels, e.g., BA in Geography to MA in Geography, BS in Mechanical Engineering to MS in Mechanical Engineering. A complementary goal was to light up less conventional pathways from undergraduate to graduate study, e.g., BA in Ethnic Studies to MEd in Educational Administration, BS in Global Environmental Science to MPH.

The review team finds the institution’s efforts to catalyze continuity of study from undergraduate to graduate levels through the BAM program to be off to a solid start; with sound governance in place and numbers of pathways and students on the rise, coupled with early reports of strong student satisfaction, this effort quickly eclipsed a proof-of-concept stage and may well become a fixture, if not a hallmark, of its academic program offerings. Further assessment and institutional

analysis will help program leads develop a better understanding of student learning and achievement outcomes and, in turn, set longer-term strategic direction and goals. Regarding the latter, the review team suggests consideration of ways in which the BAM Pathways program might even more intentionally connect to the institution's aspirations to grow and retain more diverse student and faculty bodies, particularly among its Native Hawaiian populations, throughout all the campus's scholarly communities.

Advancing Undergraduate Research and Civic Engagement

The institution closed its presentation of this third and final theme by highlighting its concerted efforts to strengthen two well-established high-impact practices in undergraduate education, i.e., undergraduate research and community engaged learning. The report describes how each of these spheres of work was in stride, bolstered by explicit grounding in the institution's ILO framework, e.g., "inquire and conduct research" as an intellectual and practical skill, "civic partnership in communities" as a personal and social responsibility. The Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) was established in 2011 as a part of the Honors Program and was subsequently realigned with the Office of the Vice Provost for Research & Scholarships to underscore that undergraduate research and creative work ought to be experienced by all students. UROP invited faculty to find ways to welcome undergraduates into the folds of their scholarly agendas and guided students to connect with them in turn – the crux undergraduate research programs in their present forms nationally. Further, the UROP team worked to secure and allocate as much scholarship funds to as many students as possible and facilitated other structures in support of its mission, e.g., summer symposia, piloting courses, and student showcase events. Numbers of faculty and student participants were on the rise, even during the pandemic, and the UROP team was developing its capacities for tracking and analytics.

Unlike its more singular effort with UROP, the institution anchored its efforts to facilitate community engaged learning opportunities for undergraduates through two units: the Office of Civic and Community Engagement (OCCE) and the College of Social Sciences Program for Civic Engagement (PCE). Efforts to enhance and build civic partnerships were intrinsic to this institution, evidenced by a service-learning program that goes back decades, 2000-plus students participating annually in OCCE-organized opportunities, and over 60% of undergraduate degree programs reporting incorporation of civic and community engagement learning outcomes.

The review team finds the institution's efforts and aspirations to deepen undergraduate learning through undergraduate research and community engagement comparable in ambition to most peer institutions. Engaging undergraduates in the research fabric of major public universities presents cultural and systemic challenges: that undergraduates have as much to give as they do to gain requires a deconstruction and reconstruction of premises undergirding the research enterprise; that undergraduates face opportunity costs often necessitates direct funding to make engaging in research financially viable in a personal sense; that fostering the development of a single research opportunity in the arts or humanities can take as much time and energy as creating five-fold the number in STEM disciplines makes the calculus of staff time and energy vis-à-vis scale agonizing at times. If cultural and systemic challenges characterize the work of those looking to elevate undergraduate research, organizational challenges abound in a university's civic partnership work, as lifelong passions and commitments to reciprocity rarely conform to an institution's calendar and other bureaucratic structures. Fortunately, the review team finds that those leading the way for undergraduate research and community engagement were not only mindful of these challenges but also strategic in their approaches. As the UROP team's work continues, the team is excited about the commitment expressed to finding ways to connect undergraduate research with the NHPoL initiative, specifically in making undergraduate research at UHM distinct from anywhere else with an embrace of indigenous ways of

knowing. Considering the future of civic partnerships and community engagement at UH Mānoa, the team applauds the strong curricular integration in this area and its effort toward a systematic assessment of student learning outcomes. This assessment activity will go a long way toward developing a strong application for becoming a Carnegie Community Engaged institution, should UH Mānoa decide to make a bid for that status in the next application cycle.

