

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

SPECIAL VISIT REVIEW OF

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT HILO

October 14-15, 2009

Team Roster

J. Michael Ortiz, Chair
President
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Leanne Hinton, Team Member
Professor of Linguistics
Department of Linguistics
University of California, Berkeley

Linda C. Buckley, Assistant Chair
Associate Vice President
Academic Planning and Educational Effectiveness
San Francisco State University

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution according to Commission Standards and Core Commitments and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting commission for Senior College and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT3

 A. Description of Institution 3

 B. Recent Accreditation history and Special Visit Report 4

 C. Description of the Team’s Review Process 6

II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS.....7

 A. Institutional Governance and Decision-Making 7

 B. Planning and Enrollment Management..... 13

 C. Doctorate in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization..... 16

III. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE NEXT WASC CYCLE26

IV. CURRENT BUDGET ISSUES28

V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....29

I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution

The University of Hawai‘i at Hilo is a comprehensive regional university located on the island of Hawai‘i, the southernmost and largest island in the Hawaiian archipelago. UH Hilo is part of the University of Hawaii’s ten-campus system of public higher education and is the only accredited, four-year educational institution on the island. Formerly named Hilo College, the University began offering the baccalaureate degree in 1970 and was first accredited by WASC in 1976. The University is comprised of five degree-granting colleges and one outreach college. It offers 32 baccalaureate programs and master’s degrees in six fields. Since 2004 the University has added two doctoral programs, one in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization and another in Pharmacy.

The University is comprised of five degree-granting colleges and one outreach college:

- the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS)
- the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resource Management (CAFNRM)
- Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language (CHL)
- the College of Business and Economics (CoBE)
- the College of Pharmacy (CoP)
- the College of Continuing Education and Community Service (CCECS)

In Fall 2008, total FTE faculty numbered 240.4, with full-time faculty headcount at 208 and part-time faculty at 83. UH Hilo had 3,247 FTE students, an increase of 5.7% over Fall 2007, and a headcount of 3,773, an increase of 5.6%. Of these, 321 were graduate students

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

(headcount), including students admitted to the College of Pharmacy, for an increase of 8.5%. As of August 10, 2009, it is anticipated that enrollment for Fall 2009 will rise by seven percent.

B. Recent Accreditation history and Special Visit Report

This section on recent accreditation history will refer to the following:

- The Spring 2004 WASC Educational Effectiveness Review
- The January 2008 Special Visit Report from UH Hilo
- The March 2008 Special Visit
- The June 2008 Commission Action Letter
- The August 2009 Special Visit Report from UH Hilo
- The October 2009 Special Visit

In Spring 2004, the University underwent its WASC Educational Effectiveness review and WASC reaffirmed the accreditation of the University and scheduled the next review to begin with a proposal in 2010, the Preparatory Review for 2013, and the Educational Effectiveness Review for 2014. In addition, the Action Letter identified four issues that were to be addressed in a March 2008 Special Visit:

1. Mission, Planning, and Institutional Resources
2. Institutional Governance and Organizational Structures
3. Diversity

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

4. Educational Effectiveness

The charge to the Special Visit Team also called for a review of the two newly implemented doctoral degrees at the time of the visit in March 2008.

Special Visit – 2008

The University's Special Visit Report of January 2008, which preceded the March 2008 site visit, was organized around the four issues raised in the Commission's 2004 Action Letter and the approval letters for the two new doctoral programs. The report documented notable progress in the areas of fund raising and diversity while the sections on institutional resource planning, governance, and educational effectiveness indicated minimal progress, most of which had occurred within the 9 months preceding the visit. The sections of the report that addressed the doctoral programs and graduate programs and graduate education in general were abbreviated and, in the case of the Hawaiian Indigenous Languages and Culture Revitalization, raised many questions among team members with regard to capacity and stability.

The March 2008 WASC team focused all of its attention on the issues indicated above. It commended the institution for great progress in regard to external funding, diversification of the faculty, incorporation of issues of Hawaiian culture into the curriculum, and implementation of the two new doctoral programs. Also worthy of commendation were major additions to the physical infrastructure of the campus and to the senior administrative leadership. In addition to its commendations, the visiting team noted some significant areas of concern, most especially in regard to governance and decision-making and the doctorate in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization. The Commission endorsed

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

the findings and recommendations of the Special Visit team and urged UH Hilo to give them full consideration. In addition, the Commission requested another Special Visit in Fall 2009 in order to investigate the progress on the following issues of concern.

