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Institutional and Visit Context

The University of Hawaii at Manoa (UHM) is one of ten institutions forming the University of Hawaii System. The UHM is the unique doctoral/research extensive university in the System, with seven community colleges, a comprehensive University of Hawaii-Hilo campus located on another island, and a small upper-division campus, the University of Hawaii-West Oahu, making up the other nine parts of the University of Hawaii System. UHM is classified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research-Extensive institution, and it enrolls 12,242 undergraduate and 5,876 graduate students, of whom 76% are listed as minority students. The UHM is arrayed in 17 schools and colleges plus Outreach College and the Graduate Division, and offers 92 bachelors, 91 masters, and 58 doctoral degree programs. It also is the administrative home for a number of off-campus facilities, including the Lyon Arboretum, the Waikiki Aquarium, and the Mauna Kea telescope.

The University of Hawaii was first accredited by WASC in 1952. Its 28 professional programs are accredited by the appropriate professional organizations. The impetus for this Special Visit was the result of the ten-year accreditation review, conducted as a visit in spring 1999 and the subsequent WASC Commission action in summer 1999. The Visiting Team Report and the WASC Commission action letter form the basis for and the limits of this Special Visit.

The 1999 Visiting Team Report found an institution with considerable difficulties. It summarized its findings in four principle areas, each with a number of specific recommendations. These four areas were: Planning, Governance and Resources (p. 17 ff); Undergraduate Education (p. 30 ff); Graduate Education and Research (p. 37 ff); and Library, Computing and Information Learning Resources (p. 40 ff).

The Commission Action Letter (6 July, 1999), in evaluating the Visiting Team’s report and the institutional response to this report, also grouped its areas of concern into four topical areas, which were thematically organized differently from the earlier Team Report. These were: Need for Clarified Strength and Leadership throughout the Institution (p. 2-3); Planning, Priority Setting and Action (p. 3); Student and Educational Program Quality (p. 3-4); and Assessment and the use of Data (p. 4). The evaluation and recommendation section of this report subsume the comments and recommendations of both 1999 documents.

The WASC Commission acted in June 1999 to Reaffirm Accreditation and to schedule a special visit in spring 2002, “addressing the issues stated in this letter and the major recommendations of the evaluation team.” The Commission also indicated that it would establish the date of the next comprehensive visit at its June 2002 meeting. The present review is a year later than the Commission action proscribed; this was due to the coordination of reviews of all three of the senior UH institutions (UHM; UHH; and UHWO) as well as a fourth review of the UH System Office, especially with respect to System issues and future directions regarding the three senior level institutions. This report is the result of the Special Visit to the UHM, following from the 1999 Commission action. The reviewers were aware of the observations of the Visiting Team reviewing the UH System Office; one of our members was also a member of the UH System Office team. Another member had been on the 1999 WASC visiting team.

Institutional Context. The UHM was an institution with significant leadership, organizational, operational, and political challenges at the time of the 1999 visit. Many of the specific issues identified in this 1999 process have now been addressed, some brought to completion and others in process. Few still persist as unanswered. As the sole research university in the relatively small environment that is Hawaii, the UHM historically has been subject to intense interest and political pressures from the public, the legislature and state government, and its Board of Regents, with some members, at times, acting individually. One faculty member characterized the UHM as “the most public university in the United States,” an apt description in many ways. Moreover, the UHM is clearly the dominant entity in the ten-institution University of Hawaii
System, and it faces a particular set of challenges because it is both the largest and the only research institution in this System. Some operating issues that confront the UHM are beyond the scope of this special visit.