Conclusion

In conclusion, following its review of materials and its visit with members of the UH Mānoa community, the review team views the whole and the constitutive components of the academic innovation and engaged learning theme in three mutually reinforcing ways. First, the theme and its parts would in large measure be rudderless without the institution's development and advancement of its ILOs over the past decade. The institution should be proud of this achievement. Second, each element stands as a body of work that is worthy of being spotlighted by the state's – or any state's – flagship institution of higher learning. And third, if the development of ILOs serves as one bookend in the timeline of academic innovation and engaged learning, another bookend may well be a transformation of the institution's general education program. Regarding the latter, though the general education proposal was well-conceived, at the time of the team's visit it remained at a nascent stage in its development. If the proposal continues to move ahead, the institution's administrative and academic leaders would do well to consider how sweeping structural and substantive changes in general education can propel academic innovation and engaged learning, both overall and among its constituent efforts.

For the promotion of engaged learning, the team recommends that UH Mānoa set expectations for gains in both student achievement and the extent to which academic innovations have been

implemented successfully on campus, with a special focus on closing achievement gaps. (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 4.4)

Component 9. Conclusion: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

The institution indicated at the end of the self-study that the process was an energizing and informative journey for the teams of faculty, staff, and students who worked on the final product. The review team was impressed by the dedication of the participants in this process and by their commitment to seriously engage with the challenges associated with achieving the institution's goals. The team commends UH Mānoa's approach to the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation, with its ambitious themes and its commitment to a collaborative and inclusive self-study process. The campus responded graciously to the team's requests for evidence during the visit and communicated candidly with the team during meetings. In this WSCUC review, UH Mānoa demonstrated the courage to pursue the most challenging areas of inquiry. The team is grateful to have heard the community's voices.

The report's conclusion emphasizes the challenges that lay ahead, including the need for additional human and financial resources, the need to define the strategic priorities of the campus more clearly, and the need to identify the metrics by which each unit's contribution to achieving these goals should be measured. The review team agrees that these issues represent current gaps in the institution's efforts to accomplish its goals and point the way toward next steps. This is evidence that the self-study led the institution to reflect on lessons learned and clarify what it plans to do next. The self-study identified two critical needs for future development of transformational student success: the need for consistency in how the university evaluates and assesses effectiveness of current efforts and the need for sustainable, permanent funding. Specifically, the review team encourages assessment-informed development of critical academic supports such as the Learning Assistant program as well as academic advising, beginning with the hiring of an inaugural director who is empowered to convene and

coordinate advisors throughout the campus. Further, the review team strongly supports institutional investments in comprehensive data systems, including learning management systems that can connect faculty and staff in the pursuit of common goals and the production of more equitable student achievement outcomes.

With respect to next steps for academic innovation and engaged learning, the self-study highlighted ways in which UH Mānoa advanced efforts to strengthen student learning through research and community engagement and to create new pathways for interdisciplinary and graduate study. Each of these was reflective of some of the best thinking nationally with regard to high impact educational practices. Though not a pillar of the self-study, because it was in such early stages of development, the proposed redesign of the General Education program loomed large. As it continues to move forward, opportunities abound for further intentional integration of UH Mānoa's ILOs into all aspects of academic experiences offered inside and outside the classroom.