- Institutional Governance and Decision-Making
- The Doctorate in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization

C. Description of the Team's Review Process

The 2009 Special Visit Team began their preparation for the October 2009 visit two months before the actual site visit. Team members received from WASC a package of materials that included the January 2008 Special Visit Report from UH Hilo, the March 2008 Special Visit Team Report, the June 2008 WASC Commission Action Letter, and the August 2009 UH Hilo Special Visit Report. Each team member read all materials and recorded their impressions of the extent to which UH Hilo had responded to the Commission recommendations and the relevant WASC Standards. In mid-October, all team members participated in a telephone conference call to discuss and compare their analyses and to refine the remaining questions to be asked of university personnel and additional materials that the team needed to examine. The team met on the evening of October 13, 2009 to review and confirm the visit itinerary.

On October 14 and 15, 2009, the team members met with the Chancellor, the ALO, the VCAA, the Graduate Council, the Registrar, the Long Range Budget Planning Committee, representatives from the Faculty Congress Executive Committee, the GE and Assessment Committees, and faculty and students from the College of Hawaiian Languages. The team

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

also read and discussed 16 messages that had been sent to the team through the confidential email account established for this visit. All of the requested materials were provided to the team in a timely manner, and all university personnel cooperated openly and candidly during our conversations. In general, the team was very well-taken care of during the visit, and would like to extend thanks to everyone involved at the UH Hilo campus, especially the Accreditation Liaison Officer, who provided constant support during the visit.

II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

A. Institutional Governance and Decision-Making

The 2008 Special Visit Report noted continuing problems associated with the two-tiered faculty governance system, including conflicts between the University Congress and the college senates, conflicts between the college senates and the deans, duplication of work, and inconsistent decision-making processes. (CFR 1.3 and 3.10)

In its June 2008 Action Letter, the Commission recommended:

- There be a systematic method for the codification of University policies (CFR 3.8);
- Governance structures and responsibilities be formally resolved and codified in the Faculty Manual. (CFR 3.8 and 3.11) This would include implementing the recommendations that:
 - Purview over curricular review and approval move to the University Congress “to ensure appropriate university-wide input and to avoid redundancy in courses;”

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

- The college deans' roles be clarified so that there is a clearer correlation between their responsibilities and their authority in both academic and fiscal matters;
- The shared governance process be clarified in order to articulate the “difference between consultation with faculty to inform academic and administrative decisions compared to the (administration’s) authority to make final decisions”;
- The University administration play an appropriate role in ensuring that the governance structure, however delineated, supports effective decision making.

It should be noted that the Commission Action Letter of June 2008 indicated that unless these problems were resolved satisfactorily, the University “could be found out of compliance with Standard 3.”

University Response to Commission Recommendations

According to the August 2009 Special Visit Report, in consultation with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) and faculty representatives of each college, the Chancellor appointed a Task Force on Shared Governance and charged it with addressing the Commission’s concerns. Task force members included the VCAA as chair, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VCSA) as facilitator, the campus ALO, and a representative from each of the colleges, the Graduate Council, and the Faculty Congress.

Over AY08-09, the task force developed procedures for academic policy review and for campus-wide curricular review, specifying the responsibilities of the college deans, the

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

VCAA, the chancellor, and a new Campus-wide Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC) associated with the Faculty Congress.

Drafts of the procedures were presented to the faculty both online and in open meetings, and were reviewed by the Deans Council, the VCAA's Academic Affairs Council, and the Chancellor's Staff. The task force completed its deliberations in April 2009 and sent its recommendations to the Chancellor. She approved the final version of these procedures in June 2009, for implementation Fall 2009.

The new policy procedure provides a pathway for proposals for new campus-wide academic policies and revisions to current policies. The new process is laid out in a widely distributed flowchart that includes explanatory notes.

Faculty, staff, departments, and administrators can initiate campus-wide policy proposals and revisions for policy modification, with consultation with affected and/or expert campus constituencies strongly encouraged at each level of review. New academic policies are added to the campus Academic Policies website, the UH Hilo Faculty Handbook, and other appropriate venues, including a new Chancellor's webpage. College-specific academic policies are also possible. For such policies, the dean becomes the decision-maker. Following his approval, the policy is added to the college's policy manual.

