Aloha Mike,

Please accept herein the Faculty Congress Academic Policy Committee Annual Report for the academic year 2012 – 2013. The committee attempted to deal with a number of issues, resolved some, were directed to postpone others, and made suggestions for next year’s committee on others. I had an excellent support committee and their work should be commended. Thank you for your sound leadership.

2012-13 Committee Members: Mitchell Anderson, Chair
Katherine Anderson, PHARM
Roberta Barra, CoBE
Jeannie Flood, Nursing
Armando Garcia-Ortega, CAFNRM
Mazen Hamad, CHEM/NS
Jodilyn Kunimoto, Student Services
Kirsten Mollegard, English/HUM
Michael Sado, UHHS

Meeting Dates:
October 2, 2012
October 26, 2012
November 15, 2012
December 7 2012
January 15, 2013
February 14, 2013
March 13, 2013
April 5, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charges to the Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Credit Hour Policy per WASC</td>
<td>Passed: March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Time Limit to Graduate</td>
<td>Passed: March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Policy Flowchart to reflect Unit Governance</td>
<td>Re-routed to VCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise CRC and Program Modification Process</td>
<td>Congress directed to postpone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Program Review Process</td>
<td>Passed: April 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC)</td>
<td>Passed: April 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion and Contract Renewal Notification</td>
<td>Incomplete: Pass to APC 2013 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; P and Contract Renewal e-filing</td>
<td>Incomplete: Pass to APC 2013 - 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,

Mitchell Anderson
**Credit Hour Policy**

Per the WASC Audit Checklist, which is based on Federal DOE guidelines, UHH must have a policy that stipulates what constitutes a credit hour earned at UHH. The Carnegie unit, which is used by the Federal DOE identifies a credit hour in terms of the amount of work necessary to attain the learning outcomes consistent with the traditional 1 hour of face-to-face meeting time and two hours of preparation and homework. One of the primary concerns in contemporary education is that many courses do not fit the traditional model of face-to-face and homework. In addition to labs that sometimes satisfy this definition of credit hour by meeting for 3 hours with little or no preparation or homework, Educators are experimenting more and more with online courses (no face-to-face), blended courses, inverted classrooms, internships, etc.

The system already had in place a policy that mimicked the Federal guidelines (see Feb and March Minutes). The APC developed and passed the following policy that is consistent with the Federal and Manoa Guidelines, but which incorporates all teaching styles into one policy:

**UHH Credit Hour Policy**

*Regardless of the type of academic activity, schedule, or method of delivery, one credit hour at UHH represents the expected amount of work a student must expend to achieve intended learning outcomes consistent with that of a traditional course (i.e. one that meets one hour per week, with a minimum of two hours additional work such as preparation, research, homework, investigation, etc. over the course of an approximate 15 week semester).*

This definition of credit hour implies:

1. One credit hour for courses with a non-traditional schedule (e.g. labs, directed studies, internships, etc.) or with alternative methods of delivery (e.g. online, hybrid, reverse lecture, etc.) represents an equivalent amount of work, as defined by intended student learning outcomes. Since there is no substitute for time spent in study or research, at least as much time must be spent “learning” regardless of the academic activity or method of delivery.
2. Courses with equivalent department course numbers should be consistent in terms of learning outcomes, regardless of the method of delivery.
3. Each credit hour represents approximately 45 hours of work. Departments should particularly keep this in mind when assigning non-traditional credit for activities such as independent study, service learning, laboratory, practica, seminar, internships, and courses with variable units, etc.
4. Only students who are able to demonstrate they have achieved the minimum intended learning outcomes will be awarded the credit hour.
Review Process

The application of the credit hour policy will be reviewed within the Academic Program Review process, New Course Approval (Curriculum Review Committee(s) and Curriculum Central), and General Education Certification and re-Certification. (Note: WASC requires universities to ensure their Credit Hour Policy is reflected in their work. These mechanisms are natural ones for review.)

Ph.D. Time Limit to Complete the Degree

The APC proposed that the following general time limits for Ph.D. programs be adopted as UHH Graduate Division policy. An individual program may shorten the time limits, if desired and internally approved. Special exceptions to the limits, with the support of the program and Dean, would require graduate council approval.

- Graduate level courses may only be applied towards the degree requirements if taken within 10 years of the completion of the degree. [Credits used towards fulfillment of another degree may not be used.]

- The maximum time a student may take to complete all requirements for a Ph.D. is 7 years from matriculation into the Ph.D. program, with a possible extension for extenuating circumstances not to exceed 10 years in total. A petition for extension will be submitted by the program to the Graduate Council, and if approved, the Graduate Council will forward approval of the extension to the VCREDP.

Subsequent notes: The charge of the APC is to deal with undergraduate policy according to the by-laws. This perhaps should have been questioned when the charge came from Congress. Also, subsequent to this passing it was noted that the VCREDP position is not yet authorized. Thus, the Graduate Council may find it difficult to forward approval of the extension to a vacant position. This matter should be revisited next year.

Revise Policy Flowchart to reflect Unit level Governance

This issue was passed the previous year. This year’s APC was asked to revisit it to ensure that the unit level governance was more explicit in the flowchart. The original impetus for revising the flowchart was to include the role of the Graduate Council. This year’s committee made the requested changes, moved footnotes back to a second page where they had been before (due to insufficient room on a single page) and asked Media Services to assist in making the flowchart as presentable as possible. They did a wonderful job by developing a color version. Unfortunately, when the flowchart came up for a final vote it was pointed out that the flowchart included review by the VCR, an unauthorized position. Congress suggested tabling the motion and sending the flowchart to the VCAA for a recommendation.
Notes to accompany the Academic Policy Proposal Flow Chart

This process is intended to govern the proposal and approval of new or modified academic policies.

Academic policy proposals may originate at any level of the campus community.

When the need is apparent, or when directed to do so by decision-making authorities, persons proposing new or amended policies are responsible for seeking consultation with appropriate university staff members, to ensure compliance with law, government and system policies, and other regulations. Proposals may be returned for further consultation at any point in the process.

Certification of consultation must be provided by the consulted staff member or members and forwarded with the proposal.

Footnote references from the flow chart:

1. For the purposes of this document, Dean(s) includes Deans, the University Librarian, and the Director of Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani, the College of Hawaiian Language.
2. For the purposes of this document, the word "Unit" in the phrase "Unit Governance Entities" includes, but is not limited to, the Colleges and the Library.

3. Representatives of Faculty Congress and Graduate Council are responsible for seeking consultation with appropriate Faculty and Staff members within their respective units on the potential implications of new or amended policies. Faculty Congress will appoint a member as “liaison to Graduate Council” to communicate between the two representative bodies.

4. Referrals for proposal revision from Faculty Congress and Graduate Council are sent to proposal originator.

5. Referrals for proposal revision from the VCAA may be sent to either Faculty Congress or Graduate Council, depending on the scope and potential implications of the proposed policy.

6. There is a time-limit between receiving and voting/deciding on a proposal. For Faculty Congress, the time-limit is two months. For Graduate Council, the VCR, and VCAA this is one month. If time-limit is not met, the proposal shall automatically be advanced to the next recipient without recommendation.

**Note that the University administration is responsible for:**

- Developing forms and documentation consistent with these procedures;
- Arranging for a system to track policy proposals as they move through the process, and arranging for training of users;
- Specifying procedures to notify submitters, reviewers, and other appropriate participants of the progress and final status of proposals, using a combination of web-posting, email, hardcopy distribution, etc., as appropriate;
- Codifying long-standing policies and procedures and posting them on the academic policies webpage; and
- Ensuring that other campus shared governance constitutions and by-laws are consistent with these established processes.

**Revise Curriculum Review and Program Modification Flowchart**

Congress was concerned that subsequent to CRC approval of new programs they were not given a chance for further review. The APC was charged with inserting review at this point of the process. However, prior to the APC addressing this concern Congress rescinded the charge.
Revise the Program Review Process

Last year’s Congress, as part of an effort to transform program review and accreditation into more faculty-centric processes, and in response to WASC’s increased emphasis on Assessment and demonstrated student success, began an effort to revise the PR document and process accordingly. At the same time they decided to make the document more user-friendly. Consequently the APC was charged with completing what they had begun and implementing the new document and procedures. This was the most significant work the committee completed this year, both in terms of time and importance. Given the critical nature of the work the committee vetted the new document and the proposed procedural changes thoroughly across campus and incorporated input from multiple units.

The committee incorporated as much as possible from the old document, rearranged the document so that each requirement was included up front, with help available in appendices associated with each section, introduced an optional annual update that helps to ensure that the memorandum of understanding developed at the end of program review remain current during the 7-year review cycle, and proposed an Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) to assist programs with the process (more on PRAC immediately below). A copy of the new PR document is included in the appendices.

Academic Program Review Advisory Committee

The committee proposed this new standing committee of the Congress to help train faculty members in program review and to further assist programs with developing their memorandum of understanding and reviewing their optional progress reports. The new committee will consist of a core executive committee of 3 – 5 members, with further membership composed of faculty from programs recently passing through program review and others scheduled for program review in the next two years. This provides an optimal training model, with successful program review faculty advising upcoming program review faculty on what to expect, what types of information to gather, when and where to gather the information, how to identify a good external reviewer and the process for inviting them, what past programs included in their MOUs and what might be a good idea to omit, etc. The core committee members are intended to provide leadership and continuity across time. The initial core committee will define policies and procedures for the committee.

Tenure and Promotion and Contract Renewal Notification

The charge from Congress to the APC was to make suggestions for policy that would stipulate that applicants for T & P and Contract Renewal are advised of the recommendations of the
various reviewers as the applications pass through the system. The Chair contacted UHPA for advice on this matter and was informed of the following:

1. The current contract stipulates that the candidate shall be informed of the recommendations of the TPRC when their recommendation is recorded (i.e. when it is passed to the next review mechanism, presumably the VCAA for UHH). This is something that TPRC’s have been requesting in recent years, but has not occurred.
2. Congress has no jurisdiction with respect to the Deans or Division or Department Chairs. Our interpretation of this statement by UHPA is that the contract does not say anything about notifications by Division or Department Chairs, other than their recommendations are not separate but will be attached to those of the Deans, and that we have no jurisdiction over what the Dean does in terms of notification.
3. Some DPC’s already have policies, according to the contract. According to UHPA we do not have jurisdiction over the DPCs since they are handled in the contract.

Recommendations of the APC:

i. The committee advises Congress to send a memo to the VCAA reminding the administration of this stipulation in our contract.
ii. Next year’s APC should continue discussions with UHPA to clarify what can and cannot be attempted. In particular, it is still not clear if Congress can recommend that DPC’s include in their procedures a notification stipulation. Despite an email request for clarification the chair did not hear back from UHPA on this issue.

**Tenure and Promotion and Contract Renewal e-filing**

The committee was charged with investigating the possibility of e-filing dossiers, and to propose policy to that effect. This seems to be one of the more difficult charges from Congress. The chair met with former TPRC faculty who had concerns, and heard from others that also had concerns. These concerns are all noted in the April minutes and are summarized below”

i. Confidentiality of dossiers
ii. Consistent filing requirements across units
iii. Accessibility for candidates, but more so for the reviewers. Many of the faculty had concerns that some reviewers are not comfortable reviewing only electronic versions of dossiers. It is difficult to navigate and for some to read on a monitor.
iv. Some material does not lend itself well to e-filing. One of the biggest concerns was the student comment evaluations, which currently take up a large portion of the
dossiers. The committee did note that these comments are not really all that valid, since they are not authenticated in any sense.