The institutional report was most candid about the challenges associated with becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning. While recognizing accomplishments, the report also indicated that the journey ahead was still long and will require continued effort. The report made repeated reference to the complicated and often unsatisfactory relationship between the university and its host people and culture. In the conclusion the report focused additional work on more holistic approaches to Native Hawaiian student success (starting with K-12 engagement), the recruitment and development of more Native Hawaiian faculty and staff, and trust build through partnerships with the Native Hawaiian community. The review team agrees that these are important next steps. In addition to these areas of ongoing focus, the review team believes it remains vital for the institution to deepen and widen conversations across campus on a broader set of goals that can be achieved in the years to come, so that there is ongoing, visible evidence of progress on this most foundational and important goal. There should be evidence that the entire UH Mānoa community embraces this vision of becoming a Native

Hawaiian Place of Learning and that the burden of achieving this goal does not fall alone on a small number of faculty, staff, and students.

The review team acknowledges that there will not be – and may never be – a completely shared vision and consensus on precisely what it means to be a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning. It is also likely that this is a goal that will always be in the condition of becoming rather than the kind of goal that can actually be fully accomplished. But ever-higher levels of discernible progress, and ever-higher levels of community-wide shared responsibility, should allow the institution to maintain the correct navigational bearing.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

UH Mānoa engaged in a comprehensive self-study that realized its dual intentions to demonstrate compliance with the WSCUC Standards and to present evidence that that campus has achieved progress toward its high priority goals. The review highlighted where the campus made gains and where it must concentrate its effort for future success. Coupled with the campus strategic plan, which closely aligned with the institutional report's themes, the campus's committed self-study contributed analysis and insight valuable to the institution at this moment in time. By asking challenging questions, evaluating the campus's development, and marshaling its resources effectively in response to its findings, UH Mānoa can continue to advance. The team offers these five commendations and five recommendations.

Commendations

The team commends UH Mānoa for:

1. Its approach to the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation, with its ambitious themes, tackling challenging areas of inquiry with a commitment to a collaborative and inclusive self-study process.
2. The Wayfinding Project, which demonstrates an observable commitment to incorporate Native Hawaiian language and navigation in the interest of the university of becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning. This project may prove to be a model for other institutions of higher learning as they grapple with how to render “place” as they acknowledge that the lands upon which their campuses are built were forcibly taken from indigenous peoples.
3. The Institute for Sustainability and Resilience (ISR) for its smart approach to the simultaneous advancement of UH Mānoa’s teaching, research, and service missions on topics of critical importance to the state and its communities. Specifically, ISR’s development of “SUST” [Sustainability] courses is noted as a high-quality yet expeditious curricular innovation.
4. The STAR project, a constellation of data-informed applications that assist with campus planning, enrollment management processes, and student support intervention. The STAR apps are likely to be critical for aligning new GE requirements and improving degree completion pathways.
5. The campus culture through which the faculty, staff and administration take seriously their commitment to support Mānoa’s students with academic advising, engaged learning initiatives, and responsive student services.

Recommendations

The team recommends that UH Mānoa:

1. Engage in a systematic and concerted effort, over the course consecutive budgets, to align resource allocation with the thematic priorities of the institution to minimize the overreliance on soft money and volunteerism in implementing programs and services in areas that otherwise are best supported with permanent institutional resources. (CFR 3.4)
2. Work with the Board of Regents develop a policy for UH Mānoa that clearly defines conflict of interest and a process for resolving conflicts should they arise, given the unique executive structure under which the UH Mānoa CEO serves as the UH System president. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7)
3. Tie its thematic priorities to a set of measurable targets and timetables. These goals must be visible, accessible, and actionable.
 - a. For transformational student success, establish clear, time-bound goals for retention, degree completion, and equity. By pursuing student outcome data disaggregated by academic unit and demographics including race/ethnicity, Mānoa can guide resource allocation, institutional policy, and practice. (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 3.4)
 - b. For the promotion of engaged learning, publish expectations for gains in both student achievement and the extent to which academic innovations have been implemented successfully on campus, with a special focus on closing achievement gaps. (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 4.4)
 - c. For recognizing progress toward becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning, confirm the qualitative and quantitative goals that embody the greatest significance and meaning for the community and pursue them through the strategic allocation of resources. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3)