The UHM and the University of Hawaii are distinct entities, with the former being a subset of the latter. Both have had significant change in the past four years since the 1999 visit and WASC action. In 1999, Dr. Kenneth Mortimer was both the president of the UH as well as the chancellor of the UHM campus. The System and campus central administrative offices both were co-located on the Manoa campus. Dr. Mortimer resigned his dual posts in the System and UHM as Dr. Evan Dobelle joined the UH System as its president in summer, 2001, with an agenda of bold change. In turn, the new System president appointed Dr. Deane Neubauer, a longtime political science professor at UHM, as interim chancellor of the Manoa Campus in 2001. This appointment began the process of defining a chancellor and CEO for the UHM, a position that was distinct from the president of the UH System. In August, 2002, Dr. Peter Englert became the permanent chancellor of the UHM campus, with Dr. Neubauer moving to a new position as Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs for the UH System. In the years prior to the relatively recent appointments of Dr. Dobelle and then Dr. Englert, both the UH System and the UHM had considerable turnover and thus confusion in its leadership. Although there is an ongoing process of defining the roles of the president of the UH System and the chancellor of the UHM, with these two appointments of Dr. Dobelle and Dr. Englert the Board of Regents has committed itself to a new level of leadership that should add stability and direction to both the System and the campus. This appears to be a potentially appropriate and defining outcome for both the entities.

The UH System and the UHM now have the necessary senior executive leadership in place. The respective roles of the System president and the chancellor at Manoa are newly defined, and will be more clearly understood by the incumbents and by constituents with more time. There remains, however, considerable uncertainty of the senior leadership teams for both entities. The System leadership team is redefining itself, with new System-wide positions of Vice Presidents for Public Relations and for Finance recently created and filled. The System positions of Vice President for Academic Affairs and Vice President for Research are not now permanently filled. At UHM, several key positions likewise are not at present filled. The campus is searching for a Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, and for a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Several key dean and director positions likewise are occupied by interim appointees. There also is a significant reorganization of the student affairs leadership, with two now unoccupied vice chancellorial positions to be defined and then filled. Of particular concern to the team is the administrative arrangement in which deans and vice chancellors who report directly to the chancellor are appointed by the Board of Regents, with concurrence from the president. The roles and responsibilities of these key senior leadership positions at the campus level, whether now filled or not, must be defined and understood by all stakeholders in order for the UHM to sustain the positive changes that have occurred in the recent past.

There appears to be significant operational and, indeed, cultural change since the 1999 WASC action. The Special Report prepared by the campus for this special team visit described accurately a large number of key initiatives and actions taken in direct response to the recommendations of the 1999 visiting team and the WASC commission action in June of 1999.

"Since the last WASC visit in 1999, there has been significant change at Manoa and within the ten campus system. We have a new System-level president, Evan Dobelle, and a new Manoa chancellor, Peter Englert. We have, since 1999, hired eight new deans and directors and have recruited scores of new faculty members to the Manoa campus......We have developed and implemented a new General Education Program and vigorously stepped up our assessment efforts. We engaged in a far-reaching community-wide planning process. Our strategic plan, Defining Our Destiny, was approved by the Board of Regents in November 2002.
While many of the conditions at Manoa that led to this special visit have been addressed, there are, as to be expected, new concerns and challenges. There is, however, one fundamental difference between our campus today and the way it was in 1999: our capacity to confront and manage change has increased greatly. This change at the Manoa campus has resulted from 1) a new attitude; 2) new leadership; 3) organizational and institutional reform; and 4) a commitment to becoming a self-learning institution.

Budgetary and political difficulties similar to those that beset the UHM as well as the System, as a whole in 1999, are still present today. The campus is engaging a period of major change. Yet the UHM is positioned far better today than in 1999 for confronting these external and internal issues and challenges. The campus has in place a widely appreciated strategic plan, ready for implementation. It has developed a strategic plan for its IT environment, and support for the library has increased significantly. A new focus on undergraduate education and its assessment is beginning, and program review is again functioning strongly. The new leadership in the System as well as at the UHM campus is continuing to define the roles and responsibilities of each entity and its administrative principles, and the UHM chancellor is staffing his central administration. Faculty involvement in the institution’s governance has improved since the 1999 visit.