In preparation for the new process, a review was completed in Spring 2009 of policies and practices presented in the Faculty Handbook. Long-standing academic policies specific to UH Hilo were separated from UH system policies and conditions established by the faculty union contract. In the summer of 2009, the VCAA approved, with the support of the Deans Council, the codification of a set of long-standing campus-wide academic practices as

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

campus academic policy. These academic policies have been integrated into the 2009-2010 Faculty Handbook, distinguished from system policies and union requirements; the handbook is posted at <http://www.uhh.hawaii.edu/uhh/teaching>. The University's new academic policies online archive is now being populated and will be maintained by the UH Hilo library; this archive is at <http://www.uhh.hawaii.edu/policies/index.php>. The University believes that the interest generated by the new process will lead faculty to review existing policies, reconsider their genesis, and update them in light of changing conditions.

The August 2009 document also maintains that the University has taken steps to clarify the roles of the deans in academic and fiscal matters. In the new curriculum and academic policy processes, the role of the deans is clearly defined. College review bodies are to determine that curricular proposals are consistent with academic integrity, program coherence, and the University's mission and strategic plan; that adequate resources are available for the proposed changes; and that cross-college programs are reviewed by all affected units. Implications for departments are identified, verified, and resolved. In approving proposals and passing them on for subsequent review and action, deans are certifying that evidence has been provided that these expectations have been met.

Deans may approve policy proposals, may return them to initiators or college review bodies for reworking, or may, after consultation, disapprove them. Approved policies are added to the college policy manual if they are college-specific or forwarded to the Congress if they involve more than one college.

In August 2008 a Deans Council was formed by the VCAA, composed of the deans of CAFNRM, CAS, CoBE, CoP, and CCECS; the director of CHL; and the university librarian;

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

it is convened each month by the VCAA. The deans, directors, and VCAA discuss college-specific and campus-wide academic and fiscal issues and have, as a council, made recommendations to the VCAA on such matters as the new curriculum and policy processes, the recent codification of long-standing academic practices as academic policy, and the new timeline for curriculum review.

All deans are members of the Enrollment Management Initiative Team (EMIT), and two deans are members of the Long Range Budget Planning Committee (LRBPC). Thus, deans are active contributors to the development of new university policies pertaining to student retention, recruitment, and academic success; and to fiscal planning and the development of the university budget. Through these standing committees they provide feedback to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, who chairs EMIT, and the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs, who chairs the LRBPC.

The deans receive allocations to the colleges for faculty salaries, lecturer funds, and operating expenses. Budget allocations come to the campus from the UH System, internal allocations are made to the three major units—Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Administrative Affairs—by the office of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs following consultation with the Chancellor’s Staff and the LRBPC, and allocations are made to the colleges by the VCAA. The deans receive faculty feedback and work with college-level shared governance entities to set funding priorities.

In addition to clarifying the role of the deans, the University has also more clearly articulated the decision-making roles of administrators and consultation rights of faculty. The chancellor’s expanded website now posts information for the campus on university

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

policies, governance roles and responsibilities, and organizations that advise the chancellor.

The webpages may be accessed at

<http://www.uhh.hawaii.edu/chancellor/OfficeoftheChancellor.php>. Links are provided in a number of places to Board of Regents Policy 1-10 on “Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision Making and Academic Policy Development.”

Both of the new campus-wide procedures discussed above allow for faculty initiation of curriculum and policy proposals. Consultation among faculty and between deans and college faculty is essential as the proposals circulate within the college.

In a newly codified policy, decisions regarding course assignments and scheduling are made by department chairs (and division chairs in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Hawaiian Language) in consultation with the dean/director of the college. It is the dean’s responsibility to advise and to consult with department and division chairs about patterns of course enrollment and demand, and to make the final decision in such matters as canceling under-enrolled courses and reassignment of faculty to teach high demand classes. EMIT has assisted the deans in this regard by making current enrollment data available and by establishing campus-wide deadlines for such decisions. The first campus-wide course cancellations and re-assignment of faculty occurred July 6, 2009, with compliance from all degree-granting colleges.

Team Findings

The team met with the Council of Deans, Graduate Council, Task Force on Shared Governance, College Senate representatives, Faculty Congress Executive Committee as well as the Vice Chancellors and determined that the response to the Commission’s

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

Recommendations have been addressed as indicated in the Campus Report. The Task Force on Shared Governance developed a plan to codify Academic Curricular and Policy decisions. The recommendations were vetted through the institutional community and were met with widespread support. The recommendations of the Task Force approved by the Chancellor have resulted in the clear delineation of the role of the college senates in relation to the university Congress regarding curriculum and policy and the creation of the Campus-wide Curriculum Review Committee. This action addresses a key concern cited in the Commission's Report and has resolved the problems which existed in the two tiered governance structure. In addition, the Library archivist has created an archive of policies in the Library and was actively engaged in the identification and cataloguing of university policy, past and present, to ensure the accuracy of the Faculty Handbook and to create an accessible archive. All new policies created through the newly approved process will also be included.

