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I. Summary Data Form

INSTITUTION: University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

PRESIDENT/CEO: Peter Englert, Chancellor  Date: January 2003

1. YEAR FOUNDED: 1907  2. CALENDAR PLAN: Semester

3. DEGREE LEVELS OFFERED:  
   ___ Associate  ___ X Bachelors
   X Masters  ___ X Doctorate
   ___ X Professional

4. SPONSORSHIP AND CONTROL: Public

5. CURRENT ENROLLMENT:  
   Headcount  % Minority  FTE
   A. Undergraduate  12,242  81%  11,113
   B. Graduate  5,876  68%  3,838
   C. Non-degree  578  56%  434
   TOTAL  18,696  76%  15,385

6. CURRENT FACULTY:  
   Full-time  1,193  % Minority  35%
   Part-time  274  % Minority  53%

7. FINANCES

   A. Annual Tuition Rate: $3,216 Undergraduate  $4,320 Graduate
   B. Total Annual Operating Budget: $230,798,260
   C. % from tuition and fees: 20%
   D. Operating deficit(s) for past 3 years: 2001 – none
      2000 – none
      1999 – none
   E. Current Accumulated Deficit: None

8. GOVERNING BOARD:  
   A. Size: 12  B. Meetings a year: not less than 10

9. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS:  
   A. Number: 8  B. Total Enrollment: 1,767

10. LIBRARY:  
    A. Number of Volumes: 3,234,973
    B. Number of Periodical Subscriptions: 26,882
WASC SUMMARY DATA FORM
NOTES

- Current enrollment = Fall 2002 data.
- “Minority” = all but “white.”
- “Graduate” includes post-baccalaureate.
- Current faculty = Fall 2002 instructional faculty. Excludes researchers, specialists, librarians, and extension agents.
- Tuition rate is based on academic year 2002-2003 full-time regular resident tuition for two semesters.
- Total annual operating budget is for FY 2002-2003 tuition and general funds.
- Percent from tuition and fees is an estimate of projected tuition fees based on current collection.
- Off-campus locations = out-of-state international locations are counted as one site. Enrollment in on-line courses is included in the enrollment count.
II. Nature of Institutional Context and Major Changes Since the Last WASC Visit

Institutional Context

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

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

Today more than 18,500 students are enrolled in Mānoa courses, on campus or via distance delivery. Classified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University-Extensive institution, Mānoa offers 92 bachelor’s degrees, 91 master’s degrees, and 58 doctorates. We also offer first professional degrees in law, medicine, and architecture. Approximately 65 percent of Mānoa students are undergraduates, over 60 percent are Asian or Pacific Islanders, and 57 percent are women. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, Mānoa is the most diverse campus in the United States.

Mānoa’s special distinction is found in its Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific orientation and unique location. Together, these foster advantages in tropical agriculture, tropical medicine, oceanography, astronomy, electrical engineering, volcanology, evolutionary biology, comparative philosophy, urban planning and international trade. Mānoa also offers instruction in more languages than any other U.S. institution of higher learning. As a result, students are provided special opportunities for research, service learning, and co-curricular activities in Asian, Pacific, and Hawaiian studies. The beauty of the verdant Mānoa valley provides a backdrop for a unique, yet inviting, campus. Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific traditions are well represented throughout the campus. There is an authentic Japanese tea house and garden, a replica of a Korean king’s throne hall, and a Hawaiian taro patch. Off-campus facilities include the Lyon Arboretum, the Waikīkī Aquarium, several marine facilities, and the world famous telescopes atop Mauna Kea.

The University of Hawai‘i was first accredited by the Western College Association in 1952. The Mānoa campus is currently accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Twenty-eight professional programs are also accredited by appropriate agencies.
Major Changes Since the Last WASC Visit

According to our recently adopted vision statement, Mānoa sees itself as “a premier research institution whose scholars are leaders in their disciplines and whose students are prepared for leadership roles in society.” Our campus “strives for excellence in teaching, research, and public service.” Our vision statement describes us as “an innovative institution, comfortable with change” (emphasis added).

Since the last WASC visit in 1999, there has been significant change at Mānoa and within the ten-campus system. We have a new system-level president, Evan Dobelle, and a new Mānoa chancellor, Peter Englert. We have, since 1999, hired eight new deans and directors and have recruited scores of new faculty members to the Mānoa campus. The number of full-time faculty members has grown from 1,675 in 1999 to 1,792 in 2002. We have also started construction on a new $300 million medical school complex located in downtown Honolulu. Enrollments have increased, growing from 17,004 in 1998 to 18,696 in 2002. We have developed and implemented a new General Education Program and vigorously stepped up our assessment efforts. We engaged in a far-reaching community-wide planning process. Our strategic plan, Defining Our Destiny, was approved by the Board of Regents in November 2002. Since 1999, we have also endured a faculty strike, and along with the rest of the nation, the tragedy of the September 11th terrorist attacks. With an economy that is heavily dependent on tourism and airline transport, our state has struggled to diversify our economic base amidst economic uncertainties and global tensions. These worldwide problems have served to exacerbate the tensions within Hawai‘i, leading to increased competition for funding, resources, programs, and services.

While many of the conditions at Mānoa which led to this special visit have been addressed, there are, as to be expected, new concerns and challenges. There is, however, one fundamental difference between our campus today and the way it was in 1999: our capacity to confront and manage change has increased greatly. This change on the Mānoa campus has resulted from: 1) a new attitude; 2) new leadership; 3) organizational and institutional reform; and 4) a commitment to becoming a self-learning institution.
A New Attitude

Our commitment to change on the Mānoa campus was brought on not just by the last WASC visit, but by the realization that we needed to develop a new approach to planning, governance, and decision-making, with “effective processes of involvement and active engagement of appropriate constituencies.” We needed to articulate a collective vision, a vision that would better organize our institutional assets, to ensure greater educational effectiveness, and align with both our campus and system missions. We set out to transform our institution. The 1999 WASC Accreditation Visit Report described Mānoa as “beset with budgetary difficulties;” it detailed painful, damaging cuts as well as the “uneven effects of hiring freezes” and the lack of “broadly-based engagement and buy-in” with regard to planning efforts. The report described “significant problems in governance and administration” and weakness in the planning and assessment regime. The report made nearly thirty recommendations.

The 1999 WASC report sparked a change in attitude on the Mānoa campus. We needed change. We needed to become a more engaged, more connected place of learning. We needed to build more partnerships among students, faculty, and staff. We needed to devise more effective planning and administrative mechanisms. We needed to collect and make more effective use of data to inform our deliberations. Above all, we needed to enhance communications. We needed to build community and begin a process of mending the damage to our institution brought on by years of budgetary trauma and inadequate approaches to campus planning, governance, administration, and management.

New Leadership

In 1999, Kenneth Mortimer served as both president of the University of Hawai‘i system and chancellor of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. The WASC Commission letter dated July 6, 1999 expressed the “need for clarified and strengthened leadership throughout the institution...[F]urther, the role of the Executive Vice Chancellor as the primary officer of the Mānoa campus needs to be clarified and codified in such a way that it can be clearly understood by all constituencies within the University." Today we have a system president and a separate chancellor for the Mānoa campus. The Mānoa chancellor is fully authorized to speak and act on behalf of our campus and is the designated chief executive officer of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

Organizational and Institutional Reform

Over the past year, there has also been significant organizational and institutional reform on the Mānoa campus and within the University of Hawai‘i system. These efforts have been informed by consultative campus and system strategic planning processes. To accomplish institutional objectives, various executive and administrative responsibilities needed to be clarified and coordinated within the system. The system reorganization, including the creation of separate chancellors for each of the seven community colleges, as well as vice presidents for research, international affairs, and student affairs, was approved by the Board of Regents in
December 2002. This reorganization will increase the overall efficiency of the University system in areas such as research administration, distance learning, information technologies, student financial aid, and enrollment management, thereby allowing each campus to focus on its distinctive academic mission. Instead of having ten separate accounting or student information management systems, the consolidation of non-academic administrative functions will eliminate duplication and provide economies of scale. The reorganization also streamlines the interface with the public, allowing for a more consistent and coherent image of the University of Hawai‘i. Over the long-run, significant savings are anticipated which can then be channeled into academic programs.