Recommendations:

a. Set up policies that allow optional (for the pilot phase) e-filing, or a blend of e-filing and hard copy. The main part of the dossier is created electronically now and it would be easy for candidates to e-file that part. It would also be easy to provide both hard copy and electronic, but the policies and safeguards need to be put into place for the electronic side. Much of the standard dossier is easily scanned or put into electronic form as well.

b. Develop policy that deals directly with the student comment evaluations. Congress should consider making this optional, and DPC’s might want to consider downgrading their importance as there is no method in place to authenticate them.

c. Develop mechanisms that ensure common filing deadlines, access by the candidate until the deadline but not after, to allow for changes by the candidate up to the deadline but not after, etc.
Appendices

1. Program Review Document
2. Minutes -- November
3. Minutes – December 2012
5. Minutes – February 2013
6. Minutes – March 2013
7. Minutes – April 2013
This document constitutes a proposed revision to the current guidelines housed within the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. This revision was developed as a response to faculty concerns about the efficacy and the lack of purpose in the current process.

This simplified and reorganized text was developed through extensive research of existing “best practices” and under direct mentorship from WASC at the 2012 Program Review Retreat.

In the spirit of our new 2011-2015 Strategic Plan: ‘A’ohe pau ka ‘ike i ka hālau ho’okahi/One learns from many sources. This document helps us build our university community by encouraging meaningful learning and teaching across disciplines and academic interests. But given the relatively early stages of our cognition of institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) and the incorporation of assessment at multiple levels, this iteration is meant to be the first step. The first cycle detailed in this document allows departments and programs to target ILOs and to gradually build meaningful assessment in a manner that can answer the fundamental questions as to why we do program review: what we do, how well we do it, and how we achieve broader university-wide goals?

Seri I. Luangphinth (Chair), English
Mitch Anderson, CAS—Mathematics
Todd Belt, CAS—Political Science
Michael Bitter, CAS—History
Mark Panek, CAS—English
Keola Donaghy, CHL
Terry Jalbert, CoBE
Karla Hayashi, Kilohana
Preamble: Why Do Program Review?

Through the program review process, faculty examine what we do and how well we do it, so we can better achieve broader university-wide goals.

2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examinations and placement, and evidence from external constituencies and professional organizations.

Academic Program Review Schedule

The Academic Program Review Schedule is set by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, with the intent that the cycle repeats itself every seven years.

What are the Major Components of a Program Review?

I. Mission Statement and Goals of the Department or Program

A mission statement is a general explanation of why your program exists and what it hopes to achieve in the future. It articulates the program’s essential nature, its values, and its work. Goals are general statements of what your program wants to achieve.

II. Secondary Accreditation (if applicable)

Colleges, Departments, and Programs are encouraged to coordinate specialized program accreditation processes (i.e. ABET, AACSB, NASPE) with institutional program review processes to avoid duplication of labor. If this is the case with your program, please state the goals and requirements for specialized accreditation here.

III. Executive Summary by Dean, Department Chair, or Program Chair

---

1 Also in accordance with UH Executive Policy E.202, Review of Established Programs.
An executive summary typically interprets quantitative and qualitative data (addressed in the next sections) as evidence of program performance. Its purpose is to encapsulate a program’s strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement. This summary also incorporates annual Progress Reports (see “What happens to Program Review and the MOU” following section VII below) on the previous Program Review and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which is discussed in section VII. Questions to consider:

- What functions does the College/Department/Program serve for students, for the larger Institution, and/or for the Community?
- How has the College/Department/Program and/or mission changed since the last MOU from the previous Program Review?
- What has been done by the College/Department/Program since the last MOU?
- What has administration done to address items in the action plan since the last MOU?

More suggestions for the executive summary can be found in Appendix A.

IV. Program Organization
- Background
  - A brief history of the program and its degrees, if any. (e.g. Describe the multiple degrees, certificates, or different major tracks offered students, and program goals)
  - How does the program support the mission of the College and University?
- Program Components (See Appendix B)

V. Evidence of Program Quality

This is where programs have the opportunity to demonstrate their strengths. This section contains:

- Quantitative Data and Tables
  Pre-formatted Data Reports are provided by the institutional research officer (See Appendix C). Programs are encouraged to include a brief analysis of the data.
- Evidence of Student Success
  - Assessment-based evidence of Student Success, including a compilation of Annual Assessment Projects, a Curriculum Matrix that aligns ever increasing levels of student learning outcomes with courses, and an Annual Assessment Plan (See Appendix D).
  - Other Evidence of Student Success (See Appendix E)
- Evidence of Faculty Quality (See Appendix K).
VI. Future Program Goals and Resource Requirements

- Future Goals
- Current and Future Resource Requirements (e.g. academic support for faculty, operating budget, space and facilities for teaching and research, new hires, lecturer/instructional support, equipment, library acquisitions, technological support, etc.)
- Program Chair Evaluation

VII. External Reviewer’s Report

Programs may also choose to include within this section an optional short response to the Reviewer’s comments, or they may choose to address them in their meeting with the administration. (See Appendix L for more information on the External Review process.)

VIII. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

Academic Program Review is intended to serve as a basis for informed decision making, particularly with respect to planning and allocating limited resources. An essential part of this process is the Memorandum of Understanding, wherein programs and the administration agree upon program strengths, weaknesses, future directions and goals, and the responsibilities of each towards achieving those goals. The MOU is negotiated between the program and the administration. The MOU is posted on the VCAA website and forwarded to the Faculty Congress through the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee. Programs are encouraged to consult with the Advisory Committee on their MOU prior to its formulation. Recommendations within the MOU are to be integrated into UHH planning and resource allocations.

What happens to the Program Review and MOU?

Each Program Review and MOU is kept in the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. To ensure these once-per-cycle MOUs remain useful (i.e. current and relevant), and to identify continued progress made by both parties regarding the stipulations found therein, programs will be allowed to submit very brief Annual Progress Reports. These Reports will be submitted to both the Administration (including Deans/Division Chairs) and to the faculty driven Academic Program Review Advisory Committee.

The Annual Reports should be encapsulated in 1-2 page narratives that document discussions undertaken by the faculty, the Chair or Director, the Dean and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and provide the program the opportunity to address (1)
What has been done by the program since the previous year? (2) What has administration done to facilitate program success since the previous year? and (3) What deficiencies and problems have emerged since the last MOU? These short reports serve as routine follow-ups to the Memorandum of Understanding that starts every cycle. To assist this process further, pre-formatted data reports will be provided to each program annually by the institutional research office to assist programs in identifying changes or new trends. (An Annual Progress Report Template can be found in Appendix J.) These annual reports can then be compiled to contribute to the body of the larger, cumulative [subsequent] Program Review (which is submitted every seven years).

Annual Reports should involve collective input by the entire unit and should be sent to involved parties, including the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee, which serves to ensure the consistency of policy across the institution. Programs that choose to do so should submit their annual report by the end of the Fall Semester, with feedback from the Dean and VCAA received no later than the following March 1.
Academic Program Review Timeline

This timeline documents a 7-year process that begins the first year subsequent to the review and culminates in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that then serves as the guide for the future course of the Department or Program. Most programs viewing this document for the first time will be most interested in AY6, the year prior to the review, and AY7, the year of the review.

AY1: First annual review of Data from IR
Assessment of Selected Learning Outcomes
Annual Report
First response to the Action Plan (from the previous MOU)

An action plan is a seven-year plan developed by the faculty to guide a seven-year process of improvement.

AY 2-5: Annual Reviews
Ongoing annual review of data by IR
Assessment of Selected Institutional Learning Outcomes
Annual Report

AY 6: Annual Review of Data & Preparation for Program Review
Final Annual review of data by IR
Assessment of Selected Learning Outcomes
Annual Report

Jan: Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs formally notifies the Department of upcoming Program Review (to include appropriation of resources for Program Review)
Spring: Dean or Chair and Faculty begin compiling the Program Review
April: IR provides comprehensive institutional data to Department Chair and faculty for review
AY 7: The External Review and the Drafting of the MOU

Aug: Department Chair submits prospective name(s) and schedule for external reviewer

Fall Semester:
Dean or Chair and Faculty finalizes compiling the Program Review
External Reviewer visits and evaluates the Department or Program (Alternately, the
External Reviewer visits and evaluates in early Spring, which compresses the
subsequent timeline below. Programs are encouraged to schedule the External
Reviewer visit for the Fall.)

Spring Semester:
Jan: External Reviewer will have submitted findings to the College, Department, or
Program as well as to the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee and the
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The College, Department, or
Program will distribute this report to their faculty for input. The Academic Program
Review Advisory Committee may also provide recommendations and suggestions for
further consideration by the faculty in the unit undergoing Program Review.
Mar: The Department or Program collectively responds to the reports from the external
reviewer and Academic Program Review Advisory Committee, either for inclusion in
the final report or for use during discussions with the administration regarding the
MOU.
April: The VCAA, Dean, Chair, and faculty in the Department begin drafting an Action
Plan resulting in an MOU.
May: MOU is signed and the action plan starts the next 7-year cycle for
improvement.
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APPENDIX A: Executive Summary

Ideas for inclusion in the Executive Summary: The following are provided to stimulate thought and will not be relevant to every program. Since the executive summary is by definition abbreviated, the discussion of each of these chosen for inclusion should necessarily be brief.

- The results or impact of the prior program review. Progress by the department in meeting its action plan within the last MOU, progress by the administration in supporting the same action plan.
- National trends in the major.
- Growth or decline in the number of tenure-track or tenured faculty, instructors, or adjunct faculty since the last program review.
- Notable trends since the last program review in the numbers of majors, enrollment patterns, student/faculty ratio, retention data, or enrollment caps.
- Notable student successes – covered in more detail within subsequent sections.
- Brief overview of faculty productivity in instruction, scholarship/creativity, and service to UHH – covered in more detail in subsequent sections.
- Brief overview of significant community service – covered in more detail in subsequent sections.
- Deficiencies in departmental expertise, if any. Are you currently pursuing new faculty lines?
- Special accreditation or other external evaluation.
- Faculty commitment to diversity issues.
APPENDIX B: Program Components

Ideas for inclusion in the Program Components Section: The following are provided to stimulate thought and will not be relevant to every program.

- How the department organizes its curriculum to meet Major program requirements, provide service and General Education courses, and achieve program efficiency.
- A more detailed explanation of the growth or decline in the number of tenure-track or tenured faculty, instructors, or adjunct faculty since the last program review.
- Curriculum changes since the last program review or a short overview of how the program has determined that its curriculum is current and relevant. Discuss necessary changes anticipated for the future.
- Are the department's programs fulfilling state, regional, and national needs and expectations?
- Is the curriculum adequate to meet the needs of the diversity and number of student majors and students in service courses?
- How up-to-date is the curriculum for current and future students seeking careers inside and outside of academia?
- How does the quality of the curriculum (e.g. comprehensive and integrated among courses from 100-level through 400-level, within its stated goals) compare to those recognized as highly effective curricula by regional and national scientific and educational societies?
- How does the curriculum compare with similar departments at 4-year liberal arts colleges, comprehensive regional universities, and major, tier 1 universities with Ph.D. programs?
- Is the department serving non-majors to the satisfaction of the students and faculty across the campus?
- How is the department ensuring it is in compliance with the UHH Credit Hour Policy, particularly for its non-traditional courses, such as labs, directed readings, practica, internships, online or inverted lecture, service learning, etc? Note: the Credit Hour Policy states:

  Regardless of the type of academic activity, schedule, or method of delivery, one credit hour at UHH represents the expected amount of work a student must expend to achieve intended learning outcomes consistent with that of a traditional course (i.e. one that meets one hour per week, with a minimum of two hours additional work such as preparation, research, homework, investigation, etc. over the course of an approximate 15 week semester).
APPENDIX C: Quantitative Data and Tables

This section details the quantitative evidence, most of which is required by the University of Hawai‘i system. This data may help Colleges, Departments, or Programs track the size of their major, changes in course caps, contributions to system and graduation requirements, linkages with other programs and certificates, and other such factors that impact the quality of student learning. This data, along with yearly assessment results, can help faculty evaluate the quality of instruction and course delivery.