All levels of faculty and administrators were informed of the procedures recommended by the Shared Governance Task Force, recommended by the Congress and approved by the Chancellor. All of the structural concerns regarding shared governance that were noted in the March 2008 Special Visit appear to have been addressed through this process. Additionally, the Long Range Budget Planning Committee was identified as a model for shared governance by faculty and administrators alike.

B. Planning and Enrollment Management

While the 2008 Commission Action Letter commends the University for its progress in strategic planning, it also notes that strategic planning efforts need to be situated within the

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

context of system planning priorities. The dominant issue in the conflict between the system-wide funding model and the preferred Hilo model is the proportion of students who are not Hawaiian residents.

In response to this issue, the Commission recommended that the University establish an Enrollment Management Committee to develop a growth plan for the campus that is within the parameters set by the Regents and the System, and that would establish a plan that integrates incremental growth with appropriate resource allocation and ensures educational effectiveness.

In response to this recommendation, the August 2009 Special Visit Report states that the University has developed an Enrollment Management Implementation Team (EMIT). EMIT represents another major institutional initiative to meet student need/enrollment growth through more effective planning and institutional coordination. The Team was convened in August 2008 by the Chancellor and tasked with improving enrollment planning and management processes. Composed of decision-makers and key representatives from the Chancellor's Office and the Divisions of Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Student Affairs, and University Relations, the Team has met twice a month since its inception. It is chaired by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and co-chaired by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The deans of each academic college are members.

Discussion and action by EMIT members focus on enhancing the recruitment, retention, and graduation of students. The overall goal is to do so in a purposeful, coordinated manner that aligns initiatives and outcomes with UH Hilo's mission and campus strategic plan, as well as with the UH System's strategic goals and performance measures. Of note, EMIT has

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

instituted and is refining a course management planning cycle. This new process tracks and predicts student registration and strives to match course offerings/seat availability with student demand, with an eye towards improving student time-to-degree. EMIT is also in the process of rethinking UH Hilo's marketing and brand strategies to allow for more effective and targeted recruitment/retention of students. More detailed information on EMIT is available at

<http://www.uhh.hawaii.edu/chancellor/EnrollmentManagementImplementationTeam>

It is important to note the EMIT has helped to forge important collaborations and partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs. The responsibility for student success is seen as a shared endeavor and a shared responsibility. EMIT also has been a means for improved and timely campus communication about student-related concerns. Through a Team blog, members remain abreast of current discussions and have an easy reference page to guide enrollment-related decisions; similarly, regular updates regarding enrollment figures are provided to all members. Further, the work of EMIT has been data-driven; the work of the campus Officer of Institutional Research (under the Division of Academic Affairs) and of the UH System Institutional Research Office is used to inform discussion and decisions in an objective way. These discussions should serve as the foundation for improved curricular and co-curricular program delivery, and thus enhanced student success going forward.

Team Findings

The university has benefited much from the creation of the EMIT. It has resulted in supporting data driven decisions which have enhanced the institution's ability to respond to

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

the curricular needs of current and future students while working within a restricted budget. While this is not a shared governance committee, it has representation from all of the university constituents including the Congress.

C. Doctorate in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization

The 2008 Special Visit Report raised a number of serious issues regarding the integrity and viability of the HILCR program. Specifically, the team noted a serious conflict of interest in the program's inclusion of its own faculty as students in the program. In addition, the team noted problems with assessment, the publication of M.A. and Ph.D. curricula, and program capacity.