Efforts to reorganize the Mānoa campus are also underway. We are working to ensure closer coordination between academic affairs and student affairs and greater academic oversight over admissions and records. Other significant changes being proposed on the Mānoa campus include: 1) the creation of an office of undergraduate education; 2) increased focus on diversity and equity; 3) closer integration of academic and residential programs through the planning, design, evaluation, and review of an Honors College and other live/learn opportunities; and 4) the creation of new interdisciplinary programs that involve leveraging of existing resources to respond to emerging societal needs (e.g., public policy issues, sustainable development, and digital and cinematic arts).

Commitment to Becoming a Self-Learning Institution

Given the amount of change that has occurred on the Mānoa campus, along with the complex array of social, economic, and political conditions affecting public higher education, it has become imperative for our campus to adopt a holistic approach to assessing educational effectiveness. We have endeavored to develop new assessment procedures in order to determine whether our institutional systems, such as course and program design, faculty support, and program review, are consistent with our educational goals and standards and effectively linked to evidence of student learning.

Indicative of our commitment to self-learning and building a culture of evidence, the faculty has developed and implemented a new General Education Program based on hallmarks for student learning, which will be systematically reviewed and updated. In addition, the faculty
has developed new tools (capstones, portfolios, entrance/exit interviews, surveys, etc.) for the assessment of student learning.

Five years ago, we had suspended program reviews and, at the time of the last WASC visit in 1999, we were not in compliance with the Board of Regents timeline for review. Today, we are on schedule, with academic programs reviewed on a five- to seven-year cycle. The process has also been revamped to include external reviews and the use of assessment data so that program reviews are more explicitly linked to student learning.

We have built an institutional portfolio listing comprehensive data on students, faculty, resources, and assets, and have shared these data widely. We espouse a philosophy of budgetary transparency and have developed for the first time direct linkages between our planning and budgetary priorities. Moreover, we have mapped our campus priorities and budgets to the system-wide plans and budgets to ensure greater coherence, consistency, and coordination. While the system of budgeting at the University of Hawai‘i is complicated by the existence of numerous processes (state biennium budget, annual budgeting/expenditure control, capital improvements, and many different fund and revenue sources), we seek to educate and involve all constituencies in the financial planning and management of our campus.

III. Statement on Report Preparation

This report was prepared by the staff of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office. Overseeing the process was a WASC Advisory Committee comprised of representatives from the Mānoa Faculty Senate, Academic Deans and Directors, Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i (ASUH), and Graduate Student Organization (GSO), as well as carryover members from the previous administration’s WASC advisory group. In addition to periodic meetings with the Advisory Committee, specific briefings on the WASC Special Visit were provided to both the Council of Academic Deans and Directors and the Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Complete sets of the WASC required data elements, stipulated policies, and other information pertinent to the WASC standards have been circulated (http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/wasc_report.html). In addition, then Interim Chancellor Deane Neubauer conducted a special workshop on the new standards for all deans and directors. Copies of the new WASC Handbook of Accreditation were given to all deans and directors. A website containing information from the previous visit as well as data and reports related to the upcoming special visit was created (http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm).

Immediately following the WASC visit in 1999, five different issue-specific groups were formed: 1) governance; 2) budget and planning; 3) students and educational programs; 4) assessment; and 5) diversity. The groups were appointed by then Executive Vice Chancellor Dean Smith and charged with reviewing the WASC recommendations and preparing background reports to assist in the development of a response to WASC. An Accreditation Advisory Committee was appointed to provide further review and counsel. This effort then led to a year-long strategic planning process which was designed to address many of the deficiencies with respect to planning,
governance, and communication identified in the WASC Commission letter and Accreditation Visit Report.

In addition to this special visit report, the staff of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is developing an on-line campus portfolio which includes basic descriptive data, stipulated policies, exhibits and data displays, and various reflective essays (http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/portfolio.html). It should be noted that the data displays for a regular visit have also been prepared (http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/wasc_report.html).

IV. Response to Issues Identified by the Commission and the Visiting Team

The July 6, 1999 Commission letter identifies the following major areas of concern: 1) clarified and strengthened leadership; 2) planning, priority setting, and action; 3) student and educational program quality; and 4) assessment and use of data. In this section, we describe each issue and the action taken by the institution; we then offer an analysis of the effectiveness of the response.

Clarified and Strengthened Leadership

The Commission letter and team report identified “serious issues with the governance and administrative structures of the university and the effectiveness of their operations.” It was noted that individual regents acted outside of the formal action of the full Board and that there was a need for defining the role of the senior executive officer for the Mānoa campus more clearly. In response to these concerns, the following actions have been taken:

- Consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, the Board of Regents recently approved a major reorganization of the University of Hawai‘i system, which has served to further define the executive and administrative authorities of the president and chancellors of each campus.

- In 1999, the president of the University of Hawai‘i system was also the chancellor of the Mānoa campus. Following the creation of a chancellor for the Mānoa campus, the position was filled on an interim basis in July 2001. Then, on August 1, 2002, Peter Englert was appointed as the permanent chancellor for the Mānoa campus, thereby clarifying and strengthening leadership and advocacy for the campus. Professor Joanne Cooper, former chair of the Mānoa Faculty Senate, reflects on the hopes of the faculty and their involvement in the selection of the new Mānoa Chancellor:

  During this crucial year I served as Chair of the Faculty Senate for Mānoa and as the Chair of the Search Committee for the new chancellor. Both were heavy responsibilities, but I was supported in these endeavors by a wise and hard working Senate and an equally wise and hard working chancellor’s search committee. As I sit here today, I realize that we quite possibly would not have the wonderful new chancellor we have at Mānoa without the efforts of these
two groups in fashioning a compelling job description and pouring over the many applications while we looked for someone who would lead us in this new century. The selection of a new chancellor, after approximately fifteen years in which the campus functioned without one (except in the dual role of system president), played a crucial role in shaping the future governance of the campus. The arrival of Peter Englert, with his dedication to Pacific Island peoples (as well as issues of access, equity and consultative governance), provides the campus with a sense of promise and new possibilities. (Reflective Essays, Reflections on Faculty Governance at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/fac-gov.12-02.pdf)

- There has been significant turnover on the Board of Regents. Newly-appointed members as well as carryover members have received training and counsel regarding authority, procedures, and protocol.

- There has been a significant change in leadership at the Mānoa campus and within the system.

- Faculty, students, and other constituencies were involved in the search process for the president, chancellor, vice chancellors, and other senior administrative posts.

- More formal procedures for system-level consultations, involving the Mānoa Faculty Senate and other key governance groups in campus deliberations, have been developed.

- New administrative bodies, such as the Mānoa Management Executive (comprised of the chancellor, vice chancellors, selected deans, and other senior managers) and the Mānoa Management Team (comprised of all executives reporting directly to the chancellor), have been created.

While it is too early to assess the full impact of all of these changes, several outcomes are apparent.

Since the last WASC visit, the Board of Regents has exercised appropriate oversight over major institutional changes including the hiring and evaluation of the president and other senior administrators, the reorganization of system and campus administrations, and the adoption of system and unit strategic plans. This constitutes a significant amount of change that occurred within a relatively short period of time. The Regents have exercised appropriate oversight and have upheld institutional integrity. In this significant transition, there have been no complaints of individual regent misconduct.
Accountability has increased. We now have a chief executive officer, whose full responsibility is the Mānoa campus, and a cadre of qualified senior and campus-level administrators able to provide effective educational leadership and management.

Communication of institutional purposes to both internal and external constituencies has been enhanced. A series of discussion papers on important topics, such as consultation procedures, Research Training and Revolving Fund uses, and the offering of academic degrees by research units, has been prepared, disseminated, and discussed.

A strategic plan for the campus has been developed, endorsed by the Mānoa Faculty Senate and other key constituencies, and approved by the Board of Regents.

A financial plan linked to the budget has also been approved by the Board of Regents.

Since 1999, there has been more efficient utilization of resources, yielding an increase in student enrollments and full-time faculty members, a growth in computer and library resources, and a major new investment in a state-of-the-art student information system. Also, for the first time in many years, the University of Hawai‘i implemented special salary adjustments for faculty members based on merit, retention, market, and equity considerations.