4. Regularly survey the broader campus environment on issues relating to a supportive climate for the diverse campus community. (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 4.3, Equity and Inclusion Policy)
5. Continue the journey of becoming a Native Hawaiian Place of Learning through greater transparency, inclusion, consensus about defined initiatives, and parallel high-level resource support. Invite Native Hawaiian students, staff, and faculty to engage in a critical reconsideration of the stated tenets of the Native Hawaiian Place of Learning aspiration and generate a mutually agreeable vision. (CFRs 1.1, 4.6)

APPENDICES

The report includes the following appendices:

- A. Federal Compliance Forms
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
 - 3. Student Complaints Review
 - 4. Transfer Credit Review
- B. Off-Campus Locations Review
- C. Distance Education Review

FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

OVERVIEW

There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

- 1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
- 2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
- 3 – Student Complaints Form
- 4 – Transfer Credit Policy Form

During the visit, teams complete these four forms and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

- (1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-
 - (i) It reviews the institution's-
 - (A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
 - (B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and
 - (ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.
- (2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

- (1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Credit Hour Policy.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor’s degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master’s degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

Rev 03/2015

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

| Material Reviewed | Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.) |
|---|---|
| Policy on credit hour | <p>Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where is the policy located?</p> <p>UH System Executive Policy 5.228: Credit Hour UH Mānoa Policy 5.114: Credit Hour Policy & Review Procedures</p> <p>Comments: The policy is imminently accessible and clear.</p> |
| Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour | <p>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>UH Mānoa Credit Hour Review Procedures</p> <p><u>Review of Credit Hours</u> The Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) requires that accredited institutions regularly review the accuracy of credit hour assignments for all courses to ensure compliance with federal guidelines on the credit hour. Executive Policy E5.228 requires that each campus implement a process to conduct this review. To comply with accreditation standards and executive policy, UH Mānoa courses shall be reviewed using the following procedures:</p> <p><u>Semester Review of Contact Hours</u> Each semester, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA) will conduct an automated review of the course schedule for the following semester to ensure that the credit hours and contact hours comply with Executive Policy E5.228. The Vice Chancellor will provide deans and department chairs with a list of courses that fall short of the required contact hours. Department chairs (or their designees) will review the syllabi of courses identified and provide</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>justifications to the dean for the credit assigned. In cases where sufficient justification is not provided, a dean may require that the coursework be revised to reflect the credits assigned, or that the credits be adjusted to reflect contact hours. If credits are adjusted downward, tuition will be refunded to students. The OVCAA will maintain a record of responses for future reference and may request a review of these courses during program review (discussed below).</p> <p><u>Course Approval Process</u> Proposals for new courses and modifications to existing courses are reviewed prior to approval. The review includes consideration of the ratio of contact hours to credit hours, and a review of syllabi to ensure learning outcomes and coursework are equivalent to the credit hours requested.</p> <p><u>Academic Program Review Process</u> A review of courses is included in the periodic review of academic programs every 5 – 7 years. During program review, courses are reviewed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Contact Hour/Credit Hour Review. The contact hours and credit hours for each traditional course offered over the previous two academic years will be reviewed for compliance with Executive Policy E5.228. The OVCAA will provide data to each department under review. 2) Audit of Syllabi. A sampling of syllabi will be analyzed to ensure an adequate justification for the number of credit hours awarded upon successful completion of the course. The audit will include a review of syllabi for nontraditional courses offered during the previous two academic years. <p><i>**Note: Effective July 1, 2021, per the campus reorganization (Phase II), the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA) is the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Excellence (OVPAE).</i></p> |
| | <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> |
| | <p>Comments: Evidence presented during this review serves as proof that the institution adheres to this procedure.</p> |
| <p>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</p> | <p>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Fall 2021 Schedule of Courses</p> <p>Comments: The schedule of on-ground courses demonstrates that they meet for the prescribed number of hours.</p> |
| <p>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i></p> | <p>How many syllabi were reviewed? 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Studies 220: Introduction to Indigenous Studies (Online) • Learning Design & Technology 661: Design Thinking for Creative Problem Solving (Hybrid) • Information & Computer Sciences 669: Social Computing (Online) <p>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both</p> <p>What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA/MS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral</p> <p>What discipline(s)? American Studies; Learning Design and Technology; and Information and Computer Sciences</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Comments: The syllabi demonstrate that students are completing the prescribed hours of work to warrant the credit hours awarded. |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i> | How many syllabi were reviewed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nursing 421: Summer Internship • Kinesiology & Rehabilitation Science 488: Practicum in Health and Exercise Science • Social Work 790/791: Second Year Practicum • Nursing 668: Community Based Participatory Research for Advanced Practice Nurses (Field Work) |
| | What kinds of courses? Internship; practicum; field work. |
| | What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA/MSW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral |
| | What discipline(s)? Nursing; Education (Kinesiology and Rehabilitation Science); and Social Work |
| | Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Comments: The syllabi demonstrate an appropriate assignment of credit hours. |
| Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials) | How many programs were reviewed? 6 2021-2022 UH Mānoa Catalog |
| | What kinds of programs were reviewed? BA, BS, MS, MFA, PhD |
| | What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA/MFA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral |
| | What discipline(s)? German (BA); Electrical Engineering (BS); Information Systems (MS); Dance (MFA); Sociology (PhD); Tropical Plant and Soil Sciences (PhD) |
| | Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Comments: The programs reviewed in the catalog and on the institution's website are of an acceptable length. |