Based on the team report, the Commission found the University to be out of compliance in its fulfillment of CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.7. In response to these issues the Commission recommended:

- Clarifying admissions requirements for the Ph.D.
- Delineating the curriculum of the Ph.D. vis-à-vis that of the M.A. and publishing a curriculum showing the differentiation between the two;
- Assessing student learning for both the M.S. and Ph.D.
- Developing a conflict of interest policy covering individuals serving simultaneously as students and faculty;
- Building faculty capacity

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

University Response to Commission Recommendations

According to the August 2009 Special Visit Report, there has been much activity within the Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language (CHL). The graduate programs have been reviewed and policies and practices have been developed in consultation with external experts, to develop a sustainable and effective assessment system, and clarify their mission and broaden their vision. An immediate product of training in assessment practices has been a multi-year plan for integrating student learning assessment into the graduate programs, with the objective of ensuring continuous improvement in learning and teaching. (CFR2.3)

According to the document, the college has also reaffirmed its original vision. The core purpose of the Ph.D. program in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization (HILCR) has been the development of Hawaiian language-speaking academics to serve the project of Hawaiian language revitalization. However, as indicated by the inclusiveness in the title of the program, from the outset it has welcomed representatives of other indigenous peoples; the first student to earn the doctorate is, in fact, a Maori speaker. When the next Ph.D. cohort comes in, the college will reach out to students and scholars of indigenous languages throughout the Pacific and the Americas.

In addition, two external reviewers, University of Kansas professors of linguistics and preservation of indigenous native American languages, visited the college November 18-21, 2008, examining policies and practices and interviewing students and faculty. The director of the Alaska Native Language Center also spent a sabbatical semester at the college, observing the operations of the graduate programs. (CFR 2.1, 2.7) In April 2009, the VCAA

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

and ALO consulted with the president of the Commission regarding progress in the program. Suggestions from these several experts have been incorporated into recently approved policies for the college's graduate programs regarding conflict of interest, make-up of comprehensive and dissertation committees, and language of the dissertation.

Of the cohort admitted in 2006, one has completed all course work and the comprehensive examination and has successfully defended her dissertation. She was awarded the Ph.D. in HILCR in December 2008. Four others have passed their comprehensive examination; two dissertation proposals have been approved by committees, and two other proposals are under review and revision.

In response to the Commission recommendation, the admissions requirements for the Ph.D. program appeared on page 288 of the university catalog for 2008-2009 and will appear in that section of all subsequent university catalogs

(<http://www.uhh.hawaii.edu/catalog/graduate-education.html>). These and other program requirements also appear on the university's Admissions webpage:

<http://www.uhh.hawaii.edu/studentaffairs/admissions/Ph.D.h.php> (CFR 2.2)

With regard to the delineation of the M.A. and Ph.D. curricula, the University demonstrated in its August 2009 Report a matrix of the required and elective courses for post-baccalaureate and graduate programs of the College of Hawaiian Language, including the MA in HILCR and the Ph.D. program in HILCR. As is the practice in the University of Hawai'i system, doctoral courses are numbered 700 and above, while master's level courses are numbered 600 and above. The Ph.D. program offers students four tracks: indigenous education, indigenous language and culture, Hawaiian language and culture, and language

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

planning. Each student chooses two of these tracks. Each of the 794 doctoral seminars has as prerequisites 600-level courses, which are taken for credit by students in the master's programs. However, for doctoral students, these 600-level students do not count toward the Ph.D. in HILCR. (CFR2.2)

With regard to assessment of the graduate programs, some work has occurred, but much work remains to be done. In Spring 2008, following a workshop presented at UH Hilo by Dr. Mary Allen, the Ph.D. faculty developed a set of student learning outcomes and a draft assessment plan for the Ph.D. program. In September 2008, a member of the Ph.D. faculty and a member of the M.A. faculty participated in the WASC Retreat on Student Learning and Assessment, Level I in California.

Over the course of the 2008-2009 academic year, these representatives worked with faculty of each of the programs to refine program assessment plans and statements of student learning outcomes. (CFR 2.3) The faculty has not actually implemented their plan, drawing data, analyzing the data, and responding to the results.

The Ph.D. faculty and the VCAA consulted on the question of conflict of interest with the dean of the Graduate Division of UH-Mānoa and the University of Kansas external reviewers; notes of the meeting with the dean and the external reviewers' report are provided in Appendices 4 and 5 of the August 2009 Special Visit Report. New policies regarding conflict of interest, composition of dissertation committees, and language of dissertation and associated documents were approved by the Graduate Council and the VCAA in Summer 2009. (CFR 1.8, 2.2) The policies provide that:

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

- Policies pertaining to the doctoral program are presented to the College of Hawaiian Language's senate of the whole, but only faculty with the doctorate can vote on these.
- CHL faculty who are currently enrolled in the Ph.D. program may not sit on college or university personnel committees.
- Evaluation of comprehensive exams of CHL faculty who are enrolled in the Ph.D. program will be conducted by the doctoral faculty with the assistance of professors external to the program.
- CHL faculty enrolled in the Ph.D. in HILCR program may not teach any course that is part of the doctoral program (i.e., 700-level courses) nor any 600-level course that serve as a pre-requisite to the 794 doctoral seminars.
- The dissertation committee will include an institutional representative from a related field but outside CHL, to provide additional academic direction to the student and to guarantee to the university that proper standards are upheld.