Planning, Priority Setting, and Action

The Commission letter identified the lack of support and institutional involvement of key constituents for planning and decision making. It stated that “the university does not appear to have developed effective systems for on-going engagement of constituency groups nor for communication throughout the University.” The Commission also indicated a sense of urgency as well as the need to make hard decisions regarding resource allocation.

In response to these concerns, the following actions have been taken:

- A comprehensive, year-long strategic planning process was developed and implemented on the Mānoa campus.

- We adopted the mantra of the WASC team report to “communicate, communicate, communicate” through a series of public forums, newspaper articles, television appearances, interactive websites, and bulletin boards.
A partnership has been established among key governance groups (faculty, students, staff, and administration) in the oversight, development, and implementation of the planning process.

A survey was developed in which more than 1,000 respondents offered suggestions for defining our institutional purposes and improving the Mānoa campus.

A *Defining our Destiny* planning workshop was conducted in which more than 1,400 people participated in visioning, goal-setting, and problem-solving.

Prior to the unveiling of the draft strategic plan, the planning process was presented for peer review and discussion at the WASC annual meeting in San Diego.

Some 75 different improvements, repairs, and corrective actions identified through the planning process were fast-tracked and implemented within weeks of the planning workshop.

The final year of the planned four percent horizontal cut (referred to in the Commission letter as the 4+4+4) was cancelled, which stabilized unit budgets allowing for improved planning and decision making.

Funding for the library has grown from $10.1 million in 1997 to $14 million in 2001, allowing for both expansion of collections and increased operating hours and services available to students and faculty.

The role of the Mānoa Budgetary Advisory Committee was clarified and regular meetings were re-established.

A biennium budget request, linked to the strategic plan and coordinated with the system priorities and budget, has been developed.

A space inventory is being developed to ensure more rational allocation of office, classroom, and research space, consistent with strategic goals and objectives as well as programmatic outcomes.

A financial plan to increase overhead recovery rates by strategic investments in plant modernization and research infrastructure has been developed.

A number of physical planning projects (e.g., Honors College, Digital and Cinematic Arts, and College Town development) have been initiated in order to leverage new sources of funding for classrooms, dormitories, office space, and other improvements to the student learning environment. Emeritus Professor Tom Dinell tells of one such planning effort:
Kamehameha Schools held a one-day charrette this past July, led by its planning consultants, in which University administrators, faculty, students, Mo ʻili ʻili merchants, residents, and community leaders, public officials and Kamehameha School executives joined together in analyzing the existing situation, listing assets and issues and identifying common themes to form a basis of planning for the future. This charrette led to a draft Mo ʻili ʻili Regional Planning Study.

The three major themes coming out of the charrette, as presented in the draft planning study, were:

- **Place of the Heart - Mo ʻili ʻili** has a rich history for many of Hawaiʻi’s people. This richness and the fond memories associated with the community will be embraced in future plans.

- **A Fun Gathering Place** - Charrette participants recognized the potential for Mo ʻili ʻili to bring together young students, neighbors, and local residents in a fun and active pedestrian environment.

- **The Learning Village** - With its rich cultural history and the academic resources of the University, Mo ʻili ʻili has the potential to be a creative and nurturing lifelong learning community.

The UHM-Mo ʻili ʻili connection is a symbiotic one. Each of the constituencies needs the other groups. Each can be a better place because of the other participants. The opportunity for joint planning and development is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for all the players. (Reflective Essays, An Emerging Dynamic Partnership: The University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa and Its Next Door Neighbor, Moʻiliʻili, http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/uh-town.pdf)

- Lines of authority regarding capital improvements have also been clarified, leading to greater efficacy in the planning and implementation of new projects.

There have been immediate benefits to the campus attributable to these actions.

Faculty morale has measurably improved. According to a recent *Quality of Faculty Worklife* survey (Linda K. Johnsrud and Jocelyn M. Surla, 2002, *Quality of Faculty Worklife at the University of Hawaiʻi*, http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/faculty02.pdf) conducted on all campuses of the University of Hawaiʻi, morale on the Mānoa campus has significantly increased—over 11 percent on a Likert scale.
Upon the release of the draft strategic plan on May 1, 2002, the student newspaper *Ka Leo O Hawai‘i* (May 3, 2002) described the event as “heralding a new era….Bachman Hall was alive with students, professors, and community members, with hula and Hawaiian song...all to mark the unveiling of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s strategic plan draft. All to celebrate our university and our university’s mission and future. The event, and its turnout, sings of hope. Its transparency, its call for community involvement, its welcome nature seems a testament and affirmation of the changing winds…. Events that approach the university’s future, not as a chore or a begrudging obligation, but as a challenge worth taking, a battle worth winning, a reality worth visiting.”

The alignment of strategic objectives and purpose with academic personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological resources is underway on the Mānoa campus. We are guided by the mission of “leadership, excellence, and innovation” and the core commitments to research, educational effectiveness, social justice, place, economic development, culture, society and the arts, and technology. The plan also includes explicit benchmark indicators, which measure achievement of strategic goals and objectives.

Our collective vision of education attainment involves our unique status and distinctive role as the major research university in Hawai‘i. To quote from the plan, “Mānoa’s essence is research.” Research funding has surged significantly, surpassing a quarter billion annually. There has been an increase in the diversity of funding sources as well. The research productivity of faculty has also increased, as measured by publications in peer-reviewed journals and other measures of scholarly activity. Further evidence that our faculty has fully embraced the research mission is a significant increase in requests for university research and travel grants. More faculty members are traveling to international research conferences.

The strategic planning activities have energized the campus. Many new grassroots initiatives have emerged in ways that are aligned with our institutional purposes. For example, the students, with support from the administration, have organized a farmer’s market, responding to an identified need for fresh produce on campus. There are numerous sustainable development activities underway, including recycling programs, energy efficiency, and campus beautification efforts. These projects involve substantial volunteer participation of faculty, students, and the community. They signify a commitment to service and a gratifying response to our plan’s call for public action. The underlying philosophy of our planning process is that we need to build and celebrate community. We share much in common. We strive for similar outcomes. Through a reawakening of our common interests and willingness to work together as a community, we can accomplish much, even in lean times.

Other benefits include an increased vibrancy in campus life. There is more foot traffic on campus. There is more participation than ever before in graduation and commencement activities. Fewer faculty are leaving the institution for other places. There is more hope on campus.
Student and Educational Program Quality

The Commission letter cited several concerns regarding academic program quality as well as the management of admissions, recruitment, and enrollment processes. It was noted that Mānoa “will need to demonstrate how the research mission of the University is carried forward into the curriculum and student experiences,” particularly for freshmen and sophomores. At the graduate level, quality was deemed to be highly variable across programs. The failure of the University to conduct regular program reviews was noted.

In response to these concerns, the following actions have been taken:

- Admissions criteria have been restated in the university catalog and other public documents.

- An enrollment management firm, Noel-Levitz, was retained to develop an enrollment plan which includes customer service training, retention management, and telemarketing strategies. Vice President Doris Ching reports:

  In July 2000, Noel-Levitz Vice President for Educational Services Roger Swanson was assigned as lead consultant for the Noel-Levitz group, and Vice President for Student Affairs Doris Ching was named project leader for UH-Mānoa [enrollment management project]. From December 2000 through February 2002, “The Recruitment Group” of representatives of School and College Services, Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Student Housing Services, and Student Equity, Excellence and Diversity worked intensively in developing and implementing immediate strategies to increase enrollment, while simultaneously writing UH-Mānoa’s five-year recruitment plan. The process also involved four academic units—Arts and Humanities, Engineering, Ocean and Earth Science and Technology, and Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources. After the recruitment plan draft was submitted to then Interim Chancellor Deane Neubauer in December 2001 for his review and response, it was finalized in February 2002. (Reflective Essays, Enrollment Management at Mānoa, Noel-Levitz Summary Report, http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/essays-enrollment-management.html)

- A comprehensive student information and student degree audit system, including policy, process, organizational, and technological components, is being implemented by the University of Hawai‘i system.

