

WSCUC Interim Report

INSTRUCTIONS

Interim Reports are limited in scope, not comprehensive evaluations of the institution. The report informs the Interim Report Committee about the progress made by the institution in addressing issues identified by the Commission.

The Interim Report consists of two sections:

- Interim Report Form and Appendices
- Additional Required Data (as specified on the Additional Required Data form)

Please respond completely to each question on the following pages and do not delete the questions. Appendices and Additional Required Data will be uploaded as separate attachments.

WSCUC is no longer using Live Text for receiving Interim Reports. Institutions will use a free Box.com account to upload the report. Instructions for creating the Box.com account and uploading the report will be provided by email.

REPORT GUIDELINES AND WORD LIMITS

Because the number of issues reported on varies among institutions (the average is four to six issues), the length of a report will vary. However, a typical interim report ranges from 20 to 60 pages, not including appendices. Narrative essays responding to each issue should be no more than five pages each. **The total number of pages of appendices supporting the report should be no more than 200 pages** unless agreed upon in advance with the institution's staff liaison. Be sure that all attachments follow a consistent naming convention and are referenced the same way at appropriate places within the narrative. Please name them so that it is clear what they are and what section they refer to, with cross referencing in the narrative. For example, "Attachment 2-1: Mission Statement", would be used for Criterion 2. Attachments are preferred as PDFs.

Institutions that provide excessive information in their report will be asked to resubmit. You may wish to consult with your staff liaison as you prepare your report.

Some tips for providing evidence to support your findings:

- Put yourself in the place of a reviewer: what is the story that you need to tell? What evidence supports your story? What is extraneous and can be left out?
- Provide a representative sample of evidence on an issue, rather than ALL of the evidence.
- Consider including an executive summary or the most relevant points of supporting evidence, rather than the entire document.
- If you are referring to a specific page or set of pages in a document, include only those pages, not the entire document.
- If you are providing an excerpt of a document, include the title of the document, and a table of contents and/or a brief narrative to put the excerpt in context.

- If you provide a hyperlink to a web page, make sure the link takes the viewer directly to the relevant information on the page. Do not make your reviewer search for it.

REVIEW PROCESS

A panel of the WSCUC Interim Report Committee (IRC) will review the report, typically within 90 days of receipt. Representatives of your institution will be invited to participate in the conference call review to respond to questions from the panel. Your WSCUC staff liaison will contact you after the call with the outcome of the review, which will also be documented in a formal action letter.

OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW

After the review, the panel will take one of the following actions.

- **Receive the Interim Report** with recommendations and commendations—No follow up required.
- **Defer action** pending receipt of follow-up information—The panel has identified limited information that may be submitted in a short period of time, such as audited financial statements or the outcome of an upcoming meeting of the board. The panel may authorize the WSCUC staff liaison to review these materials without the full panel being brought together again, depending on the nature of the supplemental information.
- **Request an additional Interim Report**—Issues reported on were not adequately resolved or need continued monitoring.
- **Request a Progress Report**—A progress report is less formal than an Interim Report and is reviewed only by the WSCUC staff liaison. A progress report may be requested when institutional follow-up on one or two relatively minor areas is desired.
- **Receive the Interim Report with a recommendation that the Commission sends a site visit evaluation team**—Serious, ongoing issues involving potential non-compliance with WSCUC's Standards and Criteria for Review may require follow-up in the form of a Special Visit. Note that the IRC panel makes a recommendation for a visit, and the Executive Committee of the Commission or the full Commission decides on whether or not to require the visit.

Interim Report Form

Please respond to each question. Do not delete the questions. Insert additional pages as needed.

Name of Institution: University of Hawai'i at Hilo

Person Submitting the Report: Seri I. Luangphinit, ALO

Report Submission Date: April 15, 2017

Statement on Report Preparation

Briefly describe in narrative form the process of report preparation, providing the names and titles of those involved. Because of the focused nature of an Interim Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of all institutional constituencies is not normally required. Faculty, administrative staff, and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the report. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the governing board, should review the report before it is submitted to WSCUC, and such reviews should be indicated in this statement.

The Institutional Context was prepared by the ALO. The five areas required for reporting for this Interim Report were assigned to key individuals on campus per Chancellor Don Straney's directives. The Chancellor initiated a series of meetings with Deans and Directors to develop enrollment and retention initiatives. Vice Chancellor Dr. Farrah Gomes (Student Affairs) produced a report for the University of Hawai'i System Board of Regents; those documents served as the basis for the response to Item I of this Interim Report.

To show progress on Item II, the ALO compiled Core Competency Assessment in the academic units; the statement on co-curricular assessment was drafted after consultation with the new Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Dr. Farrah Marie Gomes.

Chief Financial Officer Dr. Marcia Sakai tasked a team that included Lois Fujiyoshi (Executive Director of Budget and Business Management), Mason Kuo (Director of Accounting and Finance), and Sang Son Sumida (Administrative Officer in the Cashier's Office) to develop ratios and have them vetted by the UH System in order to support the statement for Item III.

Vice Chancellor Dr. Matthew Platz (Academic Affairs) and Kelli Okumura (Institutional Research Analyst) provided information that answers Item IV.

The DL Liaison Dr. Kirsten Møllegaard and the Distance Learning Policy Committee were tasked with formulating a response for Item V.

Though not required, the ALO asked to re-run the Retention and Graduation tables required in 2013 to enable us to make a comparison against past data. Kelli Okumura (IRO) worked on updating the R&G Tables and Dr. Mitchell Anderson, author of the 2013 R&G Report, provided a summary analysis.

List of Topics Addressed in this Report

Please list the topics identified in the action letter(s) and that are addressed in this report.

1. Enrollment management efforts;
2. Demonstration of assessment efforts across all academic programs and co-curricular programs;
3. An update on the financial strength of the institution particularly as it relates to enrollment management success and negotiation with the University of Hawaii system and state legislature;
4. The status of the institutional research office;
5. Update on distance education programs, including provide learning outcomes assessment and faculty development.

Institutional Context

Very briefly describe the institution's background; mission; history, including the founding date and year first accredited; geographic locations; and other pertinent information so that the Interim Report Committee panel has the context to understand the issues discussed in the report.

BRIEF BACKGROUND OF THE BIG ISLAND

The University of Hawai'i at Hilo is a comprehensive, public liberal arts institution that originally began as "Hilo College" in 1947. In 1970, Hilo College was renamed the University of Hawai'i at Hilo (hereafter referred to as "UH Hilo") as it became a baccalaureate granting institution. The institution is situated in a small, rural community on the southernmost island in the Hawaiian archipelago.

But given its indigenous history, which has been complemented by in-migration of many different groups over the last two centuries, Hilo embraces its multicultural diversity. That diversity is reflected in our current student population; as of Fall 2016, UH System IRO reported that of UH Hilo's population of 3,666, 28% were Native Hawaiian ($n=1,049$); another 5% were other indigenous Pacific Islanders, including Micronesian, Chamorro, Samoan, and Tongan ($n=200$); 23% were Asian ($n=871$) with the biggest groups being Filipino (8%, $n=297$) and Japanese (25%, $n=207$); 23% Caucasians ($n=870$); and 13% indicating they were of mixed race ($n=505$).¹

As a primarily rural island, Hawai'i County somewhat lags behind O'ahu (City and County of Honolulu) in terms of certain socio-economic indicators. As of 2010 US Federal Census, Hilo town had an estimated population of 43,263 with approximately 21.3% under the age of eighteen.² The 2015 Hawai'i County Data Book shows that for the entire Island, with a population of 196,428, Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders made up 12.7%, Asians 22.0%, Latino/as 12.3%, Caucasians 34.3%, and Mixed-Race

¹Institutional Research & Analysis Office, University of Hawai'i System, [https://www.hawaii.edu/institutionalresearch/enrT05Report.action?IRO_INST_AND_UHCC=HIL&SEM_YR_IRO=2016-8ÐNICITY_TOGGLE=ALL_ETHNICITY&MAJOR_TOGGLE=ALL_MAJORS&drillThruLevel=&agglevel=&reportId=ENR_T05&campusContext=&drillId=&VALUE=&exportType=&drillValue=&drillTarget=.](https://www.hawaii.edu/institutionalresearch/enrT05Report.action?IRO_INST_AND_UHCC=HIL&SEM_YR_IRO=2016-8ÐNICITY_TOGGLE=ALL_ETHNICITY&MAJOR_TOGGLE=ALL_MAJORS&drillThruLevel=&agglevel=&reportId=ENR_T05&campusContext=&drillId=&VALUE=&exportType=&drillValue=&drillTarget=)

² United States Census Bureau, Hilo CDP, <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/1514650>.