The University has also responded to questions of program sustainability and faculty capacity in a variety of ways. At the time of the March 2008 site visit, the college had three tenured or tenure-track faculty and was in the process of hiring two new faculty with doctorates in linguistics, bringing to five the number of full-time tenure track faculty available to teach courses in the M.A. and Ph.D. programs. In Spring 2009, the college formalized its arrangements with affiliate faculty from UH Mānoa, the University of Western Washington, and the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, each of whom has taught at least one of the doctoral courses and each of whom is a well-established scholar in his or her field.

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

Other affiliate faculty, some of whom have taught in the graduate program, have participated at various stages in the review and approval process.

In addition, CHL has led a national and international movement to connect graduate programs serving indigenous students in the field of indigenous language education through technology-assisted joint meetings of graduate classes. Co-participant institutions are the University of Arizona, the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, and the University of Waikato in New Zealand. The college will continue to work cooperatively with other such programs to ensure diversity and rigor in course offerings. Such cooperation is part of an overall effort of the college to carefully schedule its offerings from the B.A. programs through the various M.A. programs and the Ph.D. in HILCR to make the most efficient use of faculty resources during a time of budget uncertainty.

Finally, the August 2009 report notes that after a visit from a three-member international site team, the college received accreditation in Spring 2009 from the World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC), headquartered in Norway. UH Hilo thus joins universities in New Zealand, Canada, and Europe in being accredited by WINHEC. UH Hilo also becomes the first American university to receive WINHEC accreditation; Montana State University is currently under review. Founded on the principles of the Articles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, WINHEC's intent is to build global awareness of and support for the indigenous language recovery movement worldwide. (CFR 2.1, 2.2)

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

Team Findings

We find that the HILCR Ph.D. program has resolved or is on the path toward resolving the issues brought up by the commission. The team commends the College of Hawaiian Language for their progress in addressing the issues brought up by the WASC commission. They have paused in their acceptance of new students, which has given them a chance to refine the program considerably and to make headway in the problem areas. We address these one at a time.

- Clarifying admissions requirements for the PhD. The admissions requirements are now clearly stated in the online catalog: see <http://www.uhh.hawaii.edu/catalog/doctor-of-philosophy-ph.d.-in-hawaiian-and-indigenous-language-and-culture-revitalization.html>
- Delineating the curriculum of the PhD vis-à-vis that of the MA and publishing a curriculum showing the differentiation between the two. There is now a list of required and elective classes that clearly separate the Ph.D. from the M.A. programs. See Appendix 7 to the Report to WASC.
- Assessing student learning for both the master's and the doctorate. Members of the HILCR faculty have attended workshops on campus and a WASC-sponsored workshop in California for assessment training, and have met together at length to evaluate their qualifying exam and discuss changes. They have developed a draft of an assessment plan for program outcomes (Report of Assessment Work (July 17, 2009), Appendix 8 in the Report to WASC). There is still much work to be

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

done, as they indicate in their report. We acknowledge that progress is taking place.

- Developing a conflict of interest policy covering individuals serving simultaneously as students and faculty. There is a paucity of human resources for Hawaiian language and culture teaching and revitalization. Since Hawaiian is an endangered language, anyone who knows the language and is interested in language revitalization of their language is likely to be tapped to teach. Thus virtually all the graduate students in the program are teaching either at one of the immersion schools or, if qualified, at the University. It is not surprising that their current cohort of Ph.D. students are also some of their most valued teachers. We have learned that there is a similar Ph.D. program in Indigenous Languages that has recently been developed at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks which has the same situation, in which their Ph.D. students also teach. It was pointed out by WASC that it is vital to develop a good conflict of interest policy to deal with this issue. The college invited Profs. Akira and Kimiko Yamamoto of the University of Kansas to come to campus to review their HILCR program, focusing in large part on the conflict of interest issue. The visit helped the college develop ideas that are now being implemented.