Review Completed By: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair, WSCUC Visiting Team

Date: November 6, 2021

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

| Material Reviewed | Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate. |
|----------------------------|--|
| **Federal regulations | <p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>UH Mānoa does not provide incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments.</p> <p>Comments: The institution is in compliance with federal regulations on recruiting students.</p> |
| Degree completion and cost | <p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Student Right to Know and Consumer Information: https://manoa.hawaii.edu/about/consumer-information/</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>UH Mānoa Cost of Attendance: https://www.hawaii.edu/fas/basics/student_budget/ UH Mānoa Tuition and Fee Schedule: https://manoa.hawaii.edu/registrar/tuition-fees/</p> <p>Comments: All relevant information regarding degree completion and cost are imminently accessible.</p> |
| Careers and employment | <p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>UH Mānoa Career Center partners with on-campus and off-campus employers to empower UH Mānoa students to engage in career life planning through awareness, exploration, experience, and reflection. Students are encouraged to use the FOCUS 2 Career & Education Planning Tool to assess their strengths, interests, values and abilities, and then to meet with a career counselor to discuss their results and develop an action plan. Workshops, career fairs, and graduate school fairs are held throughout the year.</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> |
| | <p>Comments: The career and educational planning function – as well as the employer partnerships and the career counselor relationships – provides information about the kinds of jobs graduates are qualified to pursue as well as provides information about graduate employment.</p> |

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair, WSCUC Visiting Team
Date: November 6, 2021

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

| Material Reviewed | Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.) |
|------------------------------|--|
| Policy on student complaints | <p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic Grievance Policy and Procedures ● Student Conduct Code ● Satisfactory Academic Progress Appeal Procedures (Financial Aid) ● Grievance Procedures Related to Disability Access Services ● Discrimination Complaint Procedures ● Interim Title IX Sexual Harassment Complaint Procedures ● Student Assistant (employment) Grievance Procedures |
| | <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? UH Mānoa websites (various)</p> |
| | <p>Comments: The policy on student complaints is imminently accessible.</p> |
| Process(es)/ procedure | <p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See links above. |
| | <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> |
| | <p>Comments: The processes and procedures for addressing student complaints are published with the policies.</p> |
| Records | <p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Records are maintained by the office of record. Complaints filed under the student conduct and academic grievance procedures are maintained for 7 years. |
| | <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: Analysis can be performed by the office of record.</p> |
| | <p>Comments: The maintenance of records is effective and appropriate.</p> |