- In Spring 2002, the Office of the Vice President for External Affairs and University Relations launched a project to create a University of Hawai‘i brand in order to pursue a new, cohesive corporate identity for the UH system.
A concerted media campaign was launched to increase our visibility and showcase areas of excellence.

The General Education curriculum was completely revamped through faculty initiative and was fully implemented in the Fall 2002 semester.

The Foundations (freshman) component of the General Education curriculum has been modernized significantly through the introduction of innovative courses based on hallmarks of student learning.

Outcomes-based assessment of the General Education curriculum has been institutionalized to ensure that the curriculum continues to include new knowledge and serve changing societal needs.

A Council of Academic Advisors has been formed to coordinate student advising services across the various schools and colleges and better assist first-year and transfer students in their academic decision making.

Freshmen seminars and learning communities have been expanded in order to offer first-year students supportive and stimulating academic environments.

Residential live/learn environments are being developed to enhance the collegiate experience for highly motivated and talented students.

Program reviews are being conducted on a regularized five-year schedule by a council of representative faculty members.

The program review self-study guidelines have been revised to include the identification and assessment of program learning objectives, scholarly productivity, and the presentation of outcomes-based evidence that educational and scholarly objectives are being met.

External evaluations have been included in the program review process.

An Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and a Program Officer have been appointed with lead responsibilities for implementing academic program reviews.

Academic programs have been reorganized and consolidated in the College of Education, College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, College of Business Administration, School of Medicine, and marine sciences.
Graduate degree programs awarding fewer than four degrees annually during the past five years have undergone review for viability. Of 15 such programs, six have been closed to admissions and five have been restructured. The remaining two programs (Natural Resources and Environmental Management and Information and Computer Sciences) have been improved with an expectation that enrollments will increase.

Chancellor Englert is leading discussions with management executives on new models for offering graduate degree programs that would foster advanced study in emerging, multidisciplinary areas.

As of Fall 2003, training will be mandatory for all new teaching assistants. Minimally, the training consists of classes and seminars before the semester starts on topics such as classroom management, grading policies, university procedures (where to go for help and how to deal with specific problems and grievances), mentoring and monitoring each teaching assistant during the semester, and an end-of-semester evaluation.

During Fall 2002, the Preparing Future Faculty program was restarted. This consists of series of presentations on how to apply for a job; how employer expectations vary in academia, government, and industry; and actions students can take to prepare themselves for the job market (e.g., externships, teaching, publishing, attending professional or industry meetings, etc.). It includes seminars by recent graduates.

The average time to degree for all masters programs (for students graduating during the past five years) was 2.7 years. This is not unreasonable since the minimum requirements typically take two years to fulfill.

Demonstrable progress has been achieved in the following key areas highlighted by the WASC Commission: 1) undergraduate education; 2) the program review process; and 3) recruitment and enrollment management.

Immediately following the 1999 WASC visit, graduate and undergraduate enrollments dropped, exacerbating a trend noted in the Commission letter. Undergraduate enrollment trends have since reversed and total enrollment has climbed steadily since Fall 2000. In fact, total headcount enrollment at Mānoa increased by 6.6 percent in the most recent fall semester, exceeding our stated goal of a five percent increase.

Graduate enrollments have been slower to respond. However, although graduate enrollments had been declining since 1994, in Fall 2002 they increased. It is too early to say that the trend has truly reversed itself, but the signs are positive. The recently-adopted strategic plan calls for increasing graduate enrollment. In response to the plan, the Graduate Division is: 1) implementing a plan to increase applications from foreign students; 2) working to improve communication with current and prospective graduate students; 3) finding ways to increase financial support for graduate students; 4) providing additional training that will better prepare
graduate students for their future careers, such as the recently reinitiated Preparing Future Faculty program and mandatory training for teaching assistants, and 5) working to reduce the time to degree by ensuring that students are adequately mentored. Particular effort is being made to ensure that students who are having difficulty completing their program meet regularly with their advisers and follow a mutually-developed completion plan. A report by the Graduate Division, *Graduate Education at Mānoa*, is posted on our website (http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/essays-graddivision.pdf). It includes data on degrees awarded, average time to degree, and financial support for graduate students.

**Undergraduate Education**

In terms of undergraduate education, WASC pointed out the need to carry the research mission forward into the curriculum and called for improvements in defining a distinctive Mānoa experience. Since the 1999 WASC evaluation, Mānoa implemented a comprehensive and radical change in the General Education curriculum. This reform was motivated by several issues and concerns. The Mānoa campus had experienced precipitous drops in enrollment and retention. The time to degree completion had increased significantly. The rigid structure and content of the General Education curriculum was deemed as not adequately addressing new knowledge and changing social needs. The curriculum was rarely assessed or updated. Core courses were limited to a select set of lower-division offerings, generally affiliated with specific departments rather than with student educational goals. Evidence from student and alumni surveys indicated dissatisfaction with the quality and availability of general education classes and questioned the value of the curriculum. Transfer students, in particular, found it difficult to meet lower-division requirements with coursework taken at other institutions.

The impetus to improve the General Education curriculum was strong, but the task was challenging. According to Professor Thomas Hilgers:

*Three issues dominated reform efforts during the three semesters between the Senate vote (December 1999) and the Fall 2001 date of the new requirements going into effect. The first involved Board of Regents endorsement of the new General Education Program. While all parties saw the advantages of the new Program, questions were raised in some quarters about the UHM-centered processes whereby the Program had been adopted. Most parties agreed that System reform of General Education would have been the preferable course. Some parties insisted that it should have been the only possible course. In point of fact, Mānoa was not alone in following what appeared to be a “go it alone” process. The same decision had been made by the faculty at UH Hilo, the campus with the System’s only other full four-year undergraduate program. It was perhaps no coincidence, then, that the Regents adopted new, independent General Education Programs for both UHM and UHH in June of 2000.*
The second issue involved faculty governance. The new General Education Plan called for total faculty governance. Since the faculty had previously played an essentially consultative role in General Education, governance processes had to be developed from scratch. Particularly problematic were issues relating to membership of the various General Education committees. Thus, it took a full year of discussion to produce a General Education governance document. The document was approved by the Senate at the end of 2000, nine months short of the new requirements becoming effective.

A third issue dominated the main faculty governance body during its first semester. The agenda of the interim General Education Committee, composed of nine faculty members, became dominated by college and school requests for waivers from the Hawaiian or Second Language requirement. This issue remained a source of contention between professional school faculty and Arts and Sciences faculty. By the end of 2000, some schools had achieved the waiver they sought, but not to the delight of all. (Reflective Essays, Improving Educational Program Quality at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa: General Education Program Reform, http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/gen-ed.12-02.pdf)

While it is too soon to provide a comprehensive assessment of Mānoa’s new General Education curriculum, academic advisors report that students have been enthusiastic about the change. The new curriculum is more flexible and allows students to meet degree requirements in ways that are more closely aligned with their individual learning and career objectives. New courses are being developed to meet educational hallmarks. These courses will be assessed on an ongoing basis.

Mānoa’s new General Education Program has received some television and newspaper coverage. One television reporter, herself a graduate of Mānoa under the old core requirements, enthusiastically praised the expansion of course selection under the “Global and Multicultural Perspectives” Foundations requirement and walked prime-time viewers through curricular offerings in the new Mānoa Catalog. Students in the transition who are able to choose between the old and new general education requirements are overwhelmingly electing the new requirements and are completing their course of study one to two semesters earlier.

Several major initiatives to improve the quality of academic life for undergraduates have been implemented:

- The New Student Orientation (NSO) is a summer program designed to assist new freshmen and transfer students in making a smooth transition to Mānoa through interactive sessions that introduce students to the academic, cultural, and social dimensions of our campus. Approximately 65 percent of entering freshmen participate in NSO each year as well as about 35 percent of new transfer students.
• The First Year Center provides a user-friendly environment to support freshmen and transfer students during their first year on campus. It offers peer advising, referrals to appropriate campus resources, a library of information on academic majors and programs, and reading materials that address strategies for success. It began in 1996 as the Freshman Advising Center (FAC). The positive response of students to FAC (approximately 1,800 students a year utilize the services) led the unit to realize the importance of increasing the access of advising to all first-year students, including transfers, who need the same level of support as freshmen.