29.4%.³ Roughly 18.5% of our population speak a language other than English at home, which is better than O’ahu’s 25.35%; however, Hawai’i County trails in those holding a bachelor’s degree or higher, 25.9% compared to 30.5%.⁴ Median household income in 2014 dollars is also lower, \$51,213 versus \$68,201, which may explain why the number of persons in poverty is also higher, at 18.1% versus 11.4%.⁵ Ironically, while levels of poverty may be high, data also shows that unemployment is down, from 10.2% in 2009 to 5.5% in 2014.⁶ The biggest growths in population from 1990 through 2010 are also in districts that are far removed from the more developed areas of Hilo and Kona: Ka’ū (South Point), 45%; Puna (Southeast) 44.6%; and South Kohala 34.2%.⁷

A profile of the local State high schools gives us an idea of the kinds of students that are emerging from these growing districts:

School	Percent Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian	Next Largest Demographic Group	Percent on Free or Reduced Lunch (Note: Title I is defined as a rate of 50% or more)	Community Attainment (College Graduate) State of Hawai’i Average: 29.4%	11 th Grade Hawai’i Statewide Assessment Program Pass Rate (Language Arts) State Pass Rate: 56%	11 th Grade Hawai’i Statewide Assessment Program Pass Rate (Math) State Pass Rate: 30%	HS Biology I: (HCPS Science) State Pass Rate: 33%
Hilo High ⁸	44.5%	12.5% (Filipino)	56.3%	30.6%	49%	21%	21%
Waiākea High ⁹	36.3%	19.6% (Japanese)	48.7%	27.8%	60%	33%	42%
Pāhoa High and Intermediate ¹⁰ (Puna)	50%	15.1% (Filipino)	84.7%	20%	48%	28%	26%
Kea’au High ¹¹ (Puna)	43.4%	21.6% (Filipino)	76.4%	25.3%	32%	17%	23%

³ County of Hawai’i Department of Research and Development, *Hawai’i County Data Book: 2015*, 4, <http://www.hisbdc.org/BusinessResearchLibrary/HawaiiCountyDataBook2015.aspx>.

⁴ Ibid., 4.

⁵ Ibid., 4.

⁶ Ibid., 3.

⁷ Ibid., 11.

⁸ Accountability Section, Assessment and Accountability Branch, Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Hawai’i State Department of Education), Hilo High School: School Status and Improvement Report, School Year 2015-2016, 2, 3, & 8, <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/ssir/2016/Hawaii/355SSIR-5.pdf>.

⁹ Accountability Section, Assessment and Accountability Branch, Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Hawai’i State Department of Education), Waiākea High School: School Status and Improvement Report, School Year 2015-2016, 2, 3, & 8, <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/ssir/2016/Hawaii/389SSIR-5.pdf>.

¹⁰ Accountability Section, Assessment and Accountability Branch, Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Hawai’i State Department of Education), Pāhoa High and Intermediate: School Status and Improvement Report, School Year 2015-2016, 2, 3, & 8, <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/ssir/2016/Hawaii/383SSIR-5.pdf>.

¹¹ Accountability Section, Assessment and Accountability Branch, Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Hawai’i State Department of Education), Kea’au High School: School Status and Improvement Report, School Year 2015-2016, 2, 3, & 8, <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/ssir/2016/Hawaii/354SSIR-5.pdf>.

Ka'ū High and Pahala Elementary ¹²	45.2%	25.2 (Filipino)	86.3%	20.3%	38%	8%	26%
Kohala High School ¹³	42.2%	28.2% (Filipino)	62.5	23.4%	44%	22%	40%
Kealakehe High (Kona) ¹⁴	27.5%	22.3% (Caucasian)	51.0%	28%	56%	37%	39%
Konawaena High (Kona) ¹⁵	38.2%	19.3% (Caucasian)	60.7%	25.7%	44%	31%	30%

All of the local State high schools report Native Hawaiians students as comprising the largest ethnic group among their student populations. It is also important to note that seven of the eight schools are designated as Title I and that only two of the eight report surpassing the Hawai'i State DOE assessment pass rates.

These statistics indicate the University is located in and serves at-risk populations. Attention to this has been reported as far back as the 2001 Self-Study for WASC.¹⁶

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

Our unique position in a community that is both rich in history but also victim to the collapse of large-scale colonial-era agriculture provides us with a responsibility not only to uphold respect for the values and lessons of the past but also to lead the way in sustainable development. Both of these charges underscore our Mission Statement and what we stand for:

A'ohe pau ka 'ike i ka hālau ho'okahi.
One learns from many sources.

The purpose of our university 'ohana (family) is to challenge students to reach their highest level of academic achievement by inspiring learning, discovery and creativity inside and outside the classroom. Our *kuleana* (responsibility) is to improve the quality of life of the people of Hawai'i, the Pacific region and the world.¹⁷

¹² Accountability Section, Assessment and Accountability Branch, Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Hawai'i State Department of Education), Ka'ū High & Pahala Elementary: School Status and Improvement Report, School Year 2015-2016, 2, 3, & 8, <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/ssir/2016/Hawaii/368SSIR-5.pdf>.

¹³ Accountability Section, Assessment and Accountability Branch, Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Hawai'i State Department of Education), Kohala High School: School Status and Improvement Report, School Year 2015-2016, 2, 3, & 8, <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/ssir/2016/Hawaii/373SSIR-5.pdf>.

¹⁴ Accountability Section, Assessment and Accountability Branch, Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Hawai'i State Department of Education), Kealakehe High School: School Status and Improvement Report, School Year 2015-2016, 2, 3, & 8, <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/ssir/2016/Hawaii/392SSIR-5.pdf>.

¹⁵ Accountability Section, Assessment and Accountability Branch, Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance (Hawai'i State Department of Education), Konawaena High School: School Status and Improvement Report, School Year 2015-2016, 2, 3, & 8, <http://arch.k12.hi.us/PDFs/ssir/2016/Hawaii/374SSIR-5.pdf>.

¹⁶ "Self Study Report: Submitted to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for Reaffirmation of Accreditation," 13 July 2001, 5-6, <http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/SelfStudy2000-2001.pdf>.

¹⁷ Mission, 2015-2016 Catalog, <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/mission>.

