Substantive Change Action Report

Proposal Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Review Date</th>
<th>June 29, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>University of Hawaii at Hilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Substantive Change</td>
<td>New Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name / Location</td>
<td>Masters in Heritage Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALO</td>
<td>Seri I. Luangphimith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC Staff Liaison</td>
<td>Karen Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reviewers</td>
<td>Dana Offerman, Ruki Jayaraman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Action and Date (See Attached)

☑ Interim Approval on 6/29/2015
☐ Refer to Commission (No visit) on ________

Additional Information¹ (See Attached):

☑ Notification of Implementation
☐ Federal Site Visit Required
☐ International Visit Required
☐ Fast Track
☐ Non Compliance

¹ Items checked or listed above must be fulfilled in order to finalize Substantive Change Approval

Commission Approval and Date (For Institutional Tracking)²³:

☐ Approved on ________

Implementation of an approved change must occur within two years of Commission approval. If the change will be implemented more than two years after the approval date, contact your WASC Staff Liaison to determine if the change requires re-approval.

☐ Not Approved on ________

² Commission approval of a new degree program signifies that the program is covered by the WASC accreditation of the institution as a whole. Approval by W should not be represented in marketing materials or any other forms of communication, as program-specific accreditation, such as that bestowed by specialty professional, or programmatic accrediting organizations.

³ Record the date that the Commission took action on this Substantive Change proposal for your records.

Findings of the Committee:

Commendations:
1. The program is clearly aligned with the mission and strategic plan of the institution.

2. The proposal presents documented program need and noteworthy responsiveness to community interest.

3. The panel commends the faculty for curriculum design with capstone focus at the beginning of the program to develop a relationship between students and faculty mentors, encourage completion of the program, and focus on program outcomes throughout the coursework.

Recommendations:
1. All syllabi must present institutional policies as outlined in the proposal template (e.g. grading policy, program outcomes aligned with course outcomes). (CFRs 2.3, 2.12)

2. The program must ensure that written communication and information literacy competencies are appropriate for graduate level work. (CFR 2.2b)
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3. The program should consider including indirect measures of student learning in its assessment plan (e.g. employment data/placement). (CFRs 4.1, 4.4)

4. 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 plan including direct and indirect measures of student learning. A clearly articulated institutional assessment plan can be applied to all programs with specific program applications aligned with assignments and capstone experiences. The plan should also include how data is collected, where it is housed, how it is aggregated and disaggregated for analysis, and who and when program evaluation based upon the data will occur. (CFRs 4.1, 4.4)

5. UHH should submit a progress report to WSCUC on August 1, 2016 describing its revised Institutional Assessment Plan and the details of that plan when applied to the new Master’s in Heritage Management. (CFRs 4.1, 4.4)

WASC Liaison Signature:

Date: 7/16/2015