I. Nature of Institutional Context and Major Changes Since the Last WASC Visit

A. INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND, MISSION AND HISTORY

A research university of international standing, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa is the flagship of the University of Hawai‘i System, the state’s sole public university system governed by a 12-member Board of Regents. A land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant institution, UH Mānoa creates, refines, disseminates, and perpetuates human knowledge; offers a comprehensive array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees through the doctoral level; carries out advanced research; and extends services to the community.

Located in Mānoa valley on the island of O‘ahu, our university was founded in 1907 under the auspices of the Morrill Act as a land-grant college of agriculture and mechanic arts. With the addition of a College of Arts and Sciences in 1920, the college became the University of Hawai‘i, and in 1972, it became the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (Mānoa) to distinguish it from the other campuses in the growing University of Hawai‘i System (UH System).

As we celebrate our centennial in 2007, more than 20,000 students are enrolled in Mānoa courses, on campus or via distance delivery. Classified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University-Extensive institution, Mānoa offers 87 bachelor’s degrees, 87 master’s degrees, and 51 doctorates as of fall 2006. We also offer first professional degrees in law, medicine, and architecture. Approximately 69 percent of Mānoa students are undergraduates, 57 percent are of Asian or Pacific Islander ancestry, and 56 percent are women.

Mānoa’s special distinction is found in its Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific orientation and unique location. Together, these attributes foster unique opportunities for study in tropical agriculture, tropical medicine, oceanography, astronomy, volcanology, botany, evolutionary biology, comparative philosophy, education, urban planning, performing arts and international business. Nearly all of the units at Mānoa have developed strengths in Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific studies, which have created an international reputation for the university. Mānoa also offers instruction in more Asia-Pacific languages than any other U.S. institution of higher learning. As a result, students are provided special opportunities for research, service learning, and co-curricular activities in Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific studies. The beauty of the verdant Mānoa valley provides a backdrop for a unique and inviting campus. Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific traditions are well represented throughout the campus. There is an authentic Japanese tea house and garden, a replica of a Korean king’s throne hall, and a Hawaiian taro patch. Off-campus facilities include the Kaka‘ako complex, the Lyon Arboretum, the Waikīkī Aquarium, several marine facilities, and the world-famous telescopes atop Mauna Kea.

The University of Hawai‘i was first accredited by the Western College Association in 1952. The Mānoa campus is currently accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Fifty-four degree programs are also accredited by appropriate professional agencies.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#I.A
B. CONTEXT FOR THE SPECIAL VISIT

Our last campus special visit concluded with a report by the visiting team in March 2003 and a letter to then Chancellor Peter Englert in July of 2003. The report and visit were requested by the Commission following a comprehensive visit in 1999 and focused on issues of leadership and communication, planning and priority setting, student and educational program quality, and assessment. The institutional report for the 2003 visit was remarkably optimistic. A new president had recently been named for the UH System, a new chancellor had been appointed as the chief executive officer of the Mānoa campus, and a new strategic plan had just been formulated as the result of a highly successful campus-wide planning initiative. The visiting team concluded that “there appears to be significant operational and, indeed, cultural change since the 1999 WASC action,” and further confirmed the university’s statement that “our capacity to... manage change has increased greatly.” The team also concluded that “the change at the Mānoa 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.” Thus, the Mānoa campus’ accreditation was reaffirmed, and the campus was given a clean bill of health until the next round of accreditation consisting of a preparatory review in spring 2009 and an educational effectiveness review in fall 2010. The only caveat to this scheduling was that we produce a progress report on the issues raised in the 2003 visiting team report and 2003 letter to Chancellor Englert. Those issues included the following: 1) a concern that planning priorities be established and aligned to the budget and that the momentum gained from the planning exercise be continued; 2) a request to define the roles and relationships of the new mid-level management (vice chancellor) positions and the role of UH System versus Mānoa leadership, along with the need to have campus lines of authority for internal appointments; 3) concerns that UH System-Mānoa resource allocation be better described and rationalized and that a transparent and timely budgeting process be aligned to campus goals; and 4) that assessment become more embedded within the campus to create a “culture of evidence” to improve student learning.