Our *kuleana* is to provide educational opportunities for students on an island that trails other counties in terms of educational attainment among the adult population. The education we provide, however, is one that also reaches beyond the classroom and enables the improvement of our local and Pacific communities

At the same time, we are a major economic “engine” in that we directly impact Hilo. Chancellor Straney reported in 2012 that UH Hilo is a solid contributor to the community via an operating budget of over \$40M per state budget allocations and \$40M in tuition/fees (combined) that fund 926 employees and 900 student employees, all in the service of some 8,056 students (a combined total of Hawai‘i Community College students and UH Hilo undergraduates and graduates given shared infrastructure).¹⁸ In 2014, the Chancellor released information to the various rotaries communicating the direct impact of research, which is said to have brought in “\$14 million in federal grants and contracts [which] have produced more than 500 jobs, many of them filled by UH-Hilo grads [. . .] netting a \$42,000 year salary” for each of these jobs.¹⁹ In addition, economic projections for Hawai‘i County (2010-2040) indicate that the largest growth area will be in health services and business services, each more than doubling from \$6.8 billion to \$1.5 trillion and \$3.3 billion to \$7.1 billion respectively; the government sector will continue to serve as a major economic engine which is projected to involve \$1.9 trillion by 2040.²⁰

ACCREDITATION HISTORY

UH Hilo was first accredited by WASC in 1976. At that time, UH Hilo was operationally integrated with Hawai‘i Community College (henceforth referred to as HAWCC). HAWCC and UH Hilo formally separated in Fall of 1990 (though we still share some of the same facilities). At that time, enrollment was pegged at 2,874 with the institution offering baccalaureate degrees in 29 disciplines and certificates in another 12.²¹ As of Spring 2017, we have an enrollment of 3,518 with 37 undergraduate programs (with 25 possible minors), 40 undergraduate and graduate Certificate or Licensure Programs, 8 Master’s Degrees, and 4 Doctorates.²² **Since the October 2014 reaccreditation visit, UH Hilo has added a BA in Gender and Women’s Studies and the MA in Heritage Management in Fall of 2015, the latter of which received substantive change approval in 2015.**²³ The institution has officially stopped out the Sino-American Dual Baccalaureate Degree and the MA in China–Relations in 2016. The BA in Economics is set to end in Fall of 2017 and the BA in Environmental Science will become a track in the BA Geography with official termination of this degree in Fall of 2020. The MS in Clinical

¹⁸ Donald O. Straney, “Toward a Vibrant economy for the 21st Century,” Presentation to the Joint Chamber Economic Development Committees, Hilo, July 25, 2012, 2, http://hilo.hawaii.edu/chancellor/documents/2012-07-25_Donald_Straney_at_Joint_Chamber_Committees.pdf.

¹⁹ Rotary Club of Hilo Bay, “Speaker: Chancellor Donald Straney,” July 30, 2014, <http://hilobayrotary.com/Stories/speaker-chancellor-don-straney>.

²⁰ County of Hawai‘i Department of Research and Development, *Hawai‘i County Data Book: 2015*, 24, <http://www.hisbdc.org/BusinessResearchLibrary/HawaiiCountyDataBook2015.aspx>.

²¹ “Self-Study Report, Submitted to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for Reaffirmation of Accreditation,” 13 July 2001, 1, 7, <http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/SelfStudy2000-2001.pdf>.

²² *Degree and Certificates Offered*, <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/degrees-and-certificates-offered>. Please note that the current enrollment figures can be found at: <http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/>.

²³ “Substantive Change Action Report,” June 29, 2015, <http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/HeritageManagement.pdf>.

Psychopharmacology will terminate in Spring of 2019. DL programs for the MA in Teaching and the BBA in West Hawai'i have also been terminated in the last three years.

The latest accreditation review occurred in October of 2014, with the team offering commendations on four items:

- The team sincerely appreciates the candor of the institutional report and openness demonstrated in every meeting and interview conducted during the time on campus.
- UH--H is clear on the institutional mission and values. The team appreciates the connection between the meaning of the degrees offered, a newly emphasized facet of accreditation for WASC, so specifically to the mission and identified values of the organization.
- It is apparent that the initial investments to support learning outcomes assessment work are paying off. The institution has established a solid foundation upon which it can build a robust and sustainable long-term assessment effort.
- Through interviews with alumni, the team learned that UH--H provides students with a transformative educational experience. Alumni spoke of the institution as a living--learning laboratory that offers undergraduate research opportunities in many disciplines. The team agrees with the offered opinion and encourages the campus to consider this feature at the heart and soul of what makes UH--H different from many other institutions.²⁴

These commendations point to UH Hilo's strong culture of assessment that has begun to produce tangible results. The institution has been engaged in core competency assessment since 2012-2013. Papers have been and are currently being read in a senior-level class in every program to draw out data on written communication and information literacy; a separate multiple choice quantitative reasoning test that gauged student ability to infer from visual depiction of information was also deployed in classes spanning all grade levels across all programs .

The commendations also highlight UH Hilo's ability to link programs to unique values that underscore our mission. It is clear from the student perspective that such attention to curricula provides them with a "transformative educational experience."

The 2014 team also noted areas of improvement, which for the immediate interim report were highlighted in the 2014 WASC action letter:

- I. The status of enrollment management efforts, specifically new student enrollment goals and retention targets identified in the institutional report;
- II. Demonstration that the educational effectiveness and assessment efforts are ongoing and have advanced across all programs offered by Hilo and through the co-curricular programs of the campus. It is important that this effort include the integration of core competencies throughout the major programs offered at the undergraduate level;
- III. An update on the financial strength of the institution particularly as it relates to enrollment management success and negotiation with the University of Hawaii system and state legislature;

²⁴ Report of the WSCUC Visiting Team Accreditation Review. October 22-24, 2014. 32.
http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/UHH_TeamreportforAVfall2014.pdf.

- IV. The status of the institutional research office, development of a data warehouse, and use of data to inform decision-making ; and
- V. Demonstration of a commitment to fully support the distance education programs, including the need to provide learning outcomes assessment and faculty development and support to advance the online education objective.²⁵

These five (5) areas are what will constitute the majority of this interim report. Please note that the collection of documents that support this Report can be found at [Documents for the 2016-2017 Interim Report](#).

Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

This main section of the report should address the issues identified by the Commission in its action letter(s) as topics for the Interim Report. Each topic identified in the Commission's action letter should be addressed. The team report (on which the action letter is based) may provide additional context and background for the institution's understanding of issues.

Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes. Responses should be no longer than five pages per issue

I ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT EFFORTS

In a March 2017 report to the UH System Board of Regents, members of the Chancellor's Executive Enrollment Management Committee presented the [UH Hilo's 2017 Enrollment Plan](#):

Over the 2012-2016 period, the total headcount enrollment at UH Hilo has declined steadily from 4157 to 3666, representing 2.5%-4.3% decreases each year. This decline is attributable to both recruitment and retention. Spring 2017 marked the first increase in new classified students since Spring 2012.

The first to second year retention rate has fluctuated over the last decade with a recent significant gain from 63.2% in 2014 to 70.9% in 2015. We have identified majors with the most significant attrition after the first year, and initiated focused advising efforts to address them. The DFIW rate of first year courses have been variable over the same period with notable gains in key classes such as MATH103 (up by 36.8%) and CHEM141 (up by 41.5%).