- (1) Every graduate student must have an outside member of their dissertation committee as well as for their qualifying exams;
- (2) The completed dissertation will also be reviewed by an expert external reader before it is accepted;

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

- (3) The current Ph.D. cohort has had a majority of their classes taught by highly qualified visiting professors from other institutions, which has meant that they are being evaluated by people without a conflict of interest, as well as receiving a broader education than if all their courses were being taught by the same small group of people who taught their Masters' courses.
- (4) The program is also developing a group of affiliate faculty from other institutions, who will enrich the program (see below) and can also serve as mentors and outside dissertation committee members who do not have potential conflict of interest.
- Building faculty capacity. The department is to be commended for bringing in two new members of the faculty last year: Drs. Scott Saft and Yumiko Ohara, who have a strong interest in Asian languages and endangered languages. These two faculty members were originally teaching linguistics in the College of Arts and Sciences. Now they have tenure track positions in the College of Hawaiian Language, which means that the entire linguistics major has been incorporated into the College programs. There are now two undergraduate streams: Linguistics, and Hawaiian language, both of which have a healthy and growing set of majors. Besides teaching general linguistics courses, Drs. Saft and Ohara have designed new courses in keeping with their new department: Dr. Saft teaches a course on "Languages of Hawaii," and Dr. Ohara teaches "Critical Applied Linguistics." The new faculty members are qualified to teach the Ph.D. level courses listed, and also can do undergraduate teaching that will relieve other faculty to teach the Ph.D. level courses.

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

In addition to the two new Ph.D.'s, the department is in the process of developing a cadre of Affiliated Professors at institutions with a focus on endangered languages and language revitalization. These include faculty at the University of Arizona, the University of Alaska, and universities in New Zealand. Currently the faculty here is teaching courses that include partnership via professors at some of these universities, with weekly joint classes via video-conferencing technology (PolyCom).

The department states that it still has a need for additional faculty, and in particular they want to have a faculty member who specializes in the languages of North America.

- Other issues for building the Ph.D. program. As the first Ph.D. program on campus, this program lacks some important resources. As the faculty said to us, “Everything has to do with the scheduling of scarce resources.” They are working on how to organize course offerings for the B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. programs so that they can offer the courses when the students need them. One of the biggest problems is that there are no student assistantships at the Hilo campus, meaning that there is no steady way to give support to their students. Student assistantships would also be helpful to relieve some of the faculty work overload.

Concluding remarks re the PhD program.

The College has been a major force in Hawaiian language revitalization around the state, including being a major player and support system in the Hawaiian immersion school

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

movement. Their curriculum center creates most of the materials and books used in those schools. The well-known birth-through-12th-grade Laboratory School (Nāwahīokalani‘ōpu‘u) is fully integrated into the workings of the College. From the establishment and support of the laboratory immersion schools to the Hawaiian language B.A. and M.A., the College of Hawaiian Language has been extremely effective. We hope that they will succeed in making their Ph.D. program as effective as their other enterprises.

III. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE NEXT WASC CYCLE

The 2008 Special Team Report noted that only modest progress had been made in involving faculty in student learning assessment since 2004. More specifically, the report stated that most departments were not assessing student learning (CFR 2.4; 2.6), that syllabi did not include student learning outcomes, and that no systematic process for faculty involvement in program review had been developed. (CFR 4.8)

Concurring with the Special Team Report, the Commission recommended that the University develop a faculty-led process for program review. In addition, they urged departments to be able to demonstrate that they have actually begun to assess students learning and as a result have begun to improve curricula in response to their assessment results.

University Response to Commission Recommendations

The August 2009 Special Visit Report addresses Educational Effectiveness in terms of curricular review. The document states that in April 2009, the Task Force on Institutional Governance asked the administration to undertake the implementation of both the curriculum review and academic policy processes by the beginning of the Fall 2009 semester.

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

As a part of that project, a new timeline was developed for reviewing curriculum changes with campus-wide impact. The two-cycle, fall and spring semester timeline that went into effect in August 2009 will provide time for appropriate planning and thoughtful consideration of curricular changes, including new courses, course modifications, new programs, and program modifications, and that ensures that students are informed in a timely manner of the requirements for their academic majors, minors, and certificates. Departments must begin planning such changes between a year and 18 months in advance of the publication of the catalog in which the changes will appear.