• The Success Program for At-Risk Students takes a proactive approach to supporting students returning from academic suspension and those newly placed on academic probation. This program provides structured assistance to help students successfully meet UHM’s academic expectations. Students must attend a mandatory workshop, which is a collaborative presentation by the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and the Learning Assistance Center. Over 400 students a semester attend one of the workshops.

• Access to College Excellence (ACE) is a learning community that serves up to 250 new freshman in which cohorts of 15-20 students take three courses together. The courses are selected to meet either General Education requirements or to introduce students to an academic area of interest. ACE students meet once a week in an integrating seminar class with a peer mentor. Cohort members are also encouraged to form student groups and to interact with their professors outside the classroom.

• The Professions Advising Center (PAC) is a walk-in advising and resource center that serves students interested in preparing for careers in law, medicine, and the allied health professions or pursuing a graduate degree at the university. Academic and peer advisers work with students to clarify goals and plan a course of study. Most recently the PAC coordinator has developed a web site (http://www.advising.hawaii.edu/artsci/pac/contact.htm) that assists students in finding information about program requirements, application procedures, pre-professional standardized test schedules, and test preparation resources. PAC receives over 1,200 on-site visitors a year and each year logs over 8,000 contacts through e-mail, telephone inquiries, website visitors, and specialized workshops.

• The Student-Athlete Academic Services (SAAS) is a fully integrated academic office designed specifically to work with men and women athletes. Since Fall 1999, SAAS has provided comprehensive academic support services for the approximately 450 students who participate in any of the 19 intercollegiate sports offered at UHM. During the four years of operation, the number of scholar-athletes has risen from 112 to over 140. At the end of the Spring 2002 semester, 52.8 percent (219 students) of student-athletes earned a semester GPA of 3.0 or higher; 40 percent (166 students) had a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher; and 24 student-athletes carried a 4.0 GPA for the semester.
The Student Degree Audit System (STAR), a fully functional computerized degree audit student system, was developed within the Colleges of Arts and Sciences. STAR will allow students to maintain an accurate and current record of academic accomplishments from their own personal computer. STAR will redefine the academic advising process, including the clarity of university academic policies and requirements, and greatly assist students in selecting courses.

The Coming Home to Mānoa program is specifically designed to attract students who have not completed their academic work and left the institution for a range of reasons. The program works to quickly and accurately provide students with information regarding degree requirements and strategies for completing degrees if students satisfy all current admission policies.

The Honors College program proposal has been developed for the establishment of a new Honors College designed to replace our current Honors program. It has been sent out for external review and is currently being evaluated by various University committees. The Honors College is being designed as a residential College with a dedicated faculty and set of new courses to address new General Education requirements.

One of the most productive initiatives reported by Ronald Cambra, Associate Dean of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Chair of the First Year at Mānoa Committee, is the First Year at Mānoa Learning Communities program. Cambra writes:

*The success of the First Year at Mānoa [Learning Communities] is reflected not only in programmatic and curricular development, but also in responses from faculty, students, and the community outside of the University. The perception of the University, from all the above-mentioned standpoints, has been positively impacted by the efforts of the First Year at Mānoa (FYM). Since 1999, FYM learning communities have served over 400 freshmen each fall, reaching up to 27 percent of the entering freshman class. The total number of learning communities available to students number approximately 40 each fall semester.*

*A full five-year program assessment and evaluation summary including retention data, enrollment data, student perceptions of academic gain, curricular connections, and development of social community has been completed. Faculty noted positive impacts on the disciplines and their relations with colleagues, and an increased sense of being a participant in campus life. Faculty also noted that students were forming communities of their own within the learning community context and that the students seemed to benefit educationally from these communities. Further studies on grade point averages, graduation rates, and student perceptions of learning communities are underway.*
Program Review

As an institution, we are committed to learning and improvement. Our campus uses a deliberate set of quality assurance review procedures at various levels of institutional functioning. New courses and programs are reviewed by department, college, and campus-wide curriculum committees. All academic programs are periodically reviewed and evaluated in terms of learning outcomes, student completion and performance, and scholarly productivity.

When the WASC review team visited in 1999, program reviews had been effectively suspended and Mānoa was not in compliance with Board of Regents policy on program review. Since that time, we have conducted a review of 39 established and 18 provisional programs, with 28 programs presently under review. Nearly all academic programs are presently being reviewed on schedule.

Mechanisms and processes have been developed to regularly review academic programs and guide resource allocation and decisions. Existing academic programs have improved and new innovative programs were added to enhance student learning at all levels. Particular attention has been given to the needs of lower division students. Since the last WASC visit, many programs have been restructured or consolidated (e.g., Communications; departments in the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources; and Lyon Arboretum). This has been, at times, a difficult process yet we have continued on this course of aligning academic programs, budgets, and missions.

The Mānoa campus is also piloting important reforms such as the use of external reviews. The reforms seek several outcomes:

- Streamline the program review process and facilitate timeliness of reviews;
- Encourage departmental self-reflection and improvement through the identification of mission and key issues and concerns;
- Use of data and evidence in the evaluation of program quality;
- Seek disciplinary expertise in the review of programs; and
- Align decision making, resources, and budgeting with the program review process to ensure the quality of our educational programs.

The program review process has functioned to strengthen the quality of several academic programs. The Department of Economics responded to the recommendations of its program review by redesigning its undergraduate program to include an undergraduate mentoring program, assessment of student learning, internships, and revamping 300-level and 400-level
courses. In addition, the department initiated its first service-learning course and has enhanced the quality of undergraduate advising. In response to concerns over the quality of its graduate program, the department added new graduate courses to broaden and strengthen offerings in microeconomic theory.

As a result of its program review, the faculty in the School of Communications scheduled more frequent office hours and adopted an open-door policy to establish a more congenial and collegial atmosphere. Faculty also took on the role of advising undergraduate students, opening a natural line of dialogue between faculty and undergraduates.

The Political Science Department used its pending program review to initiate a year-long process of review and analysis resulting in simplifying their course structure along three rubrics (Global and Asia-Pacific Politics; Theory, Media, and Methods; and Law, Policy, and Society); providing a capstone experience for its majors; and encouraging faculty to regard themselves as mentors for cohorts of students.

Another illustrative example is the recent review of English 100:

Approximately 90 percent of Mānoa’s freshmen fulfill the General Education Foundations Written Communication requirement by taking English 100. During Spring 2001, the English Department’s Composition and Rhetoric Committee proposed to assess English 100 in three stages: via its own self study of the course; via an external assessment involving professionals from the national Writing Program Administration staff; and via follow up [with] full department and campus-wide discussions. The self study (Fall 2001) provided background material for a site visit and external evaluation conducted during Spring 2002 by Dean Charles Schuster (University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee) and Professor Deborah Holdstein (Governors State University, Illinois), with funding from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA). The external review resulted in nearly 30 recommendations for program betterment. The VCAA, the Dean of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, the English Department, and the Mānoa Writing Program are currently considering the recommendations in light of likely benefits and costs. The assessment has already produced changes in the Department’s internal procedures. This semester’s activities will lead to substantive initiatives that may affect the course’s curriculum, its academic support, and even its governance. Overall, this process may become a model for assessment involving major components of the General Education Program.

(Thomas Hilgers, Director of the Mānoa Writing Program)

**Recruitment and Enrollment Management**

Even though enrollments are starting to increase, further action is required if Mānoa is to achieve its institutional objectives. To quote from the strategic plan, our hope is that “the Mānoa experience offers challenging and distinctive academic programs, innovative teaching
and service, and world-class research and scholarship reflective of global perspectives and a culturally diverse island state.” Underlying this premise is the need for Mānoa to recruit and attract highly-motivated and talented undergraduate students and to provide challenging and stimulating learning opportunities.

While the University has clarified admissions policies in published literature and ramped up recruitment activities, these actions have produced little improvement in admissions standards since 1999. SAT scores and the high school grade point averages of entering freshman remain largely unchanged. Of first-time freshman applicants, 73 percent are admitted and 52 percent enroll. From Fall 1999 to Fall 2002, the number of first-time freshman applicants increased ten percent from 4,464 to 4,915. The increase in applications bodes well for our efforts to raise the selectivity of admissions at Mānoa. At the same time, given our geographic isolation, the growing demands for quality public higher education in our State, and the lack of alternatives, we have an obligation to serve public needs. Hence, there exists a tension between selectivity and access. Our challenge is to provide stimulating and rewarding educational opportunities for the best and brightest while also addressing the significant educational needs of all people of Hawai‘i.