Analysis of the Spring 2017 data indicated that attrition of freshmen and seniors is currently equal, with sophomores and juniors being 50% better. The 4-year graduation rate improved

²⁵ Mary Ellen Petrisko to Donald O. Straney, March 6, 2015, 4, http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/CAL_150306_UHH_AV.pdf.

from 12.2% in 2009 to 18.7% in 2016, whereas the 6-year graduation rate saw a slight decrease from 36.9% in 2011 to 24.9% in 2016.²⁶

The Committee stated in light of these statistics, “enrollment planning . . . focuses on our undergraduate programs and we do not expect increases in graduate student numbers during the period of the current plan.”²⁷

Also released were enrollment projections as predicted by System IRO:

Draft: Total Enrollment Projections						
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
New Student impact: Percent Increase		-1.9%	0.0%	0.8%	1.6%	1.8%
		-68	1	29	57	67
New student impact: TOTAL ENROLLMENT	3,666	3598	3599	3628	3685	3725
Official Projections - Fall 2017 Base	3,666	3,576	3,535	3,523	3,513	3,510
NEW Student Impact: Difference from projections		22	64	105	172	215
TOTAL ENROLLMENT GOAL		3620	3650	3700	3760	3830
Needed from Retention Impact		22	51	72	75	105
Combined Enrollment Goal: Difference from Projections		44	115	177	247	320
Combined Impact: Percent Increase		-1.2%	0.8%	1.4%	1.6%	2.4%

Note: 2021 Total Enrollment Gain of 320 is 9% above IRAO projection

Campus Name: **Hilo - Enrollment Services projections (New UG students)**

Priority	Measure	Actual 2016	Past 3- Year Average Growth	Targeted Increase in Enrollment Count											
				5-Year Total Increase	5-Year % Change	2017	% Change from Previous Year	2018	% Change from Previous Year	2019	% Change from Previous Year	2020	% Change from Previous Year	2021	% Change from Previous Year
*	Total actual enrollment or targeted enrollment increase (fn1)	986	-7%	104	11%	23	2%	25	2%	16	2%	22	2%	18	2%
1	First Time Freshman from Hawai'i Island	161	0%	26	16%	6	4%	7	4%	5	3%	4	2%	4	2%
2	Transfers from UHCCs & Hawai'i Universities	243	-3%	30	12%	8	3%	4	2%	4	2%	8	3%	6	2%
3	First Time Freshman from Neighbor Islands	90	-8%	19	21%	6	7%	7	7%	1	1%	3	3%	2	2%
4	New Undergraduates from International & Pacific	76	-9%	8	11%	0	0%	1	1%	2	3%	2	3%	3	4%
5	New Undergraduates from US Mainland (+ Other)	331	-7%	21	6%	3	1%	6	2%	4	1%	5	1%	3	1%
6	Returning Students	85	-1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

The Committee released an inventory of current efforts to shore up recruitment and retention. They include: (1) the development of a “new brand” that is “focused on our unique and cultural setting”; (2)

²⁶ “UH Hilo Enrollment Plan,” February 27, 2017, 1, <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/chancellor/documents/UH-Hilo-Enrollment-Plan-02.27.17.pdf>.

²⁷ “UH Hilo Enrollment Plan,” February 27, 2017, 1, <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/chancellor/documents/UH-Hilo-Enrollment-Plan-02.27.17.pdf>.

strengthening the use of social media; (3) the rollout of a new GPS-STAR registration system that enables ease of registration for general education and the major; (4) mandatory advising (including the declaration of a major after 60 credits); (5) embedded peer advising for key first year courses; (6) direct contact between key staff (i.e. CAS Dean and Financial Aid) and students to minimize problems with academic warnings and probation and with FA deadlines; (7) the creation of a Health Care Administration and Community Health Education track in Liberal Studies to capture pre-Nursing students who are unable to enter the BSM program; and (8) a career mentorships program that is currently being developed by the College of Business and Economics.²⁸

The Committee also drafted strategies to tackle the figures received from System IRO:

1. Recruit more first-time students, especially from Hawai'i Island
 - Strengthen partnerships with Department of Education and local high schools
 - Revise recruiting materials and outreach
 - Refine financial aid strategy
2. Recruit more transfer students from UH Community Colleges
 - Increase the number of 2+2 pathways with Hawaii Community College in strategic majors
 - Identify specific majors and regions for targeted, enhanced recruiting efforts on other islands
3. Retain students in their first year; increase from 70% to 80% for both first-time freshmen and first-year transfer students
 - Offer [more] summer-bridge programs to better prepare incoming students for success
 - Increase the number of residential and non-residential living learning communities for first-time freshmen
4. Increase engagement of students with their major and with the island community to enhance retention after their first year
 - Establish peer tutoring programs in key gateway courses (MATH103, and MATH135) and prepare majors to serve as paid tutors (**CORRECTION: Since 2009, Kilohana: The Academic Success Center has been overseeing peer tutoring in Math and Writing, which has been ongoing since the 1990s; ENG 100 and ENG 100T have already piloted imbedded peer tutoring for all courses these past two academic years; Math has a pilot imbedded peer tutoring effort underway as of this Spring 2017**)
 - Expand community service and internship projects as part of curricula to contextualize lesson content and engage students on career pathways
5. Develop new sources of students
 - Recruit stopped-out and other adult learners to finish degrees at UH Hilo
 - Identify one or two new interdisciplinary majors that can be implemented without major new resources that will attract and retain undergraduate students
 - Develop attractive hybrid online courses or degree programs²⁹

²⁸ "UH Hilo Enrollment Plan," February 27, 2017, 2, <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/chancellor/documents/UH-Hilo-Enrollment-Plan-02.27.17.pdf>.

²⁹ Ibid., 3.

UH Hilo has a number of key programs that are a solid reflection of these strategies. First, UH Hilo has been working with Kamehameha Schools and the Hawai'i State Department of Education since 2014 to offer a summer bridge program called [Kupa 'Āina](#), which brings college-aspiring students to experience college-level writing and math courses while participating in "Hawaiian cultural activities to connect them to the island and culture."³⁰ With NSF EPSCor support we will begin running summer bridge programs in mathematics in the summer of 2017. The institution has also developed the [Living Learning Communities \(LLC\)](#), which bring together like-minded freshmen to experience course- and field-work that is tied to key issues via a class called [University 101](#). In the case of the creative arts, Michael Marshall of the Art Department developed paid internships with the help of the [Office of Applied Learning](#) at the local East Hawai'i Cultural Center for his UNIV 101 students—they in turn were able to learn key skills as they helped with installations of exhibitions, signage, and tours at that gallery. The Humanities Division, with a grant from GEAR-UP (Hawai'i P-20), brought in during this current academic year more than 300 students from four Title I designated high schools to experience college instruction in foreign languages, music, stage make-up, and literary and film studies. The institution looks to expanding such outreach to not only improve our enrollment and retention rates, but to also strengthen our overall service to and integration with the community.

UPDATED R&G

While updating the original Retention and Graduation Report that pilot institutions were asked to complete in 2013 was not required, we felt that running the same formulas would allow for better comparisons vis-à-vis our original reaccreditation report. =The following constitutes an analysis undertaken by Dr. Mitchell Anderson, the original author of UH Hilo's R&G report from 2013:

Retention Rates

As Table 1 indicates, retention continues to be a challenge for UH Hilo. The average first year retention rate for students entering during 2013-15 was 60%, down from 66% during 2009-11, representing a 10% decrease. Retention remains highest for Hawai'i residents, consistently hovering around 72.5%. However, the percentage of incoming students that come from Hawai'i declined 11%, while the percentage of incoming students from the Mainland USA increased 26%. Unfortunately, the retention rates for Mainland students declined 20% from 2009-11 to 2013-15, fueled primarily by 32% and 22% drops respectively, for Mainland Lower-division (LT) and Upper-division (UT) Transfer students. This was undoubtedly the primary contributor to the decline in overall student retention. The retention rates for incoming students overall during 2013-15 were very erratic. Both First-Time Freshmen (FT) and Lower-division Transfers (LT) experienced the *lowest* retention rates in the past ten years, 63.2% and 40% respectively, in 2014, and the second *highest* rates, 70.9% and 54.3%, in 2015. At 62.1% in 2014, the retention rate for Upper-division Transfers (UT) was also the second lowest in the past 10 years, but it was then followed in 2015 by its lowest level by far at 52.8%.

³⁰ Susan Enright, "Students say new Summer Bridge program gave them the boost they need to thrive," September 30, 2014, <http://hilo.hawaii.edu/news/stories/2014/09/30/summer-bridge-program/>.