While many highly positive changes have been initiated in the four years since the last WASC visit, the paramount challenge for the institution will be sustaining the momentum it now has for confronting change in positive and healthy directions. If successful, this will allow the UHM to deal with the external and internal issues that will confront it in ways that assure the institution’s success and improvement for all of its stakeholders. The senior administrative leadership must be keenly aware of the recent past of the UHM and the UH System, and continue to act in ways affirmative to the ambitious agenda of change that has been started. The University of Hawaii at Manoa should be commended for these positive changes, and congratulated for engaging the issues highlighted in the 1999 WASC review.

Quality of the Institutional Report and Supporting Evidence. The senior staff at the UHM are to be complimented for their excellent and thorough preparation for the site visit. The UHM’s Special Visit Report was a concise summary of the changes made since 1999, and it provided a thorough narrative of the institutional response to each of the issues and recommendations made by the 1999 Team and by the 1999 WASC Commission. Supporting evidence was provided in considerable detail in the thorough documentation provided to the team, and any missing data were provided promptly by the ALO and his staff. The Visiting Team would like to thank the ALO, Dr. Karl Kim, and his staff for providing such a well-prepared, thorough and data-supported experience.

Description of the team review process. The team members were provided with the UHM’s Special Visit Report well in advance of the visit. Very extensive links to web resources also were provided, and organized around the 2001 WASC Standards in anticipation of the next comprehensive review of the University. Appropriate documents in abundance were available as paper copy in the team room, and the UHM had conveniently provided IT facilities for accessing the web resources locally.

The four members of the visiting team, usually individually, engaged an extensive series of discussions with individual or groups of campus constituents on issues raised in the 1999 WASC documents. We obtained direct and documented information on all of the 1999 issues, and we were satisfied that the interview processes allowed further understanding of the changes that have been made since 1999. There was an effort made to schedule conversations with a very broad range of interested stakeholders, some frankly critical, and the team was well-satisfied with both the background information and with the broad array of information gleaned from the many meetings.
Team Findings, Analysis and Recommendations

This summary is divided into four major sections. Each team member was primarily responsible for one section and reviewed relevant institutional data and interviewed relevant campus individuals and groups. All of the 1999 recommendations are addressed in these four sections of this report.

Planning, Governance, and Resources. The 1999 accreditation team visit to the University of Hawaii at Manoa found a university with serious issues in its planning, governance, and resource allocation processes. The key observations noted that there was little campus support or involvement in the formulation of a strategic plan, and that stakeholders sought effective central leadership for the campus, one that fostered effective communication and involvement of the campus constituents in decisions. Part of the concerns centered on the perceived need for definition of a clear campus administrative leadership, distinct from the UH System. There also were issues of members of the Board of Regents acting individually in the affairs of the University.

The team recommended that hard budget decisions were needed in the near term in response to the ongoing budget crisis, and that budget and planning strategies should be developed through processes that promoted broad campus involvement. This would require a clear definition of the role of and authority of the faculty. The campus leadership, if using the position model of an executive vice chancellor as was the case in 1999, needed definition with respect to roles and responsibilities of this individual, and that of the System leadership and the University Regents. Operationally, the visiting team recommended that a tracking system for senate actions and administrative behaviors should be established, and that cross-functional teams of institutional research staff should create data systems and develop a seamless presentation of data. A campus information technology strategic plan was needed.

The 2003 special visit team found a university community dramatically changed. Representatives of the various campus constituencies were energetic, involved, and optimistic about the institution and its ability to deal with difficult issues. As well, those we met with were in general optimistic about the potential of their voices being heard as the university grapples with change, budgetary pressures, and key institutional decisions.

Campus Communication. The new chancellor has publicly affirmed the importance of consultation with the key campus constituencies and has created new consultative structures with the purpose of assuring ongoing consultation on key issues. The creation of two new administrative consultative groups is designed to establish the deans as members of the university-wide administrative team. Since the Faculty Senate Chair serves on both groups, there is also a critical link back to the faculty governance structure. The chancellor has met every other week with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and members were enthusiastic about his presence and his willingness to listen and respond to their point of view. His quarterly meetings with staff were also mentioned positively as groundbreaking and affirming. However, several members of the faculty with whom the team met expressed concern about appropriate and meaningful consultation with System-level officials about System decisions that disproportionately affect UHM.