Institutional Research (IR) will provide the following data on an annual basis to Deans, Department Chairs, or Program Directors to be used to look for trends for inclusion in the annual Progress Reports. A compiled report will then be provided in the final year prior to the drafting of the MOU, for inclusion in the Program Review. Division Chairs may also be asked to assist with data collection.

1. Student Quality and Funding Information
   a. Admission Scores
   b. Pell Grant recipients

2. Student Count Information
   a. Number of Majors
   b. Number of Minors
   c. Number of Certificates
   d. Contributions to other Programs and Certificates

3. Course Offering Information
   a. Number of Student Semester Hours (SSH)
   b. Number of Full Time Equivalents (FTE) Course Enrollment (SSH divided by 15 for undergraduate and by 12 for graduates)
   c. Number of classes and sections of classes offered
   d. Number of Writing Intensive (WI)
   e. Number of GE Courses
   f. Number and type of courses utilizing alternative delivery methods (e.g. online, reverse lecture, etc.)

4. Course Delivery
   a. Average class size
   b. Number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) faculty
   c. Number of Adjunct (Contingency) Faculty
   d. Number of Courses and SSH taught by Full Time Faculty
APPENDIX C: Quantitative Data and Tables

e. Number of Courses and SSH Taught by Adjunct Faculty
f. FTE student-faculty ratio

5. Graduation and Placement
   a. Number of overall graduates
   b. Number of Native Hawaiian graduates
   c. Student placement

6. Cost of Delivery
   a. Budgetary allocations
   b. Cost per SSH
## APPENDIX C: Quantitative Data and Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 1</th>
<th>AY 2</th>
<th>AY 3</th>
<th>AY 4</th>
<th>AY 5</th>
<th>AY 6</th>
<th>AY 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Student Count Information (per academic year)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of Minors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of Graduate Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Annual Course Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Student Semester Hours Taught (SSH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) (SSH divided by 15 for undergraduates, and by 12 for graduates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. % FTE own majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. % FTE majors within college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. % FTE all others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. % FTE Writing Intensive courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. % FTE GE courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Course Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Average class size – Brick and Mortar (computed as # registrations / # classes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Average class size – Distance Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of FTE Full Time Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Number of FTE Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. % SSH taught by Full Time Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. % SSH taught by Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. FTE student-faculty ratio (FTE course enrollment / FTE total faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: Quantitative Data and Tables

### 5. Graduation and Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Number of graduates/degrees earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. % of majors graduating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of Native Hawaiian graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Number of Certificates awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Cost of Delivery

| a. Budgetary allocations |
| b. Cost per SSH          |
APPENDIX C: Quantitative Data and Tables

A. List degrees (include tracks, options, and areas of specialization), minors, certificates, etc. offered by your program on Table 4A. (Please asterisk core courses that every major must take in order to meet major requirements in the program.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A – Degrees, Tracks, Options, Specializations, Certificates, Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Courses Required in the Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. List GE courses provided by your program. (See http://hilo.hawaii.edu/academics/gened/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B – GE Courses (Provided by Institutional Researcher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course (Alpha #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequency: sem - every semester, yr – once a year, infreq – infrequently
**Yearly Enrollment: Total yearly enrollment for the GE course for the past 7 years.

C. List service courses your program provides for other programs. For example, the English program provides Eng 225 Writing for Science and Technology for science majors. Include cross-listed courses where your program provides the course for the cross-listed program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table C – Service Courses (Provided by Institutional Researcher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Course Alpha #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Show a sequence of courses that would enable a freshman to graduate with your major in four years. (XXX No longer necessary???)

Table D – Four-Year Course Sequence for Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Faculty Productivity

Table E – Faculty Productivity

Instructional Productivity – Current Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th># SSH Yearly</th>
<th>Total # Courses Taught Yearly</th>
<th>#Courses Per Faculty</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creative/Scholarly Activities

Since your last program review, include the number of refereed publications (RP), book chapters (Ch), books (B), other publications (OP), and grants received (G – number/total dollar amount). For faculty promoted during this time period, include contributions at the rank in which the contribution was made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>G (#/$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service Activities – Typical Involvement since the last Academic Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th># Committees / Year</th>
<th>Community Projects / Year</th>
<th>Events/Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: Student Learning Assessment

This section outlines evidence of student learning, including assessment requirements. Since assessment is our most challenging and difficult requirement, this section offers in-depth details of the types of qualitative and quantitative evidence that is used in evaluating the performance of a College, Department, or Program within this framework.

Student Learning: An Introduction

Our vision for 2020, per our new Strategic Plan, challenges us to become “a university community that works together across disciplines and diverse perspectives to prepare student scholars to thrive, compete, innovate and lead in their professional and personal lives.” This aspect of Academic Program Review presents Colleges, Departments, and Programs with the opportunity to demonstrate how they are facilitating that learning, and helping students achieve desired program and institutional learning outcomes. As stated on the cover page, this first 7-year Program Review cycle detailed in this document stipulates Colleges, Departments, and Programs to target Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), with the option of also targeting their Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Please refer to Appendix F for the rubrics for Information Literacy, Communication, Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning, and Human Interaction and Cultural Diversity.

Colleges, Departments, and Programs can choose to target two of the following ILOs over the next seven years per an annual assessment plan. Units may choose the same ILOs every year based on their mission, or they may choose to assess a variety of these ILOs.

1. Information Literacy/ Critical Thinking
2. Communication/ Critical Thinking
3. Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning /Critical Thinking
4. Human Interaction and Cultural Diversity (including an understanding of Hawaiʻi’s indigenous history)
6. Other learning goals (e.g. PLOs) as determined by programs/departments/colleges (which is not required for this current cycle)

Results will be compiled into short, annual assessment reports that will help faculty and administration engage in a yearly dialogue on program performance and student learning, including how assessment results are used to revise teaching methods and/or curriculum as needed (i.e. “closing the assessment loop”). Any such changes need to then be re-assessed to determine their efficacy. (Please see Appendix I for an Assessment Report Template.) These assessment reports can also be included in the Annual Progress Reports (See Appendix J).

Assessment

Assessment begins with an inventory of courses vis-à-vis General Education and the Major/Minor. Colleges, Departments and Programs should start with a Curriculum Matrix, which (1) helps faculty to visually map the sequencing of courses from the introductory level to increasing stages of proficiency, and (2) aligns the sequencing of courses with increasing levels
APPENDIX D: Student Learning Assessment

of student learning. The Matrix also outlines how courses meet ILOs and Program-specific goals. (See Appendix G for a sample matrix with ILOs. Please note that the example is generic and is not meant to be prescriptive. More examples will be available through the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee.)

A multi-year Assessment Plan further aids Colleges, Departments, and Programs to manage the work needed to undertake annual assessment. Annual assessments must not exceed the ability of faculty to engage in this work, nor exceed the resources available to the Program or Department. (See Appendix H for a Sample Assessment Plan) Particular attention should be paid to ensure that courses delivered in a non-traditional manner such as online, hybrid, and reverse lecture achieve student learning success at comparable levels with those delivered in the traditional manner.

Once the Curriculum Matrix is devised, Colleges, Departments, and Programs must then develop methods for evaluating student work or performance to see if it is at the level indicated in the matrix. Examples of direct assessment are as follows:

1. Utilizing an identical embedded question or problem across multiple sections with multiple teachers.
2. A sampling of research papers from different levels of classes.
3. Capstone classes may collect student portfolios that allows faculty to assess student mastery of skills over time.
4. Multiple faculty observations of student performances.

Colleges, Departments, or Programs may also deploy indirect assessment (such as focus groups, surveys and reflective essays) to enhance their understanding of how students learn and how to improve their learning. Obtaining feedback from students on their learning can provide faculty with additional insight that may escape faculty attention.

Compilation of Annual Assessment (Indirect and Direct) Projects

This section is a compilation and analysis of the annual assessment projects outlined above.

The data should be accompanied by faculty evaluation of the information provided by assessment results and must include recommendations and future plans for improving weaknesses, if any, identified by these activities. When evaluating indirect assessment (i.e. surveys), faculty should discuss ways of meaningfully addressing student concerns. Data from these activities may include requests for resource allocations to address deficiencies in staffing and infrastructure identified by assessment that impede student learning.
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Colleges, Departments, and Programs are encouraged to work with the Congress Assessment Support Committee to develop best practices in assessment that suit the needs of the latter as well as align with larger, institution-wide assessment activities.
APPENDIX E: Other Evidence of Student Learning

Other Evidence/Considerations of Student Learning Success

Programs may find some of the following useful when considering student learning success.

- Is the department serving non-majors to the satisfaction of the students and faculty across the campus?
- Are the department’s programs fulfilling state, regional, and national needs and expectations?
- Feedback from stakeholders (e.g. employers, practitioners, community, departments or programs for which your courses are pre-requisites, etc.), and how this information is used to improve the curriculum or the teaching of the curriculum.
- Feedback from alumni – are graduates succeeding in graduate school or careers?
- Are the grade distributions (A, B, C, D, F, W) consistent with assessment results?
- What proportion of students are at each academic achievement level in the non-majors courses and in the majors courses?
- What are the structures, policies and procedures for academic advising, placement into introductory courses, and pre-career advising, and what are the student perceptions of these and of course scheduling?
- What is the instructional emphasis towards meeting student learning objectives (e.g. inquiry-oriented, methods-oriented, knowledge content-focused, theory content-focused), and what kinds of pedagogy are used?
- Which courses are lecture, combined lecture/inquiry/discussion, online or hybrid, and labs that are intended [in whole or in part] to gain technical expertise?
- Does the program support collaborative research between students and faculty?
  a. Directed Studies
  b. Student-faculty research projects
  c. Student theses/senior projects
  d. Summer internships
- What are the prevalent student products in courses that are graded, and do these products provide evidence that the ILOs and/or PLOs are being met?
- Which courses are writing intensive? What are the learning objectives for a “writing intensive” course? What do students do differently in writing intensive classes?
- Do science courses require full scientific format papers?
## APPENDIX F: Rubric for Information Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Documentation Conventions</th>
<th>Appropriateness of Sources</th>
<th>Evaluating Sources*</th>
<th>Integrating Sources*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 (Advanced)   | • No errors with regard to citation format (in-text and bibliography)  
• Properly documents citations and sources | • All sources are relevant and appropriate to the assignment and course  
• Utilizes a variety of appropriate sources, including peer-reviewed material | • Student demonstrates in-depth examination of information and/or material which coincide with specific needs and goals in the paper  
• Examination of information shows a clear understanding of the material’s criteria for inclusion (i.e. authority, credibility, relevance, timeliness, and accuracy) | • Student synthesizes information with a clear sense of direction/purpose in the assignment  
• Student draws exceptional conclusions or insights based on the information cited  
• Use of information leads to highly developed arguments, follow-ups, ideas, appeals, proposals, etc. |
| 3 (Competent)  | • In-text citations match bibliography and vice versa.  
• Minor errors with citation format. | • Most sources are relevant and appropriate to the assignment and course  
• A majority of the sources are relevant but may not show variety or breadth | • Student demonstrates adequate examination of the material  
• There may be minor problems with the articulation of appropriateness of material to the assignment | • Student adequately synthesizes information  
• Student demonstrates some insight but conclusions or interpretations may seem obvious |
| 2 (Emerging)   | • Incorrect use of required citation format  
• May include a bibliography but entries may not correlate to sources used in the paper | • Uses mostly online (non-scholarly) sites  
• Sources do not appear to be peer-reviewed or from reputable (government or professional organizations) sites | • Student may exhibit some attempt to examine the information using academic criteria  
• Information and/or sources are questionable | • Student includes information but exhibits problems in synthesizing it into the assignment  
• Follow-up discussion of material may be minimal, unsubstantiated, and/or unoriginal |
| 1 (Beginning)  | • No citations and/or bibliography  
• Copies or paraphrases without documentation | • No relevant sources  
• Paper is mainly speculative on the part of the writer | • No effort to examine the information  
• Little awareness of the quality of the information | • No synthesis of material into the assignment  
• Student may plagiarize or paraphrase information without citing sources |