Although the number of Foreign UT from 2009-11 was too small to include in the analysis, with 20 students, it increased 365% to 73 students during 2013-15, with the retention rate declining from 75% to 8%. In 2013, for example, the number of incoming Foreign UT students was 33, but there was a 100% attrition rate for these students. An increase in Foreign LT retention offset this loss, with a resulting net gain of 2 additional students retained each year.

Summary: The number of incoming students each year remained steady from 2009-11 to 2013-15. However, the percentage of Mainland students increased while their retention decreased. Despite the Hawai'i resident retention remaining steady, the increased Mainland attrition resulted in a net loss of 94 students over the three-year period 2013-15 in comparison to 2009-11. The significant changes in Foreign UT attrition also warrants further study. **However, we should note that these figures are based using official numbers from the UH System, which does not extract short-term exchange students (i.e. WUE) from the student data. Local segregation of transfer students intending to complete a degree here at UH Hilo versus transient exchange populations are needed.**

II A. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & ASSESSMENT—ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

UH Hilo is proud to report that we have already undertakes assessments in four key competencies: Critical Thinking, Written Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, and Information Literacy. These core competencies were already a part of the assessment of programs beginning in AY 2013-2014 as reported in Essay Two of [2013 Institutional Report to WASC](#).

Since AY 2013-2014, over 90% of programs across the four colleges have completed these annual assessments, which are funded in large part by the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (through the Faculty Congress). This reflects a commitment to core competency assessment across the majors at the undergraduate level.

Beginning in AY 2013-2014, we have used a modified version of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators that is sent out at the beginning of each academic year:

Have formal Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOS) been developed?	Published where? (website)	Do PLOs include or imply link to Core Competency? (AY 2013-2014: Written Communication)?	Process of Core Competency Assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course (400-level) 2. Assignment 3. Type of Student Artifact 4. Rubric or other instrument 	Data (measurement of the competency)	Action Taken in Response to the Data (What will you do in response to the findings?)	Date of Last Program Review
--	----------------------------	--	--	--------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------

It is important to note that this document collects information on which course is being assessed while encouraging departments to consider how their Program Learning Outcomes (PLOS) are linked to the Core Competencies, which serve as the bedrock for [General Education](#). It also ties these efforts to Program Review (last column)—this is meant to help Departments use the data that they generate in the annual core competencies, including their plans to address the data, in their reviews of their programs. Programs are now on a [rotating five-year schedule](#).

A [sample](#) of a Department Submission of Data and Identifiable Actions for Written Competency reveals how programs “close the loop” on assessment data.

The data submitted to the 3013 WASC Visiting Team included a compilation of data on [Written Communication](#) from a sampling of 300- and 400-level classes across the four colleges. Each program and department assessed student artifacts from a senior-level course of choice. The data for over 200 papers was analyzed for four areas: (1) Line of Reasoning; (2) Organization and Structure, (3) Content, and (4) Language/Prose/Syntax. Because Line of Reasoning relies on the ability to formulate a coherent argument that is supported by evidence synthesized into the paper, this skill set was also tagged as “Critical Thinking” (see yellow column in next table). The statistical significance of findings was reported in our [Response to Section V in the Lines of Inquiry](#) (Item f, p. 2):

	LineReason	OrgStruc	Content	LangGram
N Valid	229	229	229	229
Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.7161	2.6914	2.7755	2.8536
Median	2.5000	2.5000	2.8000	3.0000
Mode	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation	.65779	.63993	.69551	.62962
Minimum	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maximum	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

The data showed students exhibiting difficulty with the two higher cognitive skills required for writing: (1) Line of Reasoning (LOR), and (2) Organization and Structure (OS). More detailed findings were given to Lauri Sagle, the Head of our Composition Program, who has since worked on developing mandatory embedded tutoring for ENG 100T (Freshman Composition with Tutorial) courses (see pages 39 through 55 of [Essay Two](#) from our *2013-2014 Institutional Reaccreditation Self-Study and Report*). Since that time, ENG 100T courses have worked on addressing LOR and OS in embedded tutoring sessions starting in selected courses in Fall of 2014 and all sections as of Fall of 2015. The immediate result is a dramatic drop in the DFIW rates. Historically, ENG 100T saw underperformance in 25-30% of students. That number dropped to 14.5% in Spring of 2015 and 4.6% in Spring of 2016. Since ENG 100 and 100T are our best predictors of student retention and success, the same model is being piloted in ENG 100 (Freshman Composition) as of this academic year.

In AY 2014-2015, we ran Quantitative Reasoning, which relied on a standard instrument developed by the Math Department—the instrument asked: (1) Can students interpret quantitative information

represented graphically? (Visual); (2) Can students extrapolate such quantitative information to solve related problems that one might encounter in everyday life? (Visual and Critical Thinking); and (3) Are our graduating students more proficient at quantitative critical thinking and visual representations than incoming freshmen?

- [QR Measurement \(Test\)](#)
- [QR Rubric](#)
- [QR Assessment Report](#)
- [QR Assessment Freshmen Analysis](#)
- [QR Assessment Seniors Analysis](#)

This assessment was deployed at all levels of class standing:

		Q1		Q2		Q3		All		
Class	n	Mean	Med	Mean	Med	Mean	Med	Mean	Med	Mode
Fresh	195	.66	1	.20	0	.68	1	1.18	1	1
Soph	113	.71	1	.18	0	.64	1	1.25	1	1
Junior	92	.74	1	.32	0	.52	1	1.58	2	2
Senior	310	.73	1	.20	0	.41	0	1.35	1	1
All	710	.71	1	.21	0	.54	0	1.31	1	1

Analysis of this data was provided by then Chair of Assessment, Dr. Mitchell Anderson:

It's difficult putting a positive spin on such results, particularly in light of the fact that if a student were to flip a coin for each question, the expected/average result would be 1.5. The Junior Class was the only class with a mean higher than 1.5, and it also had the smallest representation. The results of Question 1 reveal that most students can read basic information from a graph (i.e. this positively answered our first question), and it also reveals that students tend to improve this skill as they progress from Freshman standing (positively answering part of our third question). The results of Question 2 appear to indicate that we have our work cut out for us with respect to critical thinking (i.e. this partly answers our second question in the negative). The Junior Class scored notably higher, but none of the classes performed as well as simply flipping a coin. The results of Question 3 are particularly disturbing in terms of the third question we wanted answered, with the Juniors and Seniors noticeably under-performing the Freshmen and Sophomores. However, as indicated by the last column in the "Count" table above, 25% more of the Juniors and Seniors achieved the "Competent" level, answering at least 2 of the 3 questions correctly. This is possibly the most revealing statistic in terms of demonstrating increased critical thinking skills as students progress in their studies, which answers our third question in the positive.

And in AY 2015-2016, we assessed Information Literacy in papers from both a sampling of lower level (100- and 200-level GE certified classes) and again at the upper division in all programs. **This represents the first time artifacts that from GE-certified classes from across the University at the lower level were assessed.** The rubric deployed sought to measure student abilities in (1) Document Conventions, (2) Appropriateness of Sources, (3) Evaluating Sources, and (4) Integrating Sources. Again, because skill set 3 and 4 rely on “evaluation” and “synthesis” (terms found in Bloom’s taxonomy), these areas were simultaneously tagged for “Critical Thinking” (see yellow columns):

- [IL Rubric](#)
- [Senior-level Courses \(by programs\)--preliminary data](#) (Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators)
- [Senior-level Courses \(raw data--preliminary\)](#)
- [General Education \(100- and 200-level\)](#)
- [General Education \(raw data--preliminary\)](#)

	Document Conventions	Appropriateness of Sources	Evaluating Sources	Integrating Sources
AVG (Lower Level GE)	1.58	2.70	1.95	1.98
AVG (Senior/Program)	3.08	3.14	3.18	3.16

The fact that students performed worst in what most readers (librarians and English instructors) considered the easiest skill—following a specific academic format (i.e. MLA, ALA, Chicago, Turabian)—as well as the identification of over 25% of these papers plagiarizing passages directly from texts was communicated to the Head of Composition and to the instructional librarians, who have begun looking at more rigorous instruction of citation format in freshman composition classes and in upper division class visits to the library. The Library added more emphasis on citation conventions and bibliographic management tools, especially in courses that were assessed. In some cases, additional information was added to library research guides for those disciplines.