Students in general are positive about recent and planned changes at the university, such as the new general education program. They sense the faculty’s excitement about curriculum and instructional innovations. However, they feel that the realignment of System and institutional administrative functions has resulted in confusion about appropriate ways for students to communicate with both levels of administration.

Strategic Planning. Given the importance of the campus planning process to implement the new strategic plan for the Manoa campus, it is also critical that the new chancellor has repeatedly affirmed the values and directions identified for the Manoa campus in the strategic plan, which was primarily completed before his appointment began. His vision for the Manoa campus, as an excellent public research university, is
consistent with the strategic plan. Conversations on campus with members of the faculty, staff, and students see congruence between the chancellor's vision and the campus vision as described in the strategic plan. There also is in place now a strategic plan for the campus information technology functions and, consistent with this, the budget and operations of the campus's library have been considerably improved and a new university librarian has been appointed.

The discussions about the campus strategic planning process were filled with energy and enthusiasm. This was clearly an all-campus activity that produced not just the plan as a product, but also established a precedent for engagement and responsibility for the campus among the many from the campus who participated. This strategic planning process not only empowered those from the Manoa community to believe that they could influence the direction of the campus but also gave them a sense of responsibility for achieving what they see as important steps to make the Manoa campus a community. One participant summed up the impact of the planning process by saying, "Previously, we looked to the central administration for initiatives and to accomplish objectives. Now we know that we can and should do these ourselves." Another comment also is emblematic of the outcome: "This is a place where 'go is an option.'"

**Roles.** The role of the faculty, through the senate, has been formally approved by the System and the campus. Discussions with two members of the Board of Regents confirmed that they were oriented to the appropriate role of board members.

**Budget.** The area in which information, communication, and consultative processes have not been developed in ways that function well and are widely accepted and understood is the budget. The Manoa Budget Advisory Committee is seen as moribund—it meets rarely, focuses on specific budgetary issues or problems without knowledge of the "big picture," and it is without a clear delineation of its charge vis a vis other campus groups (e.g. the Senate's Committee on Administration and Budget).

**Assessment and the Use of Data.** Since the 1999 WASC visit, the university has made remarkable progress in launching a campus-wide approach to the assessment of student learning that is supported by all constituencies. This change is both responsive to the 1999 recommendations, as well as critical to positioning UHM for the next WASC accreditation review, which will be conducted under the 2001 Standards. As pointed out in the Board of Regents policy on institutional accountability and performance, the "assessment of student learning is a responsibility of the faculty." Accordingly, the UHM Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Planning has developed a statement of support for assessing learning on campus, as well as an assessment handbook to guide faculty in developing assessment programs that reflect best practice in assessment. Also, the senate's General Education Committee is in the process of designing an assessment component for the new general education program. The primary locus of programs to assess student learning in the major is the academic department, and departmental assessment processes now are embedded within in the university's existing program review process.

The Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and his staff have provided leadership in initiating assessment activities in academic departments. They have provided $100,000 in grants to departments to support assessment implementation. They have hosted two assessment workshops in the past year, one led by a prominent national leader in assessment and another showcasing the exemplary assessment practices of on-campus faculty innovators. They are developing summaries of departmental assessment practices, making them available on the Web so that faculty can learn from their colleagues across campus.

These activities have been supported and complemented by numerous existing assessment or assessment-related initiatives on campus. For example, faculty researchers on campus have conducted two studies of learning community effectiveness. The Manoa Writing Across the Curriculum Program has conducted studies of curricular and instructional innovations related to writing. It has also provided opportunities for faculty to learn to assess writing in their courses. A new System-wide student information system (Banner) will soon be in place, capturing all information about students in a single database. The system will allow
easier access to student information as well as the possibility of secondary analysis of data. The Center for Teaching Excellence has developed an online evaluation-of-teaching form (CAFÉ) with items that allow students to rate the extent of their learning in courses. Assessment is also taking place in Student Affairs.