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair, WSCUC Visiting Team
Date: November 6, 2021

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

| Material Reviewed | Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.) |
|---------------------------|---|
| Transfer Credit Policy(s) | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer Credit Evaluation Policy & Procedures • Executive Policy 5.209: University of Hawai'i System Transfer and Inter-Campus Articulation • UH System Transfer Course Database |
| | If so, is the policy publicly available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? UH Mānoa Catalog (website); UH Systemwide Policies and Procedures Information System (PPIS) (website) |
| | Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Comments: Transfer credit policies are readily accessible and complete. |

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair, WSCUC Visiting Team

Date: November 6, 2021

Off-Campus Locations Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: University of Hawaii at Mānoa

Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit (AV) Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR)

Name of reviewer/s: James T. Minor, Kelly Wahl

Date/s of review: November 5, 2021

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address

University of Hawai'i Maui Center ("UH Maui Center")

310 W. Ka'ahumanu Avenue, Kahului, HI 96732

The UH Maui Center is located on the UH Maui College campus, one of ten campuses in the UH System.

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

The UH Maui Center worked in partnership with UH Mānoa to extend access to upper-division coursework, bachelor's degrees, and graduate degrees to students in Maui County. At the time of the visit only one program was based at the UH Maui Center: BA in Interdisciplinary Studies, which was a 36-credit degree-completion program that focused on "Human Relations in Organizations." Its students worked with faculty in the Interdisciplinary Studies program at UH Mānoa. The five-year average enrollment for UH Mānoa students in this program was 35, with an average faculty FTE of 2.5. The other programs offered in the UH Maui Center were statewide distance-delivered programs available to neighbor-island students with limited classroom utilization through the UH Maui Center. Between 2015 and 2021, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees could be pursued via offerings at the UH Maui Center. The following degree programs were available during this period for Maui County students: BA in Interdisciplinary Studies; BEd in Elementary Education: Early Childhood/Special Education (blended); MHRM (Master of Human Resources Management); and BS in Nursing - Associate's Degree in Nursing (ADN) to BS in Nursing Program (however, this program has been offered only online and in clinical settings since fall 2020).

UH Mānoa's Outreach College facilitated the delivery of UH Mānoa programs and services to Maui County students, including academic programming, advising, and student services support (registration and financial aid), provided on site at the UH Maui Center.

¹ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

The UH Maui Center also offers courses and programs from UH West O’ahu, UH Hilo, and (UH) Leeward Community College.

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Briefing materials were provided by the institution, and the following persons/committees were interviewed via Zoom:

- Dean of Outreach College (UH Mānoa)
- Staff/administrators providing services to students onsite (Director of the UH Maui Center, UH Maui Center Program Coordinator, Director of the Interdisciplinary Studies Program, UH Mānoa)
- Faculty
- Students

| Lines of Inquiry | Observations and Findings | Follow-up Required (identify the issues) |
|---|--|---|
| <i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site? | N/A. WSCUC approved the UH Maui Center as an off-site location for UH Mānoa in 1988. | |
| <i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1) | Since the 1920’s, UH has served non-traditional student populations and overcome geographic distances to provide educational offerings through the Outreach College. Outreach College provided support with program design, market research, recruiting, operations, and financial management. Academic programs were planned and developed jointly with academic organizations at UH Mānoa. The operations were managed by Outreach College, while the academic affairs were managed by the academic organizations at UH Mānoa. | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p> | <p>UH Mānoa’s presence at the UH Maui Center was embodied by the partnership designed to facilitate the transfer of the Maui County students into UH Mānoa. Integration with library resources and close work with the UH Mānoa faculty for the Interdisciplinary Studies program were key features of the students’ experience.</p> | |
| <p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p> | <p>The classroom facilities were equipped for teleconferencing, and additional classroom space at the UH Maui College campus were available for the programs.</p> | |

Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)

At the time of the visit, the Center provided student support services to assist with enrollment processes and navigation of degree program requirements. The UH Maui Center shared resources (advising, counseling, library, and computing services) and hosted a commencement ceremony for all students with a tremendous sense of pride.