A more [detailed analysis](#) was released to the Faculty Congress and the GE Committee. A [sample](#) of a Department Submission of Data and Identifiable Actions for Information Literacy reveals how programs continue to “close the loop” on assessment data is also included with this report.

Though not considered a “core competency,” literacy was also assessed in AY 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 given various reports from classes where students seemed to be struggling with readings. Using a program called Total Reader, teachers in all ENG 100 and 100T courses were asked to have their students complete a reading test that assigned a “Lexile” score to all test-takers:

Semester	Total Number of Students	Number of Students Reading in the 1200s	Number of Students Reading Below 1200	Number of Students Reading Below 1000	Highest Score	Lowest Score				
Fall 2013	249	65 (26%)	55 (22%)	21 (8%)	1600 (8)	810				
Spring 2014	189	35 (18%)	57 (30%)	22 (11%)	1600 (11)	660				
Fall 2014	221	45 (20%)	93 (42%)	27 (12%)	1600 (2)	880				
Spring 2015	187	39 (20%)	105 (56%)	69 (36%)	1600 (3)	732				
Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11-CCR
100-299	300-499	500-599	600-699	700-799	800-849	850-899	900-999	1000-1024	1025-1049	1050-1300

The data suggests that up to half of our incoming freshmen were reading below the 12th grade level. Sample texts from a number of Departments show the range of readings that are employed here at the University, with many outside of the ability of many of the students tested:

Course	Lexile score
ENG 100	850
PSY 100	850
ENG 205	1150
BUS 111	1230
CHEM 124	1230
ANTH 100	1270
ACCT 201	1320
PHIL 100	1330
POLS 101	1340
SOC 100	1430
HIST 151	1440
KES 206	1520

Reading was also qualitatively assessed using the following rubric:

Level 4 Advanced	Student clearly understands the passage and can make insightful and nuanced inferences as to content of the reading. The summary is coherent and renders the information in a highly articulate manner.
Level 3: Competent	Student demonstrates a basic understanding of the passages and is able to articulate the key issues in his/her own words in a comprehensible manner.
Level 2: Emerging	Student appears somewhat unsure about the passages and cannot fully articulate the ideas presented. The student appears to be simply reiterating key terms and exhibits some difficulty comprehending the issues. Cannot easily paraphrase in his/her own words.
Level 1: Beginning	The student appears unable to comprehend the paragraphs and cannot elucidate the key ideas or issues. The summary includes ideas or information that is not stated by the reading.

Average score for Chemistry 124 Labs (sections 1 and 2, $n = 35$) were 1.93 and 1.87 respectively for a textbook that ranked at 1230 Lexile; the average score for Accounting 201 ($n = 49$) was a 1.5 with only 5 (or roughly 10%) reading at the competent level according to the rubric. The textbook for ACC 201 was rated at a 1320 Lexile.

For the current academic year, the Assessment Committee, now under the leadership of Mary-Louise Haraguchi of the Library, is spear-heading assessment of Oral Communication; [rubric-based evaluation](#) of student oral presentations will target: (1) Organization and Structure, (2) Content, (3) Language, and (4) Delivery. Categories 1 and 2 are tagged as Critical Thinking. Assessment is planned for the end of the Spring 2017 semester, with data to be collected and analyzed in May. [Early submissions from Departments](#) are included with this report.

The data collected so far is not surprising given the student profiles of local Big Island students, who make up a large chunk of our student population (see pages 5-6 of this report). The data identifies specific areas under each Core Competency for us to target in instruction. At the larger institutional level, the data related to writing (Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Reading) has led to the proposal to turn Kilohana: The Academic Success Center into a fully equipped computer classroom as of Fall of 2017 so that mandatory imbedded tutoring time for ENG 100/100T in Kilohana can involve direct instruction of editing and formatting. The purchase of 17-20 laptops with Microsoft Office was authorized by the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is also seeking to “close-the-loop” and to address both reading deficiencies and low pass rates in key pre-Pharmacy and pre-Nursing courses by possibly expanding imbedded tutoring in lower division Chemistry and Math courses.

IIB. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & ASSESSMENT—STUDENT AFFAIRS

The Division of Student Affairs was without permanent leadership starting in Spring of 2014. Several key positions, such as the Director of Admissions and Director of First-Year Experience, were also subject to turnover. Thus, the [assessment website](#) initiated by this division in 2015 has not been updated. Program Review for the various units in this division has also lagged; while new guidelines were proposed in 2006, it is unclear when Program Review was last undertaken.

Given the recent appointment of a permanent Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, the Division is set to resume both assessment and program effectiveness.

III. FINANCIAL STRENGTH OF THE INSTITUTION

This update by the Vice Chancellor Marcia Sakai (Administrative Affairs) and the UH Hilo Fiscal Office identifies relevant changes in the financial operating environment of UH Hilo and describes what we have done as a campus to link enrollment planning with budgeting and to address financial sustainability. We take note that while the 2014 WSCUC visiting team report indicates that we have

sufficient reserves to provide the time needed to try different revenue strategies, this is not sustainable in the long run.

Operating Budgets

We continue to rely on general revenues and tuition revenues as our major revenue sources for operations. General fund appropriations have trended upward, primarily due to collective bargaining and represent ~45 percent of our total revenues. Tuition revenues have increased but that trend has plateaued and is anticipated to begin decreasing over the near term with enrollment. Our enrollment has declined since 2013 but tuition rate increases have more than made up the difference in the past.

Stable and continuing State support removes one source of revenue uncertainty, allowing us to focus on managing and balancing expenditures against more variable tuition revenue. We have managed total operating expenditures through efforts to carefully target allocation and recruitment of faculty FTE, in contrast to replacing on a one-to-one basis. Energy spending has declined in part due to favorable energy prices and in part due to renewable energy investments and LED lighting retrofit work done in-house.

Operating ratios reflect a continuing decline in the relationship between operating revenue and operating expenditures. This reflects slower growth in revenues relative to planned spending, but is mitigated somewhat by State support for capital renewal and deferred maintenance. This highlights the need to stabilize and grow tuition revenue or other sources of revenue and to critically review our spending. (Operating results for 2016 remain under discussion with the UH system office that reports this data.)

Performance Based Funding

New performance based funding was awarded to campuses based on performance for the prior academic year for achievement of goals related the UH System Strategic Directions beginning in 2016 (<http://blog.hawaii.edu/strategicdirections/files/2015/01/StrategicDirectionsFINAL-013015.pdf>).

We received allocations in each of 2016 and 2017 and managed the allocations for one-time investments to grow enrollment and graduation numbers. These include key courses for graduation and retention, new models of advising in the academic homes, themed learning living communities in residence halls, co-curricular program development, recruitment and marketing, transfer and adult student services, and process improvement in financial aid.

Reserve Levels

A first look at our updated financial ratios dependent on year-end tuition balances would indicate a significant decline in financial health. However, this is mostly an artifact of system-wide structural changes in the management of tuition reserves.