In addition, the System Office of Planning and Policy, including Institutional Research, conducts studies of alumni, graduating seniors, and entering freshmen (responsibility for the latter has recently been transferred to the Manoa campus). The office sponsors System-wide participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement, and it also generates specialized reports for departments undergoing program review. Since the 1999 WASC report, Institutional Research has widely publicized the type of data available to campus constituents. It has also redesigned its website to enhance access to and use of institutional data. The site is interactive, allowing individuals to view and request reports, and the office reports increased use of the site, as well as increased calls regarding data use.

Challenges. Despite the truly remarkable nature of the university's progress in assessment since 1999, many challenges lie ahead. The university hopes to develop within itself a "culture of evidence" to support student learning, and changing a culture takes a great deal of time. Departments are only beginning to implement their assessment programs, and few have assessment results at this time. Summaries of department activities focus more on cataloging measures than on assuring that units have developed intended learning outcomes to guide measurement. Distance education at the university is integrated into the departments' delivery of instructional programs, and thus, assessment of distance learning can progress only as quickly as the assessment of learning within departments. Intended learning outcomes for general education, as well as the manner in which the assessment of general education will take place, is uncertain at this time, although firm plans are in place to develop these important components within the next year. Finally, assessment in graduate education has not received as much emphasis as assessment at the undergraduate level.

All of these challenges are intensified by the prospect of changing leadership in the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The current leadership in Academic Affairs is knowledgeable about assessment and has been effective in coordinating and guiding the campus toward a new learning-centered understanding of its teaching mission. This has been successfully accomplished without a campus-wide coordinating committee for assessment because the current leadership has been able to rely on their long-standing institutional contacts and excellent communication skills. New—or even current—leadership may find a more formal coordinating mechanism to be useful.

The current Academic Affairs leadership is aware of the substantial but fragile nature of the progress that has been made, of the need for continued nurturing and support, and of additional components that must be put in place in order to embed assessment of learning in the campus culture (e.g., aligning the reward structure with a learning-centered culture, developing faculty assessment efforts into scholarly work rather than university service, etc.). These issues must receive continued attention if a learning-centered culture of evidence is to be fully developed at the university.
Undergraduate Education and Enrollment Management. Undergraduate education in 2003 is a vibrant web of interrelated programs. The chancellor has indicated that undergraduate studies and student life is one of four areas to which he will pay significant attention. Faculty are deeply engaged in creating an effective and relevant undergraduate program; students are enthusiastic about the many specialized opportunities available to them for research, service learning, and close faculty mentoring; and there is a cadre of devoted and highly capable staff who develop and support a well-coordinated and evolving variety of academic support programs. Overall, there is evidence of a high level of enthusiasm and this seems to exist in large measure across all segments of the UHM community. There is a strong willingness to work hard and collaboratively to improve the quality of UHM's undergraduate education and to make it distinctive and appropriate for the region. In short, there have been many improvements since the 1999 visit. The 1999 team found that there was "a strong need for greater administrative leadership for undergraduate education." Under its interim leadership, Manoa has taken this mandate to heart and moved this agenda forward effectively.

At the same time, much remains needs to be done in order to achieve and obtain the institution's own goals—and to sustain what already exists. UHM is engaged in enrollment management and planning approaches that are responsive to the advice of the 1999 Team and position the University well:

- UHM is an active and enthusiastic participant in the System's current efforts to create a comprehensive and collaborative University of Hawaii System enrollment plan among the loose federation of the ten institutions.
- Those involved in the various aspects of enrollment management have a deep understanding of how the Island culture impacts students' and families' desires for higher education, and they are wisely responsive to those special issues.
- UHM staff believe that the transfer and articulation process is working smoothly and effectively for students who transfer after one year at a community college, which has been Hawaii's traditional pathway.¹
- Concerns about unclear admission policies have been addressed through catalog rewording and improved consultation and information sharing among counselors and others on the ten campuses.
- The University of Hawaii System is developing a much needed student record system to replace outmoded campus systems. This will allow improved student tracking and enrollment management for admissions and the transfer function.
- Enrollments are growing, and with evolving plans UHM seems highly able to meet the State's needs and achieve the goals they will ultimately set.