In addition, a new online system was adopted to manage the new procedures. UH Hilo is preparing to adopt an online proposal and tracking system developed for the UH system. The University believes that the tracking system, called Curriculum Central, can solve such long-standing problems as lost proposals, proposals that do not comply with requirements, and absent-minded reviewers. It allows proposers to submit proposals in electronic format, tracks the proposals through the approval process, reports to proposers and reviewers the progress of each proposal through each step of the process, serves as a repository of proposals both in process and approved, and feeds into the university's Banner student information system and the university catalog. The degree-granting colleges will pilot the system in Fall 2009, and it is anticipated that beginning with the Spring 2010 review cycle, all proposals will go through the system.

Team Findings

Based on conversations with the registrar, the Shared Governance Task Force, administration, and faculty, it appears that the curriculum review process and program review

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

cycles have been developed and vetted with the Faculty Congress. Once these processes are implemented, the University should realize a much greater degree of oversight for curricular change and development. The Visiting Team, however, would caution the University that there is no clarity regarding the office or individual to be responsible for the implementation and adherence to the new policies. Without a strong commitment to administrative oversight, it is unlikely that the University will be able to realize the improvement in infrastructure that these policies are intended to provide for. In addition, although the Commission Action Letter did not specifically instruct the Visiting Team to report on the development of programmatic assessment, the team observed that much work remains in this area before the next WASC visit. The University would be well-advised to revisit this area and focus significant attention on this issue as they begin to prepare for the next WASC cycle.

IV. CURRENT BUDGET ISSUES

Because of the pervasive economic downturn throughout the WASC region, WASC has requested an investigation of the major impact of resource shortfalls to all institutional site visits. Team findings after speaking with campus and system officials indicated that UH Hilo is viewed as playing a special role in the system because of the nature of the programs which are offered. Enrollment growth is expected to be slow and steady as a result of the reputation of the campus. It is seen as a serious choice for many. Additionally, many Hawaiians are choosing to remain in Hawai'i because of the economic conditions and UH Hilo is an affordable option. The University has also established an excellent reputation in the Pacific Rim and will continue to attract students from this region. Additional housing is recognized as an important factor in realizing the growth potential of the campus. The

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

campus target continues to be between five and seven thousand. Several options are being considered to address the adverse economic conditions that are affecting the System. The Hilo campus shares in the reductions.

The campus is viewed as making good progress on the system strategic plan and academic planning. As a result, Hilo was acknowledged for doing its part in attempting to meet the needs of the state.

Preparation is underway to replace the chancellor, who is stepping down, with a search firm being selected in mid to late November. Recruitment will begin in January.

V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Commendations

The University of Hawaii, Hilo is commended for:

1. The work of the Task Force on Shared Governance in developing a plan to codify academic curricular and policy decisions.
2. The work of the Enrollment Management Implementation Team (EMIT) for instituting and refining a course management planning cycle that will track and predict student registration, match course offerings with student demand, and improve time to degree. Once implemented, this project will align recruitment and retention with the University's strategic priorities and performance measures.
3. The efforts of the faculty in the Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization doctorate to clarify admissions requirements for the Ph.D. and to differentiate the M.A. and Ph.D. curricula.

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

4. Building faculty capacity in the HILCR doctoral program.
5. Developing a conflict of interest policy covering individuals serving simultaneously as students and faculty in the HILCR doctoral program.

B. Recommendations

The Special Visit Team recommends:

1. That the University move forward with implementation of the curricular planning and policy review and approval process developed by the Task Force on Shared Governance.
2. That the university administration allocate resources to provide for oversight of curriculum planning and development.
3. That the University develop appropriate administrative oversight of graduate education.
4. That university administration provide leadership for further development of programmatic student outcomes assessment. Special attention should be paid to this recommendation in preparation for the next WASC reaccreditation review.
5. That the Enrollment Management Implementation Team continue to work with Institutional Research in the implementation of the newly developed enrollment planning and management processes.
6. That the faculty of the College of Hawaiian Language, including the Ph.D. faculty in HILCR, continue to implement its assessment plan and be prepared to show data, analysis and results in the next WASC reaccreditation review.““

FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

7. That the HILCR doctoral program work with administration to secure the resources needed to develop a viable doctoral culture at UH Hilo.
8. That WASC carefully review the HILCR doctoral program in its next scheduled visit since many of their plans cannot be implemented until the program begins accepting doctoral students again.
9. That the timeline for the next WASC reaccreditation proposal be moved to 2011 in order to give the campus sufficient time to implement the many initiatives that have been put in place in response to the 2008 and 2009 Special Visits.