The first structural change established a tuition reserve requirement that each campus maintain a minimum of five percent in unencumbered cash from all tuition and fee funds, based upon recurring

expenditures from those funds and general funds in the previous fiscal year (EP 8.210 System-wide Financial Reserves).

The second requires, per legislative statute, that campus Tuition and Fees Special Fund (TFSF) monies lapse to the System (Act 236, Session Laws of Hawaii 2015).

To implement the tuition lapsing requirement of Act 236, campus tuition balances at year-end are transferred to UH System-wide Support and reported there. The minimum 5 percent reserve amounts are held centrally for each campus. In the initial year of implementation, this transfer was made for all except one campus whose reserves were insufficient to meet this five percent amount. Balances remaining after the five percent amount are transferred back to the respective campuses in the new fiscal year.

While our campus retains the benefit of access to our tuition balances, the financial reporting effect is one of reducing our reported year-end net assets. This reduction affects WSCUC financial ratios that rely on this measure. For the initial 2016 year of implementation, this transfer resulted in a \$17.4m reduction in reported year-end net assets and is anticipated to be a permanent reduction in this base.

Use of Reserves

We have used reserves for one-time expenditures, approved as part of the annual review of campus operating budgets at the System Board of Regents level. In 2017, \$3.1m in one-time investments and carryover expenditures were approved to support capital renewal/deferred maintenance, energy reinvestment, construction contingency for the Daniel K. Inouye College of Pharmacy building, student housing, and conversion of contracted security services to in-house employees.

Budgeting as Tied to Enrollments

In the past 4 years, UH Hilo has endeavored to link faculty hiring decisions to enrollments. We have targeted hires for departments with a large student-faculty ratio and for faculty needed with specific expertise to avoid student bottlenecks.

For example, Kinesiology, with 216 majors, was down to three faculty in Spring of 2016, but will grow to five faculty by Fall of 2017. Biology, which had 182 majors in Fall of 2016, lost three full professors but has since been allowed to hire three replacement assistant professors. Organic chemistry is a key course for all pre-health inclined students. A retired organic chemist will be replaced with two organic chemistry faculty. With NSF EPSCoR support we will hire a computer science professor to replace a retiring Instructor, and hire an additional professor of mathematics.

More students enroll at UH Hilo aspiring to be accepted into the BSN in Nursing as opposed to any other program. We are searching for three professors and three instructors this year to replace four departures. We are also searching for a professor of English to teach scientific and technical writing to our science majors to shore up reading and writing deficiencies that are suspected of adversely impacting successful student completion in key pre-Pharmacy and pre-Nursing science courses.

However, not all hiring decisions are based purely on enrollments; some decisions reflect our commitment to honoring our core values, which includes serving the people of Hawai'i Island. Thus, we are currently searching for a Professor in Performing Arts, as anywhere from 5,000 to 9,000 people attend student productions and performances at the UH Hilo Performing Arts Center. We are also searching for: an archaeologist to staff our MA in Heritage Management, which is dedicated to preserving sites of historical and cultural importance on the island; a Professor of Hawaiian Language as part of our mission to sustain and support indigenous-based education; and an Agri-Business Professor, who will help us to better respond to the needs of the local agricultural community, which is made up of small-scale independent farmers.

IV. THE STATUS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICE

[The UH Hilo Institutional Research Office](#) has been staffed by one full-time Institutional Research Analyst. Her functions have been augmented by [University of Hawai'i System Institutional Research & Analysis Office](#), which has taken charge of aligning data across the ten campuses in the State. System IR supplies data on [10-year historical headcount and SSH](#) as well as [five-year enrollment projections](#). It also supplies [Graduation and Retention Rates](#) for this campus that are also set to peer and benchmark comparisons. The System also provides local data on [admissions](#) (including [characteristics of undergraduate applications](#) and profiles of [first-time freshman from Hawai'i State High Schools](#)). UH Hilo's IRO tracks local [Academic Data](#), including [Subject-Department Classes SSH & FTE](#) and [High Risk Courses](#); [Faculty and Course Evaluations](#) are also housed locally.

In the last two years, the IRO has been augmented by Social Sciences Division Chair Thom Curtis per a stipend paid by the VCAA. The current IT Analyst is supported by two student workers, one of whom will be employed as a casual (90-day) hire for the upcoming summer months. Going forward, the University is committed to hiring an additional IR Officer.

V. DISTANCE EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The University has been without a Distance Learning Coordinator since Fall of 2013. Since the retirement of the coordinator, UH Hilo has utilized faculty members to serve as liaisons between UH Hilo and the UH System Council for Distance Coordinators, and between Academic Affairs and the departments that offer courses via this modality. These liaisons then served as the chairs of the [Distance Learning Policy Committee](#), which maintains a webpage that hosts the BOR policy on Distance Learning as well as a number of resources (including links to "best practice") for faculty. The most recent liaison, Dr. Kirsten Møllegaard, began her term in August of 2016 and will be stepping down in preparation for sabbatical leave.

The Committee was charged with developing a rubric of policy proposal for Distance Learning to ensure that DL courses meet academic standards and integrity. The Committee initiated a survey, which solicited the following feedback from faculty:

- There does not seem to be much attention paid to DL instruction on the departmental level, nor to assessing SLOs in DL courses. 63.64% responded NO to question #9: "does your department or program currently track or assess student learning outcomes in DL courses?" 70% responded NO to question #10: "Does your department or program currently review DL course design and/or content?"
- The chronic problem of low DL student response rates on course evaluations makes it difficult for DL instructors to demonstrate competency in teaching for contract renewal and tenure/promotion purposes.
- Few departments have policies in place for reviewing SLOs and instructional methods in DL courses.
- DL courses are assumed rather than demonstrated to be equivalent to face-to-face courses in regard to SLOs and course content.
- DL courses depend significantly on the availability of tech support and help desk, and there are not enough resources allocated to either.
- It is a disadvantage for UHH students that there is no IT office on campus.
- The Online Learning Readiness Check for students (which the majority of respondents do not use) may be in need of an update as new technology becomes available.
- A full-time DL coordinator is needed to organize venues for DL faculty development, support programs' DL objectives, and promulgate best practices for DL courses.³¹

In the process of collecting information and data on DL course delivery, the Committee found that in addition to courses in Nursing, Psychology, and Communication, there are on average another 70-80 in a range of other disciplines across all four academic colleges.³² They also noted the [number of students enrolled](#) in these courses. The Committee also took stock of certain structural problems (internal and external to the university) that inhibit best practice: (1) lack of a DL support center on campus; (2) lack of a proper DL coordinator; (3) lack of Wi-Fi access in rural communities; and (4) prohibitive cost of computers and other equipment needed by students.³³

The Committee has since put forth a [revised policy](#) (which includes key recommendations) specific to UH Hilo, which is under consideration by the Faculty Congress and will be forwarded on to Administration.

³¹ Kirsten Møllegaard, UH Hilo Distance Learning Report AY 2016-17, 3, <http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/DLPolicyReport2016-17.pdf>

³² Ibid., 1.

³³ Kirsten Møllegaard, UH Hilo Distance Learning Report AY 2016-17, 3, <http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/DLPolicyReport2016-17.pdf>.

Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

Instructions: This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred or issues that have arisen at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, addition of major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, unanticipated challenges, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described in the preceding section. This information will help the Interim Report Committee panel gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the actions of the institution discussed in the previous section have taken place.