* These columns are used to simultaneously assess critical thinking
## APPENDIX F: Rubric for Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line of Reasoning</th>
<th>Organization and Structure</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Technique*</th>
<th>Style &amp; Voice*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> (Advanced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well-defined thesis that is supported by coherent and relevant arguments</td>
<td>• Organization is logical, well-planned, and organized; structure enhances the message or argument</td>
<td>• Exhibits original insight into the content</td>
<td>• Highly effective use or integration of language (grammar, sentence structure), literary (genre, rhyme scheme) or artistic techniques</td>
<td>• The medium (e.g. language, body movement, composition, tone) enhances the intended message or purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ideas and main points are based on logical and rational deductions</td>
<td>• Paragraphs are well-developed, and paragraph breaks enhance the main points</td>
<td>• Content illuminates the argument and/or message</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques produces a highly original text (e.g. essay, poem, painting) or performance (e.g. speech or dance)</td>
<td>• The project exhibits sophisticated and originality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> (Competent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifiable thesis with some gaps or inconsistencies in reasoning</td>
<td>• Some organizational problems evident</td>
<td>• Content is adequately addressed</td>
<td>• Recognizable use or integration of language, literary or artistic techniques</td>
<td>• The medium is adequate for its intended message or purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some ideas or main points may not be fully integrated into the presentation and essay</td>
<td>• Paragraphs are developed but exhibit a few inappropriate breaks, or transitions between paragraphs are awkward</td>
<td>• Content supports main argument but may not be comprehensive</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques produces a satisfactory text or performance</td>
<td>• The project is appropriate for assignment but is predictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> (Emerging)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thesis is weak, unclear or too broad for assignment, but has some relevance to the body of essay or presentation</td>
<td>• Some attempt at organization but essay or presentation suffers from gaps in logic</td>
<td>• Content is only superficially addressed or limited in breadth</td>
<td>• Use or integration of technique is awkward or incorrect</td>
<td>• Presentation or text may not be understood or engaging to the intended audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ideas or main points are based on unsubstantiated reasons or speculations</td>
<td>• Paragraphs are underdeveloped and/or transitions are highly problematic</td>
<td>• Content does not fully support main argument</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques does not appear to enhance the text or performance</td>
<td>• Presentation or text mimics what has already been done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> (Beginning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No discernible thesis</td>
<td>• Lack of organization (line of reasoning is absent)</td>
<td>• Content is not appropriate to the assignment or minimally used</td>
<td>• Poor or little use/integration of the techniques covered in or required by class</td>
<td>• The medium chosen seems inappropriate for the message or may even lack a message or intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ideas or main points of the presentation or essay are unclear, unsubstantiated, or unrelated</td>
<td>• Transitions between paragraphs are non-existent</td>
<td>• Content does not relate to the argument being made</td>
<td>• Choice of techniques appears random and/or without much thought</td>
<td>• The project is highly unorganized and/or lacks any originality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These columns are used to simultaneously assess critical thinking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Analysis*</th>
<th>Calculations</th>
<th>Visual Representations of Data and Information*</th>
<th>Scientific Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (Advanced)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates advanced reasoning based on quantifiable information; judgments and conclusions are exceptionally insightful</td>
<td>Accurately completes calculations for the assignment and presents results clearly and concisely</td>
<td>Produces highly effective visual representations of data (e.g. tables) or concepts (e.g. graphs)</td>
<td>Skillfully and precisely engages in the 6 steps needed in undertaking a science-based approach to gathering and interpreting evidence 1. Identify problem 2. Formulate a hypothesis 3. Design a project to test hypothesis 4. Collect data 5. Analyze data 6. Draw conclusions based on data 7. Produces work that contributes to the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Competent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates competent reasoning based on quantifiable information; judgments and conclusions are adequate and reasonable</td>
<td>Calculations are completed and largely successful</td>
<td>Produces competent visual representations of data</td>
<td>Engages in all 6 steps needed in undertaking a science-based approach to gathering and interpreting data 1. Identify problem 2. Formulate a hypothesis 3. Design a project to test hypothesis 4. Collect data 5. Analyze data 6. Draw conclusions based on data 7. Produces work that meets the requirements of the assignments/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Emerging)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates emerging reasoning based on quantifiable information as exhibited by difficulty in formulating judgments or drawing conclusions</td>
<td>Calculations contain multiple errors</td>
<td>Visual representations may reflect minor flaws or inaccuracies</td>
<td>Engages in the 6 steps but may exhibit problems with a few 1. Identify problem 2. Formulate a hypothesis 3. Design a project to test hypothesis 4. Collect data 5. Analyze data 6. Draw conclusions based on data 7. Produces work that may not meet the requirements of the assignment/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Beginning)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates beginning reasoning based on quantifiable information as exhibited by difficulty understanding what constitutes quantifiable information, inability to formulate reasonable judgments and/or drawing reasonable conclusions.</td>
<td>Calculations may be unsuccessful or incomplete</td>
<td>The method for visually presenting information or concepts is highly inaccurate or imprecise</td>
<td>Exhibits problems in many if not most of the steps required for the scientific process 1. Identify problem 2. Formulate a hypothesis 3. Design a project to test hypothesis 4. Collect data 5. Analyze data 6. Draw conclusions based on data 7. Produces work that does not satisfy the requirements of the assignment/course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These columns are used to simultaneously assess critical thinking
### APPENDIX F: Cultural Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sense of Place (Engagement)</th>
<th>Sense of Humanity (Respect)</th>
<th>Sense of Others (Empathy)</th>
<th>Sense of Self (Humility)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Hua</strong> (Advanced—the ripening of the full fruit)</td>
<td><em>[Homua Hawai‘i]</em></td>
<td><em>[Kākou]</em></td>
<td><em>[Oukou/Lākou]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates <em>kuleana</em> (responsibility) for and ‘<em>ike kā hohonu</em> (sophisticated understanding) of Hawai‘i’s uniqueness as the home of indigenous people, immigrants and immigrant descendants. EX: “The Pāpa‘ikou Mill Beach represents an opportunity for dialogue over the complex convergence of private property rights and public access” or “The telescopes on Mauna Kea present a quandary for various stakeholders, including scientists and indigenous activists.”</td>
<td>Expresses a multicultural approach to describing or interacting with others. EX: “I am not a Muslim but I respect a culture’s choice in limiting certain types of garments.”</td>
<td>Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of social and cultural complexities in and/or among different groups. EX: “I am straight and I see marriage as a union between man and woman, but I can respect the desire by members of the gay community to undertake such a commitment.”</td>
<td>Critically analyzes how s/he is shaped by diverse cultural and social experiences. EX: “I may be white, but I am a mixture of different backgrounds (my mother was Irish, my father was English)—and these heritages were often at odds with one another over who could rightfully immigrate to America” or “I am a Native Hawaiian who recognizes multiple heritages within my own family, and for this reason, issues of sovereignty are very complicated.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Kumu</strong> (Competent—the forming of the tree)</td>
<td>Demonstrates <em>mahalo</em> (appreciation) for and ‘<em>ike pono</em> (clear understanding) of Hawai‘i’s uniqueness as the home of indigenous people, immigrants and immigrant descendants. EX: “Hawai‘i’s beaches need to be protected from greedy foreign developers” or “Given the ancient laws, anyone should have access to any beach at any time they want.”</td>
<td>Acknowledges diversity but still exhibits some bias. EX: “Muslims have a right to follow their religious principles, but they need to respect women’s rights.”</td>
<td>Meaningfully expresses social and cultural complexities in and/or among different groups. EX: “Gays and lesbians have recently indicated a desire to engage in straight practices such as marriage.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Mole</strong> (Emerging—roots emerge)</td>
<td>Exhibits <em>hoihoi</em> (interest) in and ‘<em>ike kumu</em> (basic understanding) of Hawai‘i’s uniqueness. EX: “Hawai‘i’s beaches are among the finest in the world but owning one is hard.”</td>
<td>Limited recognition of one’s own biases when describing or interacting with others. EX: “I think women need to be liberated from the veil in Iran.”</td>
<td>Identifies (without judgment) differences in and/or among cultures and social groups. EX: “Why New York would allow gays to marry is beyond me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Kupu</strong> (Beginning—the budding of the plant)</td>
<td>Exhibits <em>manakā</em> (disinterest), ‘<em>ike ihi</em> (superficial understanding) or ‘<em>ike hemahe`ma</em> (faulty understanding) of Hawai‘i’s people, history and/or landscape. EX: “If I owned a beach in Hawai‘i, I should be able to kick everyone off. It’s my private property.”</td>
<td>Expresses a cultural self-centered approach to describing or interacting with others. EX: “Muslims obviously hate women for making them wear veils.”</td>
<td>Descriptions of different cultures and/or social behaviors may reflect some judgmental bias or stereotyping. EX: “Allowing gays to marry would be a disaster for this nation.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of these Hawaiian terms comes from the story of Ni‘aupō‘o, as documented by Kawena Pukui. It describes the stages of the growth of the niu (coconut) tree that is found in a mele oli (chant) from that story. Note that these examples are taken from actual student work and are meant to help teachers and students engage in a discussion on what constitutes “growth” in cultural diversity/fluency.
One way to analyze the alignment between curriculum, Institutional Learning Objectives, and courses is by organizing them into matrices. The tables in these appendices are examples that are not meant to be prescriptive. Programs, Departments and Colleges may alter and refine the definitions under each subcategory in the Rubrics in Appendix F. Note: The Learning Goals and Curriculum Matrix below relate to the Mathematics department’s traditional track mathematics major and are mapped to the rubrics for Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning. An Assessment Plan for 2013 – 2019 follows.

Outcome 1 (Knowledge) – Demonstrate mastery of the core material Calculus and Linear Algebra.

Outcome 2 (Knowledge) – Demonstrate mastery of the core concepts in Abstract Algebra and Real Analysis.

Outcome 3 (Comprehension) – Identify, compare, and contrast the fundamental concepts within and across the major areas of mathematics, with particular emphasis on Linear Algebra, Abstract Algebra, and Real Analysis.

Outcome 4 (Reasoning) – Use a variety of theorem-proving techniques to prove mathematical results.