The problems in Hawai‘i’s public school system have been well documented. In the most recent national assessment (National Assessment of Educational Progress) of students’ skills in mathematics and science administered by the U. S. Department of Education, Hawai‘i’s students scored below the national average. Only 63 percent of ninth grade students in the Class of 2001 made it to their senior year four years later. There are significant needs for improving education in Hawai‘i. For this reason, the University of Hawai‘i has launched an ambitious P-20 partnership program with the State’s Department of Education. The effort involves college readiness, support of science and mathematics curricula, and sharing academic support services and resources across the entire system of public education in Hawai‘i.

We recognize the need to address shortcomings in our admissions and records system. An effective comprehensive enrollment management plan or the infrastructure to enact it has yet to be implemented. While we are on the verge of implementing a state-of-the-art student information system called Banner, our campus still suffers from unclear admissions policies, insufficient information resources, and inadequate oversight and management. A series of short-term solutions have been implemented, such as the hiring of temporary employees and the authorization of overtime pay. Real reform will come only after reorganization has occurred, new permanent people have been hired, and the Banner student information system has been fully implemented.

Assessment and the Use of Data

The Commission recognized the considerable availability of data at Mānoa, while noting that data are not widely disseminated or used in financial and program decisions. Specifically noted was the need to improve data about “students, their experience and learning achievement.” To demonstrate educational effectiveness and student learning, the Commission stated that, “in
addition to the award of grades by individual faculty, a more systematic review of learning is required as well as demonstration of the effectiveness of University programs and activities to support student learning.”

In response to these concerns, the following actions have been taken:

- The Mānoa Faculty Senate’s Committee on Academic Policy and Planning developed a *Handbook on Departmental Assessment of Undergraduate Learning* in Fall 2000, which has been disseminated and is available online at http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/.

- An Assessment Fund of $100,000 annually was established to support faculty efforts to assess programs, with twelve awards given in Spring 2001 and six awards in Spring 2002.

- Leadership workshops were conducted to apprise incoming and existing department chairs of the resources and data sources available to them.

- On Saturday, March 9, 2002, an all-day Assessment Workshop was attended by over 60 department chairs. Featured were Peter Ewell, Senior Associate at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, and a several recipients of the 2001 Assessment Fund.

- On November 20, 2002, an Assessment Workshop was attended by over 60 departmental assessment officers. Featured speakers included key assessment resource people on campus as well as more recipients of the 2001 Assessment Fund.

- Program review guidelines were revised to include assessment of student learning and use of evidence to improve educational effectiveness; a full round of reviews was conducted.

- Academic programs undergoing program review are given informational resources regarding assessment of student learning outcomes.

- In Spring 2001 and Fall 2002, deans and department chairs reported on the status of assessment efforts in their programs. These data were assembled into summary tables and a report which has been disseminated. (WASC Required Data Elements, Table 7.1, Summary of Departmental Assessment Reports and Table 7.2, Summary of Data-Gathering Approaches, http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/wasc_report.html.)
The General Education Committee held a retreat on December 13, 2002 to discuss the assessment of student learning outcomes for the new General Education Diversification requirements.

Throughout the Fall 2002 semester, other General Education committees (Foundations; Oral Communication; Writing; Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues; and Contemporary Ethical Issues) discussed processes for identifying both student learning outcomes and assessment instruments by which to evaluate student learning in the context of the new General Education curriculum. Proposals are presently under review.

Management and Planning Support data have been reorganized, posted on a website (http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/maps2002.htm), and made easier to access and use.

The campus participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement for the past two years. The results have been circulated among senior managers, including the deans, and members of the Mānoa Faculty Senate.

The staff of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is presently developing *Assessment Matters*, a campus newsletter which will highlight key assessment activities and resources on campus as well as best practices in higher education.

An assessment website is under development to showcase campus assessment activities and provide resources and data to faculty, chairs, and program directors.

The College of Education is implementing an electronic portfolio system to assess students’ achievements across courses.

The College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources has integrated assessment planning into its reorganization by asking faculty to develop curricula designed so that students provide evidence that they have achieved established learning outcomes.

The Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs presented campus assessment initiatives and outcomes at the 2002 WASC annual meeting and the 2002 American Association for Higher Education Assessment Conference, “Assessment: A Shared Commitment,” for peer review and counsel.

The University of Hawai‘i co-sponsored the Pacific Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research Conference on May 24-28, 2002. Many Mānoa faculty and administrators attended.

Our approach to assessment of student learning outcomes has been consistent with our mission as a research university. We believe that assessment is most appropriately conducted by academic leaders in individual programs, that it is a scholarly endeavor informed by data, that it includes peer review, and that it recognizes the evolutionary nature of learning and discovery. Assessment is fundamental to being an innovative learning institution.
Since the last WASC visit, we have made a significant beginning in building a culture of evidence on the Mānoa campus. This has been achieved by the commitment of many faculty, the leadership of the Chancellor, Mānoa Faculty Senate, Council on Program Reviews, and key academic deans.

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs recently conducted a census of programs regarding assessment activities. Nearly all departments are engaged in the assessment of their undergraduate programs. Many seek student feedback through end-of-course evaluations, focus groups, exit interviews, and student and alumni surveys. A number have moved well beyond satisfaction surveys to measures of student learning outcomes.

Capstones, internships, theses, design projects, and other culminating course-based experiences are most commonly used to assess student performance and learning. In the relatively new Global Environmental Sciences program, for example, students write a thesis and then present it in a public seminar with faculty, graduate students, and peer undergraduate students. Individual student learning is assessed by a faculty committee. This collective evaluation of students has provided valuable feedback that is being used to improve the program. A new capstone course (Ocean 498: Communication of Research Results) has been designed; it emphasizes skills relating to research methods, ethics in science, oral presentations, and the writing of a thesis.

Another example is the Department of Mathematics, which has designed a culminating credit/no-credit capstone course in which students are asked to integrate their learning. Students write a paper on a mathematical concept and make an oral presentation. Students are also given a departmentally-designed exit examination, which requires them to develop a proof by contradiction and by induction; to explain various algorithms; and to solve problems in multivariate calculus, logic, and set theory. Faculty members were surprised to find that the results for the elementary part of the examination were mixed but generally disappointing. Student performance was generally much better on more advanced components, which require knowledge from coursework taken more recently. This has launched faculty discussions about ways to reinforce basic concepts, especially in calculus and linear algebra, across the curriculum.

Several programs encourage or require students to develop digital portfolios with examples of work from across the curriculum. In the programs of Theatre and Dance, for example, a faculty mentor is assigned to each student upon declaration of the major. The mentor meets regularly with the student to discuss progress toward program learning objectives using a checklist and a scoring rubric. Students collect digital video portfolio evidence to demonstrate the learning and acquisition of skills. In preparation for an exit interview, students assemble performance samples into a portfolio which demonstrates that the program’s learning outcomes have been met. As the Dance Chair noted, “Performance is such a powerful and fleeting medium.” Video portfolios provide “repeatable” performance evaluation as well as the tracking of progress across time. The use of video greatly enhances a student’s ability to engage in self-judgment,
critique, and learning. The portfolio also provides a compilation of the student's work, which is of value to students for professional purposes.

A number of programs are collecting evidence from student performance on national or statewide examinations. The Department of Nursing, for example, set a standard for its graduates of a 90 percent pass rate on the National Council Licensure Examination (a national licensing examination). Of the 226 students taking the exam from Spring 1997 to Fall 2001, 212 students passed and five failed (a 97 percent pass rate), thus demonstrating that the Department adequately prepares its graduates to become licensed nurses.