The UH Mānoa programs offered by the Center were personified by a key Native Hawaiian staff person committed to believing in people, extending educational opportunity, and solving administrative barriers on behalf of students as they arise. It is clear that much of the student experience was defined by the outsized efforts of one individual. Certainly, many students also formed positive connections with faculty once firmly on a degree path. Still, the first point of contact was critical for students who found their way to the UH Maui Center with hopes of continuing their education. STAR Balance also facilitated contact with UH Mānoa campus support resources. Advising evaluation data indicated that the services provided were effective.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p> | <p>Faculty and lecturers vetted by the UH Mānoa academic departments taught in the program, including full-time faculty. The Education program and the graduate degree (MHRM) were taught by full-time, tenure-track, and adjunct faculty. The Interdisciplinary Studies program faculty at UH Mānoa had academic oversight of the program, and they were responsible - with the support of the UH Mānoa infrastructure - for assessment of student learning and curriculum development.</p> | |
| <p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</p> | <p>The UH Mānoa faculty, from the academic organizations partnering with Outreach College, designed the programs and courses in the same manner as other offerings from UH Mānoa, using the same approval and evaluation processes. Through program review, the assessment of student learning was considered to be equivalent to the achievement found on the UH Mānoa campus.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p> | <p>Spring 2021 single-semester GPA data showed that the Maui Center’s Interdisciplinary Studies students performed better than the UH Mānoa students (3.55 vs. 3.21). The four-year graduation rate for UH Maui Center Interdisciplinary Studies students (2016 cohort) was 81%. By race/ethnicity, the four-year rates were as follows: Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander - 86%; Caucasian - 50%; and Asian - 100%. The average time-to-degree for UH Maui Center Interdisciplinary Studies students was 3.7 years. The average time-to-degree by race/ethnicity was: Native Hawaiian - 3.8 years; Caucasian - 3.2 years; and Asian - 3.7 years. As the students were primarily working adults who pursued the program part-time, the time-to-degree was acceptable.</p> | |
| <p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p> | <p>Student proposals submitted in the Interdisciplinary Studies program served as assessment artifacts for the evaluation of program learning outcomes achievement, and survey data were analyzed. Plans for a senior capstone were shared. The student performance in the Interdisciplinary Studies program at the UH Maui Center was assessed as comparable to that of the UH Mānoa campus students.</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p> | <p>Academic program quality assurance processes occurred via the UH Mānoa program review and evaluation policies. Accreditation review processes were incorporated (e.g., substantive change review; specialty accreditor review). Educational effectiveness was determined via UH Mānoa campus standards and expectations</p> | |
|---|--|--|

Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit

Name of reviewer/s: Kelly Wahl

Date/s of review: November 8 - 12, 2021

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs¹ and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Programs: Bachelor of Social Work, Master of Education in Learning Design & Technology, and Master of Library & Information Science

Courses: LIS 615, LIS 645, LIS 648, LIS 656, LIS 665, LTEC 641, LTEC 643, LTEC 673, LTEC 687, LTEC 690, SW 302, SW 303, SW 325, SW 326, SW 360, SW 361

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

Number of programs in fully online modality as of fall 2021: 18

Degree levels at which programs are offered (and counts of programs per level): Bachelor's (6), master's (10), and graduate certificate (2). Disciplines represented include: Economics, Interdisciplinary Studies, Nursing, Social Work, and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (baccalaureate level); Education, Nursing, and Social Work (graduate level).

FTE enrollment in distance education courses in fall 2020: 8,560 FTE (during pandemic); in fall 2019 (pre-pandemic): 3,735 FTE.