Outcome 5 (Communication) – Demonstrate the abilities to read and articulate mathematics verbally and in writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses for Majors</th>
<th>Require Elective</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
<th>Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 205, 206 - Calculus I-II</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 231 - Calculus III</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 232 - Calculus IV</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 300 – Ordinary Diff. Eqns.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 301 – Partial Diff Eqns.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 310 - Discrete Math</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 311 - Intro to Linear Algebra</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I,D,M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 317 – Theory of Eqns.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 421 - Probability Thry.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 422 -</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What follows is the mathematics department’s tentative long range assessment plan at the time of its 2013 Program Review. The assessment plan is designed to address the six major aspects of our instructional mission.

1. **Developmental** – preparing underprepared students for success in STEM disciplines and others that require more than nominal mathematics. Our developmental mission is usually satisfied through Math 103 and 104F.

2. Mathematics for **non-science** majors. This part of our mission is usually satisfied through Math 100, 121, and 115.

3. **STEM** mathematics (the Calculus two-year sequence)

4. Preparing students for the **Transition** from the Calculus to higher level mathematics. This part of our mission is usually satisfied through courses such as Math 310, 311, 314, and 317.

5. **Teaching** Track majors. Preparing our teaching track majors for a successful career in secondary teaching is accomplished through a variety of courses such as Math 421-22, 431, 441, 454, 496, and perhaps an as-yet undeveloped capstone experience.

6. **Traditional** Track majors. Preparing our traditional track majors for success in graduate school or mathematics-based careers is accomplished through a variety of courses such as Math 431-32, 454-55, topics courses, and perhaps an as-yet undeveloped capstone experience.

Given the fact that assessment requirements and WASC directions in this area frequently change, as do the missions and personnel in departments, and that assessment efforts provide information
that may alter or suggest changes in future assessments, the math department elected to develop a rather loose assessment plan that was intended to assess the major aspects of its mission and involve all faculty members, rather than developing a detailed assessment plan with specific learning outcomes identified. Our plan is to have at least two faculty members take responsibility for leading a meaningful assessment in each of the six instructional areas. The faculty members will not necessarily be required to concurrently teach the courses in which the assessment occurs, if in fact it occurs in the classroom, but will be required to lead the effort, identify the student learning outcomes that will be assessed, design the assessment mechanisms (e.g. embedded problems, rubrics, procedures, etc.) provide leadership and assistance as necessary, and formulate the annual assessment report. Dr. Anderson will be available as a consultant to all efforts, and will attempt to ensure that the assessments are relevant and as a whole provide a comprehensive and cohesive view of how well we achieve our instructional mission in terms of student success.

What follows is a tentative schedule for the assessment efforts. Planning and design should occur during the year prior to each assessment; and it is anticipated that some efforts may continue for more than a single year or may be adjusted and repeated at a later time. Undoubtedly some faculty members will want to assess the effectiveness of their efforts at closing the loop in terms of improving student learning. Thus, this assessment schedule is tentative in its most literal sense.
## Assessment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mission Area</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>STEM – Calculus</td>
<td>Wissman, Lazarevic, New “Calculus Lab” Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Traditional Track</td>
<td>Pelayo, Ruiz, Wissman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>New Developmental Instructor; with additional assistance from a TBD volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Figueroa-Centeno, Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Teaching Track</td>
<td>Ivanova, Bernstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Non-Science</td>
<td>Webb, Bernstein, Lazarevic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: Assessment Report Template

Academic Year:
Report Date:
Assessment Project Coordinator:
Faculty Involved:

1. **Student Learning Outcomes Assessed for the present academic year.**

   *This section should simply list those SLO’s assessed this year. SLO’s may be disaggregated into Course Learning Outcomes (CLO’s), Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO’s), and/or Program Learning Outcomes (PLO’s), which apply primarily to the major.*

2. **Curriculum Map**

   *This section should identify in which course(s) the assessment was administered. Optionally, it could also include how the SLO’s align with other courses in the program; that is, where students encounter opportunities in the curriculum to gain knowledge and skills pertinent to the designated outcomes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>SLO#1</th>
<th>SLO#2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Audience**

   *This section should include the type of participants (e.g. Math majors, NS majors, non-science majors, etc.), their academic level (e.g. fresh/soph, junior/senior) and the number of participants.*

4. **Assessment Details**

   *This section should describe how the SLO’s were assessed. (This may be done separately for different assessment efforts.) Be sure to include:*

---

1. Adapted from the form used by Phillips Graduate Institute in 2010-2011.
   Provided by WASC Assessment Workshop, Honolulu, Feb 2012.
APPENDIX I: Assessment Report Template

- What type of assessment was administered (e.g. Direct, indirect, embedded, etc.)
- How was the assessment developed and administered? What information/data was actually collected? (i.e. how was the assessment conducted?)
- How was it analyzed? (e.g. What type of scoring rubrics were used? Who developed the scoring rubrics? Who did the scoring?)
- How was it reported?
5. Results and Analysis

This section should include the results of the assessment and an analytic discussion of the results. This should include strengths and/or weaknesses that the assessment uncovered, and other relevant points.

6. Using the results to “Close the Loop”

This section should include:

- Describe how the results of the assessments were disseminated and to whom, and the review process used.
- Discuss how the results will be used to improve existing pedagogical practices and curriculum (e.g. confirm the SLO was successfully met, and/or how the department will generate strategies for modification).
- If applicable – discuss program modifications and timeline for implementation.

Note: whenever curricular changes are made as part of closing the loop, these changes need to be re-assessed to determine if they have achieved the desired result.
1. **Annual Quantitative Data**

   Attach the Pre-Formatted Annual Quantitative Data report received from the Institutional Research Office. Discuss any trends worth noting that were not mentioned in your previous MOU. These might include a significant increase or decrease in the number of majors, courses taught, cap sizes, use of adjuncts, etc. If the program experienced an unexpected faculty retirement or vacancy, this should be noted, along with plans for addressing this new deficiency (e.g. hire replacement, re-allocate resources, adjunct, etc.)

2. **Changes or trends within the department or its mission that require attention not mentioned in your program’s MOU.**

3. **Annual progress made by your program on key aspects of your MOU.**

   Include progress made by the program during the year and deficiencies that need to be addressed, if any. Include details of how deficiencies will be addressed. This is an appropriate place to also include any assessment results for the year, or simply attach your program’s annual assessment report.

4. **Annual progress made by the administration on key aspects of your MOU.**

   Include progress made by the Administration during the year and deficiencies that need to be addressed, if any. Include suggestions of how deficiencies should be addressed by the administration.
Goal 2 of our new strategic plan stresses the need to “Inspire excellence in teaching, research and collaboration.” This section highlights how faculty members’ teaching expertise, research, and other professional work contribute to the quality and mission of the program and the larger institution. Each category should be documented in explanatory and evaluative narrative.

1. Teaching

Innovations in teaching and curriculum development not already addressed in assessment data can be discussed here and documented by evidence that the College, Department or Program generates, including and not limited to

a. Non-traditional delivery such as online courses, reverse lecture, etc. and how the department ensures that student learning outcomes in these courses are consistent with those in traditional classes.
b. Joint cooperative and combined interdisciplinary efforts with other academic units, departments, and programs.
c. Service Learning activities.
d. Faculty involvement in college-wide curriculum planning and governance.
e. Curriculum development and long-range curriculum planning within the Program.

2. Research

a. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities (publications, artistic work or output, presentations, sabbatical productivity);
b. Grants and/or fellowships;
c. Professional practice or development (participation in retreats, specialized training, seminars, etc.);
d. Specialized credentialing or advanced certification achieved by faculty members.

3. Service

This section may include work done at the departmental level (i.e. advising, organizing symposiums, internships), college-level (i.e. serving on the Faculty Senate, college strategic planning committee), or institutional (i.e. Faculty Congress and Congress committees, Chancellor’s Diversity Committee). Professional memberships and service in the discipline nationally or internationally may also be included here.

4. Local Community
APPENDIX K: Evidence of Faculty Quality

Such outside activities can indicate how faculty meet program goals, and may be documented by the hours per week, percentage of time, and types of partnerships (i.e. committee events, K-12 engagement, community boards, serving as volunteer or unpaid consultant within community).

5. Faculty Planning and Development

This section may include the following:

a. faculty employed (disaggregated by rank)
b. course releases and buy-outs (grants)
c. impending retirements and other attrition
d. faculty promotions
e. salaries vis-à-vis cost-of-living adjustments
f. salary comparisons with peer institutions
g. faculty development activities – how does the department evaluate and help faculty improve their academic endeavors, thereby enabling them to succeed in tenure, promotion, and merit reviews
h. awards
i. schedule of future sabbaticals
j. anticipated faculty needs
APPENDIX L: External Review

External Reviewer/Consultant

- During the Spring or Summer prior to the review-year the program submits to the VCAA a list of no more than three names of potential external reviewers, with CV or other supporting documentation as to the qualifications of each. A formal letter of invitation is sent to the reviewer by the VCAA, and all fees and travel expenses for the external reviewer are paid by the VCAA’s office.

- Identifying an External Reviewer/Consultant: An external reviewer is a recognized expert in the field whose primary responsibilities are to identify strengths and weaknesses and show program faculty how they might develop the former and address the latter. The objective is primarily constructive guidance. Some fields have organizations that assign or provide recommendations for reviewers. Ideally an external reviewer is an expert from one of UHH’s peer institutions. Programs can also consult with the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee for assistance in identifying a suitable reviewer.

- An option is for one reviewer/consultant to work with several departments within a division. The consultant is appointed by the VCAA from a list of qualified persons recommended by department(s), or selected by a professional organization approved by the VCAA.

- The reviewer/consultant will study the program’s self study report in advance of the visit. During the visit, he/she will consult with the faculty on curriculum and instructional resources, talk with students and the dean, and visit classes, physical facilities, the library, and other support units.

- She/he will help the department to clarify its goals, as needed, and suggest more efficient or more effective ways of achieving departmental goals and mission, including more efficient management of department resources; and suggest future initiatives.

- She/he will submit a written report to the department, ideally before leaving the campus but no more than one week later. The consultant’s report and the program’s [optional] response will be included in the program review final report.
APPENDIX M: References


Minutes – November 2013

15 November 2012

Academic Policy Committee Report to Congress

Submitted by Mitchell Anderson, Chair, APC

A. Recommendations for implementing the new Academic Program Review Document

The program review document has gone through a revision, keeping the new format while incorporating the best from the previous document, much of it included in appendices designed to assist programs in filling in their self study. The committee is recommending a three-prong approach to the implementation process.

1. Educate the faculty – vet the new document across all faculty lines, including CAS, CoBE, CAFRRN, CHL, PHARM, CCECS, Library, Kilohana, and Student Services. (Hopefully we did not miss any.) The committee intends to work with the Deans, Division Chairs, and Directors to meet with faculty to provide broad dissemination and allow for discussion and input. We will begin immediately scheduling meetings with the faculty, through the respective Deans. We are also discussing scheduling a presentation to the students as well, probably through UHHSA.

One of the challenges for implementing the new format is the expected reluctance of faculty to embrace the new emphasis within Program Review on assessment, as well as the annual progress reports on the MOU throughout the 7-year cycle. The committee has identified two key factors that may assist this process. First, the only difference in the amount and content of material that is to be included in the new document is the section on Student Success. The new document obviously emphasizes the role of assessment, consistent with the new WASC requirements. Other than that, the new document is simply arranged slightly differently, which should cause no objection from faculty. Second, the 7-year cycle now allows programs to submit an annual 1 – 2 page report highlighting changes or trends not mentioned in the MOU, and progress or lack thereof made by the program and the administration in adhering to the MOU. Of course, this annual report is optional and programs that do not wish to take the opportunity can decline to do so. Programs will also have the opportunity to attach to the report their annual assessment reports on any efforts engaged in throughout the year. The committee
noted that these two issues are connected. Programs that engage in assessment on a regular basis will use these annual reports to gather their assessment information, which can then be simply compiled into the Student Success section of their Program Review document at the end of their cycle.