Employer surveys or interviews are frequently conducted among professional programs, such as Education, Nursing, Engineering, and Accounting, and are increasingly being conducted by others, such as Geology and Geophysics, Oceanography, Asian Studies, and Chemistry. The Department of Nursing regularly asks employers to rate its graduates on elements including the ability to problem-solve clinical situations and make clinical decisions, collaborate with other professionals, care for groups of patients, and perform a variety of technical skills. The feedback is discussed by Nursing's Evaluation Committee, which also disseminates the results to the faculty. Employer surveys conducted by the Geology and Geophysics Department led the faculty to strengthen its ties to the professional community through student-employer luncheons and a proposed internship course to improve students' local employment opportunities.

Several departments and interdisciplinary faculty boards regularly conduct systematic review and analysis of the curriculum by mapping program requirements and course syllabi to hallmarks and student learning outcomes. Each department in the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources created “Opportunities to Learn” matrices when the College reorganized. The result was a clear picture for the faculty of the courses in the curriculum which introduced or reinforced key learning outcomes that the faculty had developed. Similarly, the General Education Boards that oversee the Focus requirements review course proposals every semester to ensure that the designated sections meet the established hallmarks. The Foundations Board, which oversees the designation of first-year General Education courses, reviews course proposals every year.

Assessment has not always been an easy endeavor for our faculty, but it is one to which departments are increasingly committed. The experience of the Economics Department illustrates the challenges and opportunities involved in jumpstarting assessment at a research institution. In developing an assessment plan, the department began by conducting a comprehensive review of assessment practices in peer economics programs nationwide. They then entered an experimentation phase where various measurement tools were beta-tested with small sample groups. The focus has been on establishing a flexible assessment plan which is sustainable and useful in program development. Professor Byron Gangnes of the Economics Department offered the following observations: successful assessment programs tend to start off small without a grandiose plan involving wholesale changes to existing programs; do not use tools that are prohibitive costly to implement; do not use tools that alienate the faculty;
do not be afraid to try various methodologies and disregard ones that do not work. Gangnes also testifies to the benefits of assessing student learning, saying:

...we identified specific learning outcomes, including that our majors be conversant with fundamental economic concepts necessary for informed discourse, that they master analytical methods and skills appropriate for applied economic analysis in employment settings or for advanced study, that they demonstrate the ability to think critically about economic issues and to apply economic reasoning appropriately, and that they develop expertise needed to effectively communicate results to colleagues and decision-makers. In each case, we identified specific outcomes that would indicate successful attainment of the objective, for example, knowledge of the core content of intermediate theory courses and the ability to conduct and document academic research. We also identified very practical goals for department recruitment and placement of our majors. The faculty approved these learning outcomes at a regular faculty meeting. (Reflective Essays, Assessing the Economic Major: A Pragmatic Approach, http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/assessingTheEconomicsMajor.pdf)

The Economics Department, and other departments on campus, see the value in assessment and want to invest in a solid, long-term assessment plan that will meet faculty and student needs.

There is growing evidence that assessment is leading to ongoing improvement in student learning and satisfaction in many of our programs. Faculty also appear to be learning! As departments collectively identify the outcomes intended for student learning, faculty members report a better understanding of how individual course instruction contributes to student learning within the discipline. Many instructors are more engaged with their colleagues and students, and thus more satisfied.

V. Other Changes and Issues Currently Confronting the Institution

Since the last WASC visit, there has been significant change in leadership. In addition to having a new president and a new campus chancellor, many new deans and directors as well as other senior managers have been appointed. In addition to the personnel changes, there has also been significant organizational reform. These changes have served to energize the campus, as well as to remind us of key, long-standing issues confronting the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. While there is much that is new, there is also much that remains the same.

President Evan Dobelle was inaugurated on a platform emphasizing change, openness, and a deep connection to the community. He appointed new people, including several from outside the University of Hawai‘i system, to key roles: Deane Neubauer as Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs (and Interim Chancellor during AY 2001-2002); James R. W. Sloane as Vice President for Administration; and Paul Costello as Vice President for External Affairs. On the Mānoa campus, Chancellor Peter Englert was “handed over” to the campus in a traditional
Maori ceremony by representatives from his previous institution, Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand. Karl Kim was appointed Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Edward Laws as Interim Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education. Rodney Sakaguchi was appointed permanently as Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations in November of 2002. A search for the permanent vice chancellors of academic affairs and research is currently underway.

Since 1999, the following deans were appointed: Edwin Cadman as Dean of the John A. Burns School of Medicine; David McClain as Dean of the College of Business Administration; Andrew Hashimoto as Dean of the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources; and Wai Fah Chen as Dean of the College of Engineering. Other significant appointments include Carl Vogel as Director of the Cancer Research Center of Hawai‘i; Rolf-Peter Kudritzki as Director of the Institute for Astronomy; Jo-Ann Leong as Director of the Hawai‘i Institute for Marine Biology; and Diane Perushek as the University Librarian. In addition a new Athletic Director, Herman Frazier, was hired in August of 2002.

There are a large number of senior administrative positions occupied by interim personnel. In addition to the vice chancellors, searches are underway for the Dean of the Law School, Dean of the School of Travel Industry Management, Dean of the School of Nursing and Dental Hygiene, and the Dean of the School of Social Work. Other schools and colleges led by interim deans include the College of Natural Sciences, College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, School of Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Studies, and Outreach College. The large number of interim positions is a source of some concern. The failure to find permanent deans for some schools, such as the School of Social Work, has generated some tension, while other colleges, such as Natural Sciences, have existed for many years with an interim dean.

It should be noted that since the last visit, the amount of research funding on the Mānoa campus has increased significantly and now approaches a quarter billion dollars annually. We have also broken ground on a new $300 million medical school campus in downtown Honolulu. Scores of outstanding new faculty members have been hired, reversing the ten-year decline in full-time positions that characterized the last WASC visit.

There have been significant improvements in library resources and services as the Mānoa library system continues to make progress on its comprehensive strategic plan. As noted above, a new University Librarian, Diane Perushek, was hired in 2001. Over the five-year period since 1997, funding has increased by 40 percent to $14 million annually. Annual acquisitions have risen to the level of approximately 40,000. In 2001, 156 new subscriptions for serials were added. Recently, a new web-based system was developed and installed, and as of October 2002, the Mānoa library system provides electronic access to 3,500 reference sources and over 27,500 e-journals. To better serve students, not only were library hours expanded by 19 hours per week, but the Phase III addition to Hamilton Library was completed and several other renovation projects have also been initiated.
There have also been significant organizational changes both in the University of Hawai‘i system and on the Mānoa campus. The system changes include the creation of campus chancellors for the seven community colleges. In the past, there was a single chancellor of the community college system, Joyce Tsunoda, and a central administrative office staffed by vice chancellors. Under the new organization, each of the campuses will now have its own chancellor. Certain administrative functions such as research, international programs, student affairs, and academic affairs will be handled in a more centralized, coordinated fashion. The system reorganization is designed to increase efficiencies and to improve communications and coordination between the ten campuses of the University of Hawai‘i system.

Three concerns have been raised on the Mānoa campus regarding these changes. First, there is some belief that having ten chancellors instead of four (Mānoa, Hilo, West O‘ahu, and the Community Colleges) will somehow diminish or weaken Mānoa’s authority or ability to compete for system resources. A second concern involves the centralization of research administration. While research and training grants have grown across the system, Mānoa has and will continue to generate a great majority of extramurally-funded grants. Some on the Mānoa campus believe that the administrative functions and support services for research should remain entirely at Mānoa. Finally, there is concern that there will be unnecessary duplication of responsibilities and activities at both the system and campus level in areas such as student affairs, international programs, and academic administration.

It is important to note that many of these concerns were discussed at the Board of Regents meetings and at various meetings on campus. Upon presentation of the initial proposal, constituents expressed concern over lack of consultation. In response, the Board delayed approval for a month in order to allow for additional input and modification of the proposed reorganization. The reorganization was approved at a special meeting of the Board of Regents held on December 12, 2002.