Students' academic success is a matter of great importance at UHM. There is a desire to improve retention and graduation rates, and substantial efforts have been made in this regard. It is well understood at UHM that the first year of college is a key determinant of success, and UHM has done much to develop counseling, academic, and residential programs that will lead to success. Starting with New Student Orientation, there is an integrated web of programs that benefit students—improving learning, socialization, and commitment to UHM. Among them are the Rainbow Advantage, Freshman Seminars, Honors, Learning Communities, and the First Year Center, which is a place for students to find peer support on a walk-in basis. The Team believes these activities should be nurtured and sustained. In 1999, UHM's student: counselor ratio in Arts and Sciences was 840:1; the team recommended improving that ration. By Fall 2002, that ratio had improved to 480:1. In addition, professional advisers are available in all professional schools and colleges with faculty advisers and mentors in most departments. This Team suggests that finding resources for this purpose remains an essential underpinning for sustainable student

¹ This represents an internal view of this improvement. Transfer and articulation being an important statewide issue, the campus might verify their impressions of improvement in this area by checking if these views are shared outside of the campus as well.
academic success. Moreover, even as a new Honors College takes shape, it will be important to support these other successful programs at appropriate levels.

Discussions with many deans and students make it clear that UHM’s research mission is enthusiastically and effectively being brought forward into the classroom. UHM has a myriad of exciting programs in virtually every discipline. They have been developed by energetic faculty who have successfully sought federal and foundation support for their efforts and serve as active student mentors. We commend their efforts and find that the personal commitment that is essential to sustain them is strong.

Program Review. There has been a remarkable transformation in UHM’s academic program review processes. Previously, program review had been a top-down process; faculty were resistant, reviews sat on shelves, and, by 1999, it had been suspended. Program review now seems to be a highly effective process with an enviable level of faculty enthusiasm for it. Like program reviews at most research universities, UHM’s process is complex and time-consuming. But there is full engagement, and beneficial change and improvement occurs. As one member of the Council on Program Review stated, “everybody can learn,” and UHM’s program reviews are causing departments to take a serious look at their programs, especially undergraduate programs. Departments are required to state their learning outcomes and establish an assessment plan. The process includes a routine one-year follow-up to ensure that recommendations have been pursued. The administrative support and academic guidance coming from the office of the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is seen as an essential element of this success. As Manoa continues its ambitious schedule of program review, sustained administrative support and cooperation will be essential.

Budget Issues. Indirect cost distribution is very contentious, both at the level of the UH System and on the UHM campus. The University of Hawaii has the lowest overhead rate of any-doctoral/research extensive university. In part, this is due to the low expenditure of institutional funds on research infrastructure. It may also be due to the approach previously taken to preparing and negotiating the University’s overhead rate. The VP Administration is considering engaging a consultant to advise him on these matters, and this should be encouraged and pursued aggressively.

Graduate Education and Research. The 1999 WASC reports indicated several primary recommendations regarding graduate education and research, which are dealt with here. Overall, the research enterprise is highly successful. The campus as a whole shows all of the achievements of an accomplished research university, such as significant extramural grant and contract support, and a number of programs of national distinction. Yet, within this general summary statement, there is considerable variability in the success of individual units within the UHM. The very large number of organized colleges and schools, degree programs, departments, and research entities may be more than the institution is capable of supporting. In this sense, the situation with research programs and with graduate education is consistent with the overall campus need to define its specific research and educational goals to the level of individual programs and organized activities, to align its budgetary resource allocation actions in a transparent process with these goals, and to make the difficult decisions about which emphases to support. In the conversations the members of the visiting team had with campus constituencies, there is a consistent endorsement of this proposition—to make those difficult decisions and support excellence—and it is now up to the administration to follow through on this philosophy of planning and budgeting. The campus cannot be all things to all constituents.