2. Create an Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (APRAC) of Congress.

The committee recommends that Congress create a new Committee, the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee under the following preliminary conditions.

a. Membership
   i. APRAC Executive Committee (or Peer Group) of 3 – 4 faculty members, with one member from Congress designated as Chair and the remaining members appointed by Congress’ executive committee. Members will serve rotating 2 – year terms.
   ii. Remaining APRAC members will consist of faculty who have recently gone through the PR process and faculty from programs scheduled for PR in the next 2 – 3 years who have been designated by their departments or programs to gather the requisite experience.

b. Charge

The Executive Committee charge within the committee as a whole charge is to:

   i. Provide leadership and stability for APRAC
   ii. Remain abreast of PR related WASC requirements
   iii. Identify prospective APRAC members
   iv. Work closely with the Assessment Peer Group on Assessment-related PR issues (Assessment and PR are tightly coupled.)
   v. Provide expertise and training in the PR process, both for programs and for administration (e.g. work with administration to ensure that programs are prepared to satisfy all PR requirements, particularly those pertaining to assessment)
   vi. Report to Congress
   vii. Work with the Administration on PR budget-related issues

The full Committee charge is to:

   i. Provide assistance and training to programs going through the PR process or scheduled to do so in the near future
   ii. Review PR reports prior to submittal and provide recommendations to programs on improving their report and/or advice on the development of their MOU
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iii. Review annual progress reports from programs as stipulated in the PR guidelines and provide recommendations to departments for making progress on their MOU
iv. Provide recommendations to Congress for improving the PR process

3. Educate the administration – One of the primary goals of the Assessment, Program Review, and Accreditation Committees, is to institutionalize assessment across campus, which is consistent with WASC’s desire to create a “culture of assessment”. The APC feels that the faculty and administration need to work hand in hand to encourage such a transformation. This can be accomplished in part through the use of the annual reports, which encourage programs to include their annual assessment reports while further allowing programs to keep their MOUs current and relevant so they can be used for long term strategic planning and resource allocation. One of the charges of the APRAC Executive Committee is to serve as reviewer and liaison between programs and the administration with respect to the annual progress reports.

B. UHH Credit Hour Policy

The APC will be meeting in December to discuss its recommendations to Congress regarding the WASC mandated Credit Hour Policy. Initial discussion indicates that developing the policy should be straightforward. It is anticipated that the majority of the discussion will center on the WASC requirement for review, ensuring that courses are in compliance with the policy, including those that are delivered in a non-traditional manner such as online, hybrid, reverse lecture, etc. Such review generally occurs at the CRC and during program review. Hopefully the APC will be able to forward its recommendation to Congress by the end of the Fall semester.
Minutes – December 2013

12 December 2012

Academic Policy Committee December Report

The APC met Friday, Dec. 7.

Present: Mitchell Anderson, chair, Mazen Hamad (Chem), Armando Garcia-Ortega (CAFNRM), Katherine Anderson (Pharmacy), Roberta Barra (CoBE), Jeanie Flood (Nursing), Kirsten Moltegaard (English)

Guest: April Komenaka Scazolla

Old Business:

Program Review – the recommended program review document and procedures are currently being reviewed by each academic unit. Feedback is requested by early next semester and the committee hopes to incorporate the feedback and submit a motion for adoption by mid spring semester.

New Business:

The committee discussed two policy issues this month,

1. Developing a Credit Hour Policy. Below is the committee’s recommendation and justification for a Credit Hour Policy. It is currently being reviewed by the academic units. The committee hopes to submit its motion for approval early next semester.

2. Including Congress review and approval of new programs subsequent to CRC approval in the New Program flowchart. The committee is currently altering the new program flowchart to reflect the need for Congress to approve new programs subsequent to CRC approval and to conform to the Policy Flowchart it developed last year. The committee has also been subsequently charged to review again the policy flowchart to explicitly include the processes for faculty input, and hopes to bring to Congress motions in the future reflecting these desired changes in both flowcharts and their accompanying notes.

Recommended Credit Hour Policy

The APC recommends adopting the following Credit Hour Policy and its associated Review Process.

Regardless of the type of academic activity, schedule, or method of delivery, one credit hour at UHH represents the amount of work an average student must expend to achieve intended learning outcomes consistent with that of a traditional course (i.e. one that meets one hour per week, with a minimum of two hours
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additional work such as preparation, research, homework, investigation, etc. over the course of an approximate 15 week semester).

This definition of credit hour implies:

5. One credit hour for courses with a non-traditional schedule (e.g. labs, directed studies, internships, etc.) or with alternative methods of delivery (e.g. online, hybrid, reverse lecture, etc.) represents an equivalent amount of work, as defined by intended student learning outcomes. Since there is no substitute for time spent in study or research, at least as much time must be spent “learning” regardless of the academic activity or method of delivery.

6. Courses with equivalent department course numbers should be consistent in terms of learning outcomes, regardless of the method of delivery.

7. Each credit hour represents approximately 45 hours of work. Departments should particularly keep this in mind when assigning non-traditional credit for activities such as independent study, service learning, laboratory, practica, courses with variable units, etc.

8. Only students who are able to demonstrate they have achieved the minimum intended learning outcomes will be awarded the credit hour. An average student that does not expend this amount of work should not pass and should not gain the credit. A below average student should need to spend more time working outside of class in order to gain the credit, either studying or taking advantage of learning resources such as tutoring.

Note: in the interest of fairness to the students the committee also discussed including in the policy a “maximum” number of hours of outside work.

Recommended Review Process

UHH currently has a number of processes through which the credit hour policy can be reviewed. It is recommended that the application of the credit hour policy be reviewed within the Academic Program Review process, New Course Approval (CRC and Curriculum Central), and General Education Certification and re-Certification. The APC feels that periodic audits would be unnecessary once the proposed Program Review changes are implemented, since credit hour policy is tied to assessment and learning outcomes, which play a significant role in the proposed PR process.

Since traditional courses that are also offered using alternative methods of delivery are not required to pass through the CRC or Curriculum Central, it is the responsibility of departments [evidenced through Program Review] to ensure such courses still satisfy the same learning outcomes, and hence earn the same credit hour(s). For courses in which the amount of face-to-face time is less than one-third the total work for the course UHH may consider following UC Berkeley’s lead, where instructors for such courses must answer a list of questions designed to ensure the course remains at an appropriate rigor and still delivers the required learning outcomes. http://www.wascsenior.org/files/UC%20Berkeley%20credit%20hour%20policy.pdf
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Motion: Move to refer to the Distance Learning Advisory Committee the issue of monitoring and reviewing courses in which the face-to-face time is less than one-third the total work.

Justification for the recommended Credit Hour Policy and Review Process

The APC followed these considerations in developing the UHH Credit Hour Policy

1. Must be consistent with Federal, WASC, and UH system regulations and definitions.
2. Its application must be flexible in order to apply to different modes of instruction and course designs.
3. Must be verifiable/quantifiable.
4. Review process must be manageable.
5. Should be defined in terms of learning outcomes….according to the federal regulations

Why a credit hour policy?

Federal requirement (tied to awarding financial aid) and consequently a WASC accreditation requirement.

According to the WASC website, The WASC Commission has adopted a Credit Hour Policy which will apply to all WASC institutions, effective Sept. 2, 2011.

WASC Examples of Credit Hour Policy


Please also be advised that the Commission has asked WASC staff to begin integrating evaluation of institutional credit hour policies into most visits being conducted this fall. Institutions will be asked to provide the following documents and information to be reviewed by the visiting team:

- Institution’s policy on the credit hour
- An explanation of the institution's process for periodic review of the application of this policy, to assure that credit hour assignments are accurate and reliable (for example, program review, process for new course approval, periodic audits)
- A list of the kinds of courses that are offered that do not require the standard amount of in-class seat time designated in the WASC policy (for example, online and hybrid courses, laboratory courses, studio work, clinical work, independent study, and internship courses)
- A course schedule showing the weeks, hours and days that courses meet.
- Three sample course syllabi (or the equivalent) for each kind of course that does not meet for the standard amount of in-class seat time required in the policy.

Federal Definition of a Unit of Credit
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Federal regulations regarding the definition and assignment of credit hours under Section 600.2 and 600.24(f) of the Higher Education Opportunity Act now state, in part, that a unit of credit is:

"An amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

1. One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately ... ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit or the equivalent amount of work over a different period of time; or
2. At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours."

From the UH System:

E5. 228 – Credit Hour

I. Introduction

This executive policy defines credit hour and directs units (UH Mānoa, UH Hilo, UH West O‘ahu, UH Maui College and UH Community Colleges) to develop a process to assure reliability and accuracy of assignment of credit hours across activities earning academic credit.

II. A credit hour

A. Is associated with an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement

B. Reasonably approximates but is not less than

   i. One hour of class or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks for one semester or the equivalent amount of work over a different period of time. OR

   ii. At least an equivalent amount of work for other academic activities such as online instruction, laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work and other work that earns academic credit.

III. Units shall implement a process for assuring reliability and accuracy of assignment of credit hours across all activities earning academic credit.
WASC’s Responsibilities

WASC is responsible under the new federal regulations to:

- Adopt policy and procedure for review of institutional responsibilities
- Demonstrate that a review of credit hours is reflected in institutional self-studies and comprehensive team reports
- Determine that credit hour assignments “conform to commonly accepted practice in higher education”
- Optionally use sampling of course credit hour assignments
- Require corrections of deficiencies
- Promptly notify the Secretary of Education if systemic noncompliance is found, or significant noncompliance with one or more programs

Other considerations

Problems using the credit hour as a measure of education

Author Amy Laitinen, deputy director for Higher Education at the New America Foundation’s Education Policy Program, outlines many of the problems that an over-reliance on this time-unit has caused for today’s students. These include:

- Credit hours are not universally transferable. Colleges routinely reject credits earned at other colleges, a particular problem for the 59 percent of students who attend more than one institution.
- Credit hours are difficult to assign to online courses, which often allow students to proceed through courses at their own pace. The percentage of students taking at least one online course has increased from less than 10 percent to 32 percent between 2002 and 2010. For-profit universities, which often use online classes, are also seeing dramatic increases in their student enrollment.
- Credit hours do not readily translate into assessments of students’ prior learning. Yet students who earn credit through programs that assess and award credit for things they already know are more likely to stay in and complete college than those who don’t.

As the report notes, the credit hour “was never intended to be a measure of, or proxy for student learning.” Over time, however, the credit hour has taken on enormous importance in everything from setting faculty workloads to determining state and federal funding and an institution’s eligibility for federal student aid.

It is the federal student aid program’s reliance on credit hours that has stifled many kinds of innovation, the report argues. Even though the federal government has tried to indicate a willingness to move away from the credit hour, “many in the industry still believe that their safest bet, if they want to keep access to federal financial aid, is to do what they have always done: use time to determine credits.”
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*Cracking the Credit Hour* recommends a number of different policy solutions. All, it argues, are available today. The federal government could:

- Innovate within the existing frame of the credit hour. Although the recent redefinition of the credit hour was designed for other purposes, “it also created opportunities for institutions to use non-time-based measures of learning to qualify for federal financial aid,” Laitinen writes. Specifically, the competency-based model already in use by Western Governors University should “be the norm,” rather than the exception, according to U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan.
- Innovate through experimentation. The current Higher Education Act offers the Department the opportunity to create what Laitinen calls a “small, controlled, voluntary virtual laboratory of ‘experimental sites’ on which it tests particular learning-based financial aid policies to see if they work, how they work, for whom they work, and under what conditions they work.” She suggests these innovations could include financial aid for credits earned using valid Prior Learning Assessments or outcome-based financial aid.
- Innovate by moving away from a system that is free from the credit hour’s history. Direct assessment of student learning is already permitted under the Higher Education Act.