The concerns regarding the reorganization served to illuminate some long-standing tensions both on the Mānoa campus and throughout the University of Hawai‘i system. One involves the tension between functioning more smoothly, perhaps “seamlessly,” as a system, and the need for campus autonomy. This tension has also surfaced with regard to Mānoa’s implementation of the new General Education Program (as it will affect the transferability of credits from the community colleges). It has also emerged in the context of other debates involving faculty workload and customary expectations (i.e., the difference in teaching loads for Mānoa faculty and other faculty within the University of Hawai‘i system) and in terms of the offering of new degrees, programs, or certificates at various campuses. The conclusion reached by the senior management of the University of Hawai‘i is that the reorganization will allow for both increased efficiencies and better control over problems such as degree proliferation or degree duplication and also enable individual campuses to develop in terms of their particular mission. In terms of the impact on Mānoa, the reorganization has been presented as part of a larger strategy to develop Mānoa more fully as a research university, a role that distinguishes it from the other baccalaureate and two-year programs.
Mānoa’s strategic planning process served to reinforce the importance of research on the Mānoa campus. Current efforts underway to implement the strategic plan entail refining the notion of research at the only Carnegie Doctoral/Research University-Extensive institution in the middle of the Pacific. It involves better integrating research and teaching by ensuring that all students have access and opportunities to become engaged in research as part of their educational experience. It also involves recognizing and rewarding the diverse styles of research and scholarly accomplishment on campus. And it involves focusing on key areas of excellence, advantage, and promise, including an Honors College, a Cinematic and Digital Arts Program, Sustainable Development, and Public Policy programs. Relating to Sustainable Development, Director Bruce J. Miller writes:

Since the February 1 strategic planning event, our Office of Sustainability has tapped into existing resources such as facilities, grounds, and landscaping staff as well as faculty, student, private sector and community volunteers to produce valuable results without much cost. Working with more than 200 people on a dozen committees, we have been targeting two primary goals: (1) to ensure a prominent place in the University’s strategic plan by creating a supplementary “Charter of Sustainability” that identifies sustainable principles and practices, and (2) to plan and coordinate high-impact, visible projects on campus that demonstrate the benefits and wisdom of those principles and practices. (Reflective Essays, Planning Is All About Hope: the University of Hawai‘i as a Model of a Sustainable Future, http://www.hawaii.edu/wasc/uhm/essays-sustainability.pdf)

A related concern involves the quality of student life on campus. There is a need to improve and expand the number of housing opportunities for Mānoa students. There is a need to create a more vibrant campus life and to ensure greater connectivity and positive interactions with the surrounding community. The problems of substance abuse, vandalism, and anti-social behavior on campus need to be addressed. Chancellor Englert took a strong, decisive stand by moving into the dormitories to experience first hand student life on the Mānoa campus. In addition to implementing immediate corrective actions to improve dorm life, there is also a need for other longer term strategies that involve closer integration of academic affairs and student affairs, better campus planning, and enhancing the physical and social environments. One proposed change involves the creation of an office for undergraduate education. Other proposals involve expanding advising and counseling services available to students. Efforts also include planning and evaluation of an Honors College and other live/learn opportunities for Mānoa students.

At the heart of the debates over the future of Mānoa lies a fundamental tension between becoming a globally competitive, international research university and meeting the demands of our community here in Hawai‘i. While Mānoa aspires to attract top faculty and students from the world over, it must also meet pressing needs from Native Hawaiians and other underrepresented groups from Hawai‘i. While the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa is one of the most diverse campuses in the nation, it must go further in terms of promoting social justice for Native Hawaiians and enhancing the diversity of faculty, students, and staff. Implementing the
strategic plan’s goal of becoming a “Hawaiian place of learning” involves more than translating the plan into Hawaiian or putting up Hawaiian language signs and building names. This remains one of the most significant issues to confront our campus.

The issues confronting Mānoa, such as defining its research identity, improving the quality of student life, or honoring its commitments to Native Hawaiians, will require a strong planning process in which a full range of alternatives can be identified, analyzed, and deliberated. It will also require a transparent, coordinated budget process in which priorities can be funded through the allocation of state funds, tuition revenues, overhead return, and other funds. Openness and clarity in terms of strategic goals and objectives, as well as the process by which they are funded and implemented, are needed.

To treat the setting of priorities and the eventual allocation of resources as a learning opportunity for the institution—allowing for careful analysis and deliberative dialogue, as well as a recognition and respect for diversity of background, perspective, and interest and promoting innovation and experimentation—is part of our approach. As with any learning-centered institution, evaluation and assessment must be a routine activity. Especially at this research university, where our faculty are routinely involved in peer review, transforming academic planning and decision making into a form of scholarly activity will make possible achieving steady progress towards addressing the significant challenges confronting our campus.

VI. Institutional Plans to Address the New Expectations of the 2001 Handbook

Mānoa is committed to becoming a self-learning organization. We have not only reviewed the 2001 WASC Handbook, we have also begun to reorient our campus to its philosophy. The process began with several senior administrators attending WASC sessions and the annual meetings. We have also distributed copies of the new handbook to all deans and directors. Deane Neubauer, a former WASC commissioner, gave a three-hour workshop to all deans and directors on the new standards. Utilizing the WASC Handbook, we designed and implemented an extensive planning process to better define and publicize our institutional purposes. We cross-mapped the commission letter recommendations to the team report, the old standards, the new standards, and our campus strategic plan (Appendix 6: Mapping of WASC Recommendations). Our approach, which involved numerous faculty, students and members of the community, helped to insure academic integrity and connectivity among the diverse constituencies at Mānoa.

We have treated much of the planning process as an information management project, conducting inventories and surveys and comparing the data from our own internal data systems (e.g., Management and Planning Support data) with results from the National Survey of Student Engagement and other comparative data. We focused on teaching and pedagogy, on scholarship and creative activity, and student learning. We have made significant investments in the reform of General Education and our assessment activities, while we have
also made substantial progress and improvement in both our program review as well as our evaluation of faculty scholarship.

As part of the WASC special visit, we have been building an institutional portfolio and have distributed for the first time not just the data tables, but also the various stipulated policies. This has encouraged a review of the way our information and policies are collected and organized. Building a website on these related documents and databases has served to increase not just knowledge of these resources, but also our use of them. Routinely, we expect departments undergoing program review to have access to these data. This information is also more readily available to senior managers and others involved in priority setting and budgeting. The availability of this information, along with the organizational reforms, has served to improve the quality of participation, deliberation, and decision making. By building an institutional portfolio that integrates the WASC standards with our strategic planning core commitments and strategic imperatives, and greatly expanding our assessment activities on campus, we have put into place both the values as well as the approach to becoming a self-learning institution. This will, incidentally, prepare us quite well for our next comprehensive visit from WASC.

VII. Concluding Statement

To borrow a familiar line from Shakespeare, “We know what we are, but not what we may be.” The process of discovering our future, of defining our destiny, has been a valuable exercise in building community and perhaps, more importantly, in becoming a self-learning organization. The WASC accreditation process, our extensive planning endeavors, and our wide-ranging efforts to remake and reorganize our campus have all been conducted in an effort not only to better know ourselves, but also, ultimately, to enhance our effectiveness as an educational institution. The challenge involves not just meeting current needs and addressing those concerns identified in 1999, but also extending our reach to include other areas of learning and improvement.

Our strategic planning process yielded a strong degree of consensus that “Mānoa’s essence is research.” There was widespread agreement that faculty and students come to our campus to become engaged in research and scholarly activity. Part of improving the undergraduate educational experience involves increasing the connectivity between teaching and research activities on campus. We need to go further in terms of defining what it means to be a major international research university in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. While we will continue to build on areas of traditional interest and commitment, we will also need to expand into new interdisciplinary areas. We realize that we need to make substantial change and improvement in the delivery of student support services (housing, financial aid, extracurricular activities, etc.) if we are to become more than just a commuter campus.

We also know that increasing global tensions will play out on our campus in terms of new tensions and conflicts (such as the recent proposal to create a new Naval ROTC program that was supported by the students but opposed by the faculty). We are also aware that budgetary
shortfalls will continue to plague us and will serve to remind us of the importance of consultative, transparent processes. We will need to make tough decisions regarding the organizational structure of campus and the allocation of resources. And, as WASC has reminded us, we need to be ever vigilant in our efforts to “communicate, communicate, communicate.”

Forging partnerships and fostering positive relationships across campus—not just between the sciences and the humanities, but also between students, faculty, staff, and others coming from diverse backgrounds—will help us not only to define our destiny, but also to deliver it.