History of offering distance education: In fall 2010, 1,397 FTE were instructed online, which includes the online instruction of those in primarily in-person programs taking some online courses as well as the instruction for fully online programs. The growth of this online FTE through fall 2019 (pre-pandemic) represents a 167% increase. The total FTE (undergraduate and graduate) in fully online degree programs has grown from 1,820 in fall 2011 to 2,627 in fall 2019 (pre-pandemic) (a 44% increase).

The delivery platform is the learning management system named Lulima (Powered by Sakai).

¹ See Distance Education Review Guide to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general, only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

The reviewer was provided access to Laulima where all fully online courses listed in (1) were examined. A briefing was also provided by Outreach College.

Observations and Findings

| Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration) | Observations and Findings | Follow-up Required (identify the issues) |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p> | <p>Serving a student population that is spread geographically across the islands and rural areas, UH Mānoa has pursued various forms of distance education since 1927 via Outreach College, which currently runs most of the fully online programs. The campus’s Distance Learning Committee reviews new program proposals and serves in an advisory capacity. Academic units originate the programs, and their faculty have authority over the curriculum. Outreach College designs the programs, markets them, supports recruitment and operations, and manages the finances, with the programs conceived to be financially self-supporting.</p> | |
| <p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p> | <p>Efforts to ensure students are integrated into campus life range from program to program. In the BSW program, faculty and the chair engage persistently with students, use an in-person orientation, and arrange for livestreams and other inclusion efforts. Distance education technologies enable online students to participate in the student organizations. When surveyed, online students have indicated they feel well connected to their cohort and their instructors. The Learning Design and Technology program creates a sense of community that values student feedback to ensure the participation of each cohort. As they pursue the Library and Information Sciences degree online, students work closely with faculty advisors to create individualized programs.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p> | <p>Laulima offers the features found in online platforms to promote both learning (presentation of digital materials, interactive assessments, etc.) and social interaction (postings, commentary, etc.). The technology seems well supported by campus ITS with appropriate back-up and redundant server capabilities.</p> | |
| <p><i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p> | <p>Students in the online programs have access to all of the campus's advising, counseling, library, computing, academic, and other support services. A new online application (STAR Balance) is available for students to schedule remotely and for virtual appointments with faculty, advisors, and student support providers. The retention and graduation data and the learning assessment data, see below, suggest the success of the support service offered to students in online programs.</p> | |
| <p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p> | <p>In the programs examined, the same faculty instruct in the in-person and online versions of the programs; consequently, there were no faculty dedicated solely to distance learning. At the college and program level, support is provided to instructors in the online modality, along with the instructional development support of the UH Online Innovation Center, UH Mānoa's Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Assessment & Curricular Support Center. The faculty are responsible for the curriculum and its development, as well as the assessment of student learning.</p> | |
| <p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes, and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p> | <p>Departmental faculty design the online courses and programs that were examined during this review. They are approved through the same processes as the in-person equivalents, with additional review from the Distance Education Committee. For these programs, the content, outcomes, and quality of the programs and courses are identical to the in-person offerings.</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p> | <p>Data are tracked from when cohorts enter the programs. Retention and graduation rates for the examined programs are roughly equivalent when comparing online students to in-person students.</p> | |
| <p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p> | <p>The programs at UH Mānoa – both in-person and online – submit regular assessment reports that demonstrate the use of both direct and indirect assessment methods, with the findings incorporated into the further development of instruction and the curriculum. For the programs examined, where relevant, professional organization accreditation standards were applied to both the online and in-person assessments. In the recent assessments, detectable differences were not found when comparing in-person to online program student performance.</p> | |
| <p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p> | <p>There are no outside vendor contracts for these programs.</p> | |
| <p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p> | <p>Quality assurance in the proposal of online programs is handled through a comprehensive review that extends to the systemwide level, as described at: https://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/distance-education/. The campus's program review process (https://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/program-approval-review/) is applied to in-person programs as well as online programs to assure quality. Two of the programs examined in this appendix have professional accreditors that conduct periodic reviews, and these programs (MLIS and BSW) recently received favorable reviews.</p> | |