**Related issues:**

**List of courses that do not satisfy the traditional one-hour lecture, two-hour homework model**

A list of the kinds of courses that UHH offers that do not fit the traditional 1hr/2hr lecture/homework model has been requested of the chair of all colleges, in anticipation of this requirement within the impending accreditation.

One would expect to find on the list such academic activities as:

- Laboratory (e.g. one-credit Science labs that meet for three hours each week with little or no homework)
- Practica (e.g. Nursing and Education courses where students are required to enter the classroom or hospital for hands-on experience).
- Service Learning Academic Activities
- Directed Readings/Independent Study
- Study Abroad

**Syllabi**

Once the list of non-traditional delivery courses is compiled, the accreditation committee will compile three samples of course syllabi for each kind.
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18 January 2013

Academic Policy Committee December Report

The APC met Tuesday, Jan. 15.

Present: Mitchell Anderson, chair, Mazen Hamad (Chem), Armando Garcia-Ortega (CAFNRM), Katherine Anderson (Pharmacy), Kirsten Mollegaard (English)

Excused: Roberta Barra (CoBE) – sabbatical, Jeanie Flood (Nursing), Mike Sado (UHHS)

Old Business:

Program Review – the recommended program review document and procedures are currently being reviewed by each academic unit. Feedback is requested by February 1 and the committee hopes to incorporate the feedback and submit a motion for adoption by mid semester.

Credit Hour Policy – the recommended UHH Credit Hour Policy is currently being reviewed across the units. The committee has requested feedback by Feb. 1 and hopes to incorporate feedback and submit a motion for adoption by mid semester.

New Business:

The committee was charged with two new policy issues,

1. Incorporate “Unit – level processes” into the University level Policy Flowchart. The current flow chart can be found at http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/PolicyProposalflowchartNotesFINAL10-6-09.pdf
   The committee has acquired an editable electronic copy of the proposed flow chart approved by congress last year (but not forwarded to or approved by the VCAA) and intends to alter it to include the current unit-level processes.

2. Include in the Curriculum Review Process flowchart Congress review and approval of new or revised program proposals subsequent to CRC approval. The committee intends to reformat the Curriculum Review Process flowchart to both reflect this change and to match that of the Policy flowchart. The current Curriculum Review Process flowchart can be found at http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/CurriculumReviewFlowDiagramNotes10-6-09-FINAL.pdf
Minutes – February 2013

14 February 2013

Academic Policy Committee February Report

The APC met Thursday, Feb. 14

Present: Mitchell Anderson, chair, Armando Garcia-Ortega (CAFNRM), Kirsten Mollegaard (English), Jodilyn Kunimoto, Jeanie Flood (Nursing)

Excused: Roberta Barra (CoBE) – sabbatical, Mike Sado (UHHSA), Mazen Hamad (Chem), Katherine Anderson (Pharmacy)

Note: there are two motions for consideration included herein, one within old business and one within new business.

Old Business:

A. Program Review – CAS is still reviewing the proposed PR document and procedures. The CAS Senate Executive Committee meets Feb 15 at 2pm and will be attended by Mitchell Anderson, Seri Luangphinth, and Todd Belt.

B. Credit Hour Policy – the APC submits the following motion for action:

Motion: Move to recommend to the VCAA that UHH adopt the following Credit Hour Policy and Review Process.

UHH Credit Hour Policy

Regardless of the type of academic activity, schedule, or method of delivery, one credit hour at UHH represents the expected amount of work a student must expend to achieve intended learning outcomes consistent with that of a traditional course (i.e. one that meets one hour per week, with a minimum of two hours additional work such as preparation, research, homework, investigation, etc. over the course of an approximate 15 week semester).

This definition of credit hour implies:

9. One credit hour for courses with a non-traditional schedule (e.g. labs, directed studies, internships, etc.) or with alternative methods of delivery (e.g. online, hybrid, reverse lecture, etc.) represents an equivalent amount of work, as defined by intended student learning outcomes. Since there is no substitute for time spent in study or research, at least as much time must be spent “learning” regardless of the academic activity or method of delivery.
10. Courses with equivalent department course numbers should be consistent in terms of learning outcomes, regardless of the method of delivery.

11. Each credit hour represents approximately 45 hours of work. Departments should particularly keep this in mind when assigning non-traditional credit for activities such as independent study, service learning, laboratory, practica, seminar, internships, and courses with variable units, etc.

12. Only students who are able to demonstrate they have achieved the minimum intended learning outcomes will be awarded the credit hour.

Review Process

The application of the credit hour policy will be reviewed within the Academic Program Review process, New Course Approval (Curriculum Review Committee(s) and Curriculum Central), and General Education Certification and re-Certification. Monitoring and reviewing courses in which the amount of face-to-face time is less than one-third the total work for the course will be referred to the Distance Learning Advisory Committee.

Justification for the credit hour policy is included for the record as an attachment.

The following need to be completed, assuming the motion passes:

- All units should be informed of the change and the resulting necessity to include evidence within their program reviews demonstrating they are following the credit hour policy, in particular as it applies to non-traditional modes of delivery.
- All Curriculum Review Committees, Curriculum Central administrators, and the chair of Gen Ed should be notified to include the credit hour policy in their determinations for new curriculum and general education certification and re-certification.
- The Accreditation Committee should develop a list of courses that do not satisfy the traditional one-hour lecture, two-hour homework model. Such a list should include courses such as:
  - Laboratory (e.g. one-credit Science labs that meet for three hours each week with little or no homework)
  - Practica (e.g. Nursing and Education courses where students are required to enter the classroom or hospital for hands-on experience).
  - Service Learning Academic Activities
  - Directed Reading/Independent Study
  - Study Abroad
  - Seminar
  - Internship
The Accreditation Committee needs to compile three sample Syllabi from each of the types of non-traditional courses listed above.

C. Policy Flow Chart. The committee reviewed the Policy Flow Chart and Notes, and made revisions to reflect the request that unit-level processes be included. The committee elected to have graphics work on making the work less congested and more in line with other UHH web-site flow charts. The committee had some questions regarding the notes: Which if any of the bullets in the final section on administrative responsibilities should be retained?

D. Curriculum Review Flow Chart. The committee reviewed the flow chart and notes and incorporated the request to include the Faculty Congress in the review process subsequent to the CRC. The committee elected to send the flow chart to graphics for final presentation. However, the committee did not yet address the request to include the role of Curriculum Central in the review process.

New Business:

A. Time Limits to complete the Ph.D. program

The committee discussed this policy that was proposed by the Graduate Council and found it in line with that used in most graduate programs. The proposal from the Graduate Council follows. The APC recommended slight changes to enhance the clarity, and these are highlighted.

To : Dan Brown, VCREDD
FROM : Graduate Council
Re : Time limits for Ph.D. programs, approved for recommendation 11-9-12 meeting

It is proposed that the following general time limits for Ph.D. programs be adopted as UHH Graduate Division policy. An individual program may shorten the time limits, if desired and internally approved. Special exceptions to the limits, with the support of the program and Dean, would require graduate council approval.

- Graduate level courses may only be applied towards the degree requirements if taken within 10 years of the completion of the degree. [Credits used towards fulfillment of another degree may not be used.]

- The maximum time a student may take to complete all requirements for a Ph.D. is 7 years from matriculation into the Ph.D. program, with a possible extension for extenuating circumstances not to exceed 10 years in total. A petition for extension will be submitted by the program to the Graduate Council, and if approved, the Graduate Council will forward approval of the extension to the VCREDD and/or VCAA.
Minutes – February 2013

The committee had the following two questions:

1. Does this apply to PharmD and DNP programs?
2. In the very last sentence, why would the Graduate Council forward approval to the VCAA? More importantly, why is it an and/or situation, with our emphasis of concern on the “or” part?

Motion: Move to accept the proposed Time Limits for Completing the Ph.D. at UHH, with the changes as noted.

B. Tenure and Promotion e-filing.
   The committee is developing a proposal and intends to circulate it within the next two weeks.

C. Tenure and Promotion and Contract Renewal Feedback during the process, and the inclusion of an MOU between the Dean and the candidate.
   The committee is developing a proposal for the feedback portion and intends to circulate it for comment amongst the units within the next two weeks. Discussion is continuing for the MOU issue.
Minutes – March 2013

14 March 2013

Academic Policy March 2013 Committee Report

The APC met Wednesday, March 13

Present: Mitchell Anderson, chair, Armando Garcia-Ortega (CAFNRM), Kirsten Mollegaard (English), Jodilyn Kunimoto (Student Affairs), Mazen Hamad (Chem)

Excused: Roberta Barra (CoBE) – sabbatical, Mike Sado (UHHSA), Katherine Anderson (Pharmacy), Jeanie Flood (Nursing)

Note: included herein are two motions scheduled for a vote, having gone through a first reading at the last Congress meeting, and three motions being presented for their first reading.

Old Business:

E. UHH Credit Hour and Review Policy – A motion was made at the last Congress meeting to recommend to the VCAA that UHH adopt the following Credit Hour Policy. This motion was read at the last meeting and is scheduled to be voted on at the March 15, 2013 Congress meeting. The version presented at the last Congress meeting included as its final sentence in the Review Process the following: “Monitoring and reviewing courses in which the amount of face-to-face time is less than one-third the total work for the course will be referred to the Distance Learning Advisory Committee.” After discussions with the DL Advisory Committee the APC voted to remove this sentence since that committee indicated it does not have the authority nor manpower to conduct such reviews.

UHH Credit Hour Policy

Regardless of the type of academic activity, schedule, or method of delivery, one credit hour at UHH represents the expected amount of work a student must expend to achieve intended learning outcomes consistent with that of a traditional course (i.e. one that meets one hour per week, with a minimum of two hours additional work such as preparation, research, homework, investigation, etc. over the course of an approximate 15 week semester).

This definition of credit hour implies:

13. One credit hour for courses with a non-traditional schedule (e.g. labs, directed studies, internships, etc.) or with alternative methods of delivery (e.g. online, hybrid, reverse lecture, etc.) represents an equivalent amount of work, as defined by intended student learning outcomes. Since there is no substitute for time spent in study or research, at
least as much time must be spent “learning” regardless of the academic activity or method of delivery.

14. Courses with equivalent department course numbers should be consistent in terms of learning outcomes, regardless of the method of delivery.

15. Each credit hour represents approximately 45 hours of work. Departments should particularly keep this in mind when assigning non-traditional credit for activities such as independent study, service learning, laboratory, practica, seminar, internships, and courses with variable units, etc.

16. Only students who are able to demonstrate they have achieved the minimum intended learning outcomes will be awarded the credit hour.

Review Process

The application of the credit hour policy will be reviewed within the Academic Program Review process, New Course Approval (Curriculum Review Committee(s) and Curriculum Central), and General Education Certification and re-Certification.

Justification for the credit-hour policy is included for the record as an attachment.