GRADUATE LEVEL ASSESSMENT

The 2015 Substantive Change Review for the MA in Heritage Management revealed a larger problem of incoherence in graduate level education. At the time, the Review Panel cited: “The Program’s fulfillment of WSCUC’s assessment standards is minimal. The institution should strengthen its assessment framework with a clear, detailed and systematic institutional data collection including direct and indirect measure of student learning.”³⁴ While UH Hilo has a strong tradition of undergraduate assessment, a review of graduate programs revealed: (1) a lack of common SLOs to articulate learning at the graduate level, and (2) any cross-programmatic assessment of key skills and knowledge needed at all graduate levels—masters and Ph.D. This set the Graduate Council in motion. Under the leadership of the current Chair of Assessment Support, Mary-Louise Haraguchi of the Library, the Council developed [Learning Outcomes](#) that were ratified by the Faculty Congress in January of 2017. They are now in the process of developing an assessment schedule based on common student artifacts. Some graduate programs have started publishing their Program Learning Outcomes:

School of Education, College of Arts and Sciences

- [Master of Arts in Teaching \(MAT\) Program](#)
- [Master of Education \(M.Ed.\) Program](#)

Tropical Conservation Biology and Environmental Science, College of Arts and Sciences

- [Master of Science in T.C.B.E.S.](#)

School of Nursing, College of Arts and Sciences

- [Doctor of Nursing Practice](#)

Pharmaceutical Sciences Program, Daniel K. Inouye College of Pharmacy

- [Ph.D. in Pharmaceutical Science](#)

Kahuawaiola: Indigenous Teacher Education Program, Ka Haka ‘Ula o Ke‘elikōlani (College of Hawaiian Language)

- [Master in Indigenous Language and Culture Education](#)

REORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

³⁴ “Substantive Change Action Report,” June 29, 2015, [2,http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/HeritageManagement.pdf](http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/HeritageManagement.pdf).

The University is currently undergoing the process to re-organize the College of Arts and Science (CAS) into smaller units with the intention of: (1) stabilizing and rebuilding enrollment and retention, and (2) removing a level of administration between the dean and the faculty. As of March 5, 2017, the Chancellor is finalizing a plan to separate the three existing divisions into the College of Natural and Health Sciences, the College of Social Sciences, and the College of Humanities. The plan is currently slated for roll-out per the following timeline:

1. April 2017 – Faculty nominated and identified for Interim Dean positions of the three new colleges using the criteria and process detailed in the Natural Science proposal. The faculty identified for interim Dean positions will be compensated to assist in preparing for and leading the transition during Fall 2017;
2. April 2017 – Faculty transition committees identified and formed for each of the new colleges;
3. April-May 2017 – Ongoing consultation with UHPA and HGEA (collective bargaining);
4. June 2017 – Interim Dean appointed for the College of Arts and Sciences during the transition process. CAS will operate under its current structure until at least January 2018;
5. June 2017 – Interim Dean nominees will work with Interim Dean of CAS on the transition during Summer and Fall semesters, 2017;
6. Summer 2017 – Initiate searches for fiscal support positions;
7. Summer-Fall 2017 – Implement plan for reassigning support staff within the new colleges;
8. Fall 2017 – Current CAS Tenure-Promotion/Contract Renewal processes in effect for the 2017-2018 academic year;
9. Fall 2017 – Initiate national searches for new permanent deans;
10. Fall 2017 – Hire new admin-fiscal support positions;
11. December 2017 – New Tenure – Promotion/ Contract Renewal guidelines for each college will be completed in consultation with Administration and approved by UHPA;
12. January 2018 – Plans completed for establishing or continuing key procedures;
13. January 2018 – New Department Chair selection process in place and Department Chairs elected;
14. January 2018 New promotional materials, catalogs, admissions materials updated. VC's will develop a program to implement this;
15. Spring Semester, 2018 – 3 new colleges and reorganization fully implemented (no later than May, 2018);
16. Fall 2018 – New Tenure – Promotion/Contract Renewal panels appointed and operational.

OFFICE OF APPLIED LEARNING (ALEX)

In 2014, the Visiting Team strongly recommended that UH Hilo “formally adopt definitions and guidelines for the myriad of applied learning activities available at the institution. In addition to specifying minimal requirements for courses to qualify for the applied learning designation, the guidelines should be implemented uniformly across campus, should clearly outline criteria for the placement and supervision of interns and the number of credit hours awarded to them (CFRs 2.3, 2.6).”³⁵

ALEX has developed a [Faculty Handbook](#) that addresses most of these concerns for internships that are supervised and/or funded specifically by ALEX. The Handbook addresses On-Site Hours Requirements, Grading Criteria, and an Explanation of Field Supervisor’s Evaluations. Many of the internships listed on the [Internship Database](#) also link to full descriptions of the positions along with minimal qualifications. Other that were funded, included a number of paid internships at the East Hawai’i Cultural Center, are not listed; however, these internships were part of proposals by various departments which were vetted by the ALEX Advisory Committee.

At this time, ALEX has not been able to pursue standardizing other applied learning practices (i.e. teaching practicums, field research, etc.) which are largely and independently overseen by individual programs and departments. No efforts at developing standardized assessments nor any assessment efforts appear to have been undertaken. Part of the difficulty lies in a large variety of different disciplines and learning outcomes that differ from program to program and from college to college. To whom responsibility of assessment in terms of ALEX versus the GCC certification in [General Education](#) (which looks at courses that fulfill Collaborative Skills and Civic Participation) falls to is also unclear.

The role of ALEX is anticipated to change due to reorganization and evolving needs. Given the drop in enrollment, ALEX is being eyed as a means to develop credit-bearing leadership courses that will enable students to serve as peer mentors for incoming freshmen. This possible change to ALEX’s mission is one idea being floated to improve attrition in the second to third year (sophomore to junior) transition (see page 11 of this report).

³⁵ Report of the WSCUC Visiting Team Accreditation Review, October 22-24, 2014, 10, http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/accreditation/documents/UHH_TeamreportforAVfall2014.pdf.

Concluding Statement

Instructions: Reflect on how the institutional responses to the issues raised by the Commission have had an impact upon the institution, including future steps to be taken.

The Institution has kept the Commission’s recommendation that “student success become one of the highest priorities” vis-à-vis some of the statistics on retention and graduation we have been carefully tracking. Enrollment Management has become the utmost priority for our Chancellor, who has made this his base for communication on his [blog](#):

While we continue to develop academic programs that address our island’s needs, we are currently developing new ways to be more effective at recruitment, retention, and graduation rates. We are taking our efforts to a whole new level, focusing our resources on specific students for recruitment and retention. This is part of a University of Hawai’i systemwide initiative where each of the 10 campuses are developing their own five-year enrollment management plans specifically designed with appropriate goals for the individual campus. . .

I want to note that creating access and strengthening retention for students from Hawai’i Island is our top priority. We have a responsibility to serve the whole island, and we are collaborating closely with Hawai’i Community College to achieve recruitment-retention-graduation goals by creating pathways from Hawai’i CC to UH Hilo in programs such as agriculture and Hawaiian studies.

All of these approaches to enrollment management need strong administrative support to be effective and there will undoubtedly be new approaches in admissions, financial aid, communications, and course scheduling. For example, including more scholarships in initial financial aid packages to encourage enrollment, and increasing high school visits by faculty and staff to talk with Hawai’i Island students, are high on the priority list.

UH Hilo cannot grow on its own. We need to work together—faculty, staff, students—along with our local community to the benefit of all. This, combined with our strong partnership with Hawai’i CC, will ensure that Hawai’i Island’s high school students and others will have the options they need to access higher education on our island.³⁶

Such efforts have helped to spur a greater appreciation for the collaboration that is needed between academic and student affairs. The nature of high education in Hilo is changing, from a government funded entity to one that is much more reliant on tuition revenue. As such, the challenges we currently face are helping to forge alliances to help carry us through a difficult transition period.

³⁶ Don Straney, “Chancellor’s Message: UH Hilo developing new enrollment management plan,” April 4, 2017, <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/blog/chancellor/>.