One key recommendation from 1999 was that, “Tough decisions on which graduate and professional degree programs are and are not going to be maintained at UMH are crucial to improvement.” The University has acted on this in part in the past four years. It now has in place a strategic plan, which makes the UHM research agenda paramount. It has recently combined or eliminated several graduate degree programs.
Yet much remains to be done, both in graduate education and in research support. The UHM is now searching for a Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, and the filling of this position is crucial to achieving the thrust of this most important recommendation. This is a necessary activity, required to achieve a stable leadership for these critical activities of the campus, and the individual appointed to this position must have a clear understanding of the research and graduate training enterprises of research universities, be an appreciated spokesperson for these activities, and be given the authority and responsibility for ensuring that the values of the strategic plan are aligned with the need for UHM to endorse and support excellence. This has been partially met with the campus's strategic plan, which reaffirms the primacy of research and graduate education as paramount in the mission of UHM. Yet the statement of an overall commitment to research and graduate education stops short of making the decisions about which programs to enhance and which not to enhance, as noted above. The development of this clear strategy or plan with programmatic detail should be accomplished soon in the tenure of the to-be-appointed vice chancellor.

Since 1999, the Library has made remarkable strides, and this president and chancellor are actively supporting the Library’s desire to move ahead in ARL rankings. There is a new library system, a new and more welcoming building, and improved and expanded technology for students and faculty. The librarians are energetically and enthusiastically involved in curricular reform and student information literacy, and they have won national awards and extramural funding for their outstanding efforts. Moreover, the librarians are working to increase and improve collection sharing among the System’s libraries.

Institutional Plans to Address the New Expectations of the 2001 Handbook. The UHM is demonstrating substantial progress now in preparation for the next full accreditation review, under the 2001 Accreditation Standards. Many of the positive changes highlighted in this report may be viewed as entirely consistent with the work the campus requires in order to be responsive to the updated accreditation standards. While these recent changes position the campus well for the next accreditation review, the campus must continue to push the agenda of change that has been started in the recent past if they are to meet the evolved standards with success.
Summary of Findings and Major Recommendations

1. The UHM has made significant changes in response to the 1999 WASC visiting team and commission recommendations. These improve the quality of the institution, and position it for excellence in much better ways than was the case in 1999. They also provide an excellent framework for the next accreditation cycle. The key challenge for the administration and all university stakeholders will be to maintain these many changes, and to ensure that they become permanent and an understood part of the UHM culture.

2. The UHM should continue to support and develop in particular its excellent start in program and instructional assessment. The substantial changes since the 1999 visit are apparent throughout the campus, yet the changes are new. Considerable vigilance will be required of the campus administration to ensure that the development of a “culture of evidence” is sustained.

3. The administrative leadership of the campus now is in place with the appointment of a chancellor. The System president, as well as the UHM chancellor, are continuing to define and staff their administrative leadership teams. Both entities must continue to define, and to define clearly for all stakeholders, the various roles and responsibilities of the System vs. the UHM leadership. For example, the present inappropriate situation that the UHM deans report to the UHM chancellor, yet are appointed by the Board of Regents, with concurrence by the president, should be rethought.

4. The UHM must continue to develop and implement the details of its ambitious and widely supported strategic plan. As part of this, the UHM should work toward development of an appropriately transparent and timely budget process, which is defined by clearly understood policy and aligns resource allocation with campus strategic goals. Given that the budget picture for the UHM remains challenging, such difficult choices among institutional priorities must be made. The UHM is ready for such leadership.

5. The individual appointed to the Vice Chancellor-Research and Graduate Education should consider undertaking soon a specific and detailed planning exercise, to bring into alignment resource allocation with clearly defined and understood institutional priorities and goals in graduate training and research. This plan should consider ways for optimizing the research and graduate training operations and policies to further the highest institutional aim of the UHM as Hawaii’s research university. The plan should also consider ways to leverage extramural support, including the indirect cost revenues.