The following need to be completed, assuming the motion passes:

- All units should be informed of the change and the resulting necessity to include evidence within their program reviews demonstrating they are following the credit hour policy, in particular as it applies to non-traditional modes of delivery.
- All Curriculum Review Committees, Curriculum Central administrators, and the chair of Gen Ed should be notified to include the credit hour policy in their determinations for new curriculum and general education certification and re-certification.
- The Accreditation Committee should develop a list of courses that do not satisfy the traditional one-hour lecture, two-hour homework model. Such a list should include courses such as:
  - Laboratory (e.g. one-credit Science labs that meet for three hours each week with little or no homework)
  - Practica (e.g. Nursing and Education courses where students are required to enter the classroom or hospital for hands-on experience).
  - Service Learning Academic Activities
  - Directed Reading/Independent Study
  - Study Abroad
  - Seminar
  - Internship
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- The Accreditation Committee needs to compile three sample Syllabi from each of the types of non-traditional courses listed above.

B. Time Limits to complete the Ph.D. program

A motion was made at the last Congress meeting to recommend that UHH adopt the following Policy regarding Time Limits to Complete a Ph.D. This motion was read at the last meeting and is scheduled to be voted on at the March 15, 2013 Congress meeting. The version presented at the last Congress meeting included the three final words “and/or VCAA.” After discussions with Matt Platz, Dan Brown informed the APC chair that he and Dr. Platz agreed that such applications should be forwarded only to the VCREA. Those words have been removed in the version below.

Time limits for Ph.D. programs

It is proposed that the following general time limits for Ph.D. programs be adopted as UHH Graduate Division policy. An individual program may shorten the time limits, if desired and internally approved. Special exceptions to the limits, with the support of the program and Dean, would require graduate council approval.

- Graduate level courses may only be applied towards the degree requirements if taken within 10 years of the completion of the degree. [Credits used towards fulfillment of another degree may not be used.]

- The maximum time a student may take to complete all requirements for a Ph.D. is 7 years from matriculation into the Ph.D. program, with a possible extension for extenuating circumstances not to exceed 10 years in total. A petition for extension will be submitted by the program to the Graduate Council, and if approved, the Graduate Council will forward approval of the extension to the VCREA.

C. Policy Flow Chart.

Motion: Move to replace the current UHH Policy Flow Chart, found on the Chancellor’s site http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/PolicyProposalflowchartNotesFINAL10-6-09.pdf with the attached Policy Flow Chart, along with the revised notes below. The new flowchart has been developed to better reflect the role of the Research Council, and the notes included on the current web site have been revised to reflect these changes. A document comparing the current notes with the proposed notes is also attached.
Notes to accompany the Academic Policy Proposal Flow Chart

This process is intended to govern the proposal and approval of new or modified academic policies.

Academic policy proposals may originate at any level of the campus community.

When the need is apparent, or when directed to do so by decision-making authorities, persons proposing new or amended policies are responsible for seeking consultation with appropriate university staff members, to ensure compliance with law, government and system policies, and other regulations. Proposals may be returned for further consultation at any point in the process.

Certification of consultation must be provided by the consulted staff member or members and forwarded with the proposal.

Footnote references from the flow chart:

1. For the purposes of this document, Dean(s) includes Deans, the University Librarian, and the Director of Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani, the College of Hawaiian Language.

2. For the purposes of this document, the word "Unit" in the phrase "Unit Governance Entities" includes, but is not limited to, the Colleges and the Library.

3. Representatives of Faculty Congress and Graduate Council are responsible for seeking consultation with appropriate Faculty and Staff members within their respective units on the potential implications of new or amended policies. Faculty Congress will appoint a member as “liaison to Graduate Council” to communicate between the two representative bodies.

4. Referrals for proposal revision from Faculty Congress and Graduate Council are sent to proposal originator.

5. Referrals for proposal revision from the VCAA may be sent to either Faculty Congress or Graduate Council, depending on the scope and potential implications of the proposed policy.

6. There is a time-limit between receiving and voting/deciding on a proposal. For Faculty Congress, the time-limit is two months. For Graduate Council, the VCR, and VCAA this is one month. If time-limit is not met, the proposal shall automatically be advanced to the next recipient without recommendation.

Note that the University administration is responsible for:

• Developing forms and documentation consistent with these procedures;

• Arranging for a system to track policy proposals as they move through the process, and arranging for training of users;

• Specifying procedures to notify submitters, reviewers, and other appropriate participants of the progress and final status of proposals, using a combination of web-posting, email, hardcopy distribution, etc., as appropriate;
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- Codifying long-standing policies and procedures and posting them on the academic policies webpage; and
- Ensuring that other campus shared governance constitutions and by-laws are consistent with these established processes.

D. Curriculum Review Flow Chart. The Committee was asked by the Congress Chair to postpone work on this flow chart.

E. Program Review – All units have been given ample opportunity to review the proposed changes to the PR document and procedures and have provided feedback to the committee. The primary concerns of some faculty include anticipated resources necessary to perform meaningful assessments and for a new faculty committee, the proposed Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC). While resources for assessment are a very legitimate concern, assessment is already a required part of Program Review. The proposed PR document simply attempts to make the role of assessment more clear, and reflects the role of assessment that WASC and the Federal DOE place on assessment. Faculty also voiced concerns over the process of developing an MOU between programs and the administration, and the manner in which MOU’s have been used or more importantly ignored in the past. The committee’s response was to point out that one of the purposes of PRAC was to address this problem by ensuring that the MOU’s remained current through annual reports. (More on this under the second motion below.)


Motion: Move to create a UHH Faculty Congress Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) to assist programs with the program review process.

Membership: Congress will identify and appoint a 2-year Chair and 2 – 3 additional core members who will serve alternating 2-year terms and who are responsible for the following:

1. Identify faculty with recent experience in Program Review to serve in a training capacity to assist other faculty who will be coming up for PR in the next 1 – 2 years.
2. Identify faculty from programs scheduled for PR within the next 2 years. Membership by such faculty will facilitate their training.
3. Meet with programs at the beginning of the PR process to inform the program faculty members of what to expect, the deadlines that need to be met, the amount of work that needs to be distributed among the faculty members, the information that needs to
be included and how to obtain said information, how to choose an external reviewer, and the MOU development process.

4. Internally review Program Review documents prior to external reviewer visits and provide feedback to programs.

5. Assist programs in the process of identifying an external reviewer.

6. Assist programs in developing and negotiating their MOU.

7. Review program [optional] annual reviews that highlight progress or lack thereof within the MOU’s, and assist programs with their ongoing negotiations with the administration when progress is deemed insufficient.

F. Tenure and Promotion e-filing.
The committee has identified a number of challenges in moving to e-filing, and is currently developing a strategy and policy for moving towards e-filing contract renewal and T&P applications in the near future. The committee hopes to circulate a proposal within the units after spring break.

G. Tenure and Promotion and Contract Renewal Feedback during the process, and the inclusion of an MOU between the Dean and the candidate.
The committee has contacted UHPA for an initial consultation and is still researching those parts of the contract pertinent to this proposal. The committee is splitting the two issues, notification and agreement. The committee hopes to circulate an initial proposal within the units shortly after spring break.
Minutes – April 2013

19 April 2013

Academic Policy April 2013 Committee Report

The APC met Friday, April 5

Present: Mitchell Anderson, chair, Armando Garcia-Ortega (CAFNRM), Kirsten Mollegaard (English), Jodilyn Kunimoto (Student Affairs), Mazen Hamad (Chem), Katherine Anderson (Pharmacy)

Excused: Roberta Barra (CoBE) – sabbatical, Jeanie Flood (Nursing)

Absent: Mike Sado (UHHSA)

Old Business:

1. In order for the motion on PRAC to fit into the format used by other standing committees the motion to create the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) was changed to the following: Most of the wording is the same as what was presented in Congress last meeting, but now fits the format for the by-laws.

Motion: Move to create a UHH Faculty Congress Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) to assist programs with the program review process. The intent is that this will be a standing committee of the UHH Congress.

Proposed By-Laws of the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee

The Congress will approve the membership of the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) composed of an executive committee of no fewer than three or more than five faculty members from UHH and broad general membership from across the various units. Congress will also appoint a faculty member to serve as chair.

The Executive Committee will

- identify and invite faculty members with recent experience in Program Review to serve as PRAC members to assist in the training of other faculty whose programs are scheduled for PR in the next 1 – 2 years
- identify and invite faculty from programs scheduled for PR within the next 2 years to serve as PRAC members in order to help facilitate their PR training
- supervise committee meetings with programs at the beginning of the PR process to inform the program faculty members of what to expect during the PR process, the deadlines that need to be met, best practices with respect to obtaining required
information and distributing the work among the faculty members, how to identify and invite an external reviewer, and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) development process (note: programs may choose to decline this offer of assistance)

- supervise a PRAC internal review of Program Review documents prior to external reviewer visits and provide feedback to programs
- review [optional] program annual reviews that highlight progress or lack thereof within the MOUs, and assist programs with their ongoing negotiations with the administration when progress is deemed insufficient.

PRAC Executive Committee members shall serve two-year staggered terms. Committee members serving in the trainee-capacity shall serve through the completion of their program’s PR and will be encouraged to continue for at least one year in a trainer-capacity to provide continuity from year to year. The Congress Chair may negotiate a course reduction with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for the Chair of this Committee depending on the agenda of the Committee for the upcoming year.

2. Notifying candidates during the Contract Renewal and Tenure and Promotion process. The chair contacted Jim Kardash at UHPA to discuss this issue. He was informed that Congress does not have jurisdiction with respect to requesting the Dean or Division Chair to notify candidates. Further, according to the contract departments have the right to develop their own DPC policies. Therefore, any motion from the APC must take this into account. Finally, the current contract already includes the following statement regarding notifying candidates subsequent to TPRC review:

*The Faculty member shall be notified of the recommendation of the TPRC when it is reported.*

The chair asked for clarification on the meaning of “when it is reported” and was told that this referred to when the TPRC submitted their recommendation. Therefore, it appears that the contract already stipulates that candidates should be informed immediately. The chair has requested further clarification on the issue of jurisdiction from another UHPA source and is awaiting a response.

3. E-filing Contract Renewal and Tenure and Promotion applications. The committee is continuing to work on this issue and is also awaiting an UHPA response. The committee notes:

   a. We would like to suggest that within the current guidelines for applying for contract renewal and T & P that all materials be submitted electronically, and that the same timelines and confidentiality requirements still be met.
b. Much of the dossier is already prepared electronically. Problems arise with the supporting materials that are currently supplied in appendices, particularly bulky items or other items that do not lend themselves well to electronic submission.

c. Of particular concern is the appendix containing the hard copies of the students’ comments. The committee notes that the authenticity of these comments are in question, which diminishes their importance. This possibly goes against the views of many of the faculty.

d. It is the charge of the committee to suggest policy only and to leave the responsibility of accepting the policy and implementing it to the administration. However, there are a number of logistical considerations that greatly impact the future success of such policy. These include but may not be limited to:

   i. Creating a secure filing site

   ii. Confidentiality of electronic files by the reviewers – setting policy for restricting copying of electronic files and in printed form

   iii. Uniformity of filing requirements across units – formatting, page limits (or not), submission deadline enforcement, latitude in the case of electronic difficulties, large PDF files, etc.

   iv. Accessibility – from the perspectives of the candidate and more often the reviewers (many reviewers are not comfortable viewing files electronically)

e. Given these hurdles the committee is leaning towards taking advantage of the fact that a large part of the dossiers are already in electronic form and suggesting running a pilot program that allows candidates to submit all or part of their dossiers electronically. The committee is in discussion about how to handle the student evaluations in particular. Suggestions are welcome.