Despite the generally optimistic tone of the Mānoa visiting team report and the feeling on campus at that time, the cautionary issues concerning leadership raised in the report soon came to the fore. Owing to an unprecedented move in February 2003, then UH System President Evan Dobelle requested and received WASC review of the UH System (just prior to our special visit). This decision opened additional review of the operations and interactions of the UH System with the campuses in general and with the Mānoa campus in particular. Based on its concerns from the UH System visit, WASC conducted a follow-up special visit to the UH System in March 2004. At that time, the relationship between the UH System President and the Board of Regents (BOR) had grown contentious. There were also systemic communications and governance problems among UH System, the campuses and the BOR. Thus, the special visit team found that Mānoa was “stymied in its ability to truly manage the Campus,” that the conditions on the Mānoa campus were not as reported during the last Mānoa special visit, and most significantly, “that the campus may, itself, no longer be meeting Commission expectations under the Standards of Accreditation with respect to these matters.” Thus, the Commission acted to change the Mānoa progress report scheduled for March 2005 to a special visit in the fall of 2005 (since postponed to March 2007). Subsequent discussions with WASC indicated that the focus of this special visit should address issues raised in the 2003 special visit report and additionally review four issues: 1) the relationships among the campus, the President, and the BOR over lines of authority, resources, and staffing issues; 2) the progress of the Mānoa reorganization; 3) the Board’s involvement in daily management issues; and 4) the relationship between the Mānoa campus, the John A. Burns School of Medicine and the Kaka‘ako complex.
In addition to the changes and challenges described above, Mānoa experienced a devastating flood in October of 2004. Initially, the whole campus was shut down, but emergency efforts and access to state civil defense resources allowed us to support student housing and other critical activities. Approximately 35 buildings were affected and damage has run about $100,000,000. While rebuilding efforts are still underway, this event was a major test of the new administrative structure and the ability of UH System and Mānoa to confront change and manage campus affairs. Despite the tactical problems created by lack of staffing and a number of infrastructure challenges, the UH System and Mānoa worked well together to put the campus back into operational order in a shorter than expected time frame. The Mānoa Chancellor and the UH System President quickly laid out their areas of focus, staff from the UH System provided needed expertise in working with state and federal authorities and in cutting through red tape, while the campus leadership team quickly restored the educational and operating environment. Owing to remarkable efforts by hundreds of dedicated staff and faculty, only two days of classes were missed. Life safety issues were handled promptly and effectively, and in most cases, the support needed to protect critical research activities was quickly brought in. Thus, through this distressing situation, it became clear that we worked well as a team, and that together we had the leadership and staffing capacity to respond to challenges.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#I.B

C. MAJOR CHANGES SINCE THE MARCH 2004 SYSTEM SPECIAL VISIT

Since the March 2004 UH System special visit, Mānoa and the UH System have changed remarkably. We have new BOR leadership, new presidential leadership, a new UH System organization, a new interim Chancellor, new mid-level management for Mānoa, a newly-reorganized Chancellor’s Office, a revised tuition schedule and approval of our WASC Institutional Proposal guiding the next round of accreditation.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#I.C

1. Leadership Changes
In July 2004, the BOR began a series of actions that resulted in the resignation of President Dobelle, and the installation of Dr. David McClain as Acting, and later Interim, President. This was widely acknowledged as a positive move, an opportunity to restore communications, and a chance to put aside the strife of the past year in favor of a fresh start. New BOR members were appointed in July, and the BOR became recommitted to moving issues along in partnership with UH System and Mānoa. The new BOR participated in WASC training and has made a concerted effort to alleviate the decision-making paralysis of the previous year. Dr. McClain has since been appointed permanent President. In 2005, Chancellor Englert stepped down, after forming his administrative team by bringing in Neal Smatresk as the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (May 2004), Gary Ostrander as the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education (December 2004), and Kathy Cutshaw as Vice Chancellor for Administration, Finance and Operations (on an interim basis since January 2005; appointed permanently to the position in January 2007). This new team was joined by Francisco Hernandez, our first Vice Chancellor for Students in July 2006. Interim Chancellor Denise Konan has served in the position since August 2005, and a search for the Mānoa Chancellor should be completed in March 2007. The team has significantly improved the ability of the
Chancellor’s Office to manage change and advance Mānoa towards our strategic goals. Thus, the critical foundation for effective internal governance is now in place.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#I.C.1

2. System Reorganization
The UH System underwent reorganization in November 2004 and June 2005 to address some of the structural issues it faced. It realigned duties in a number of offices, eliminated offices that no longer appeared critical to the new leadership, and added a new Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer to guide the large and complex UH System budgeting process and further develop a modern financial information system that could assist our efforts to make data-driven decisions. The UH System reorganization was generally viewed as a step in the right direction, but was criticized by the Mānoa Faculty Senate, and the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly (faculty union) because it did not return operational capacity and staffing to the campuses and did little to reduce the high UH System personnel costs. Mānoa saw the need for a smaller UH System office less engaged in operations and more committed to governance and coordination than the details of campus management. The President recognized these arguments and has indicated the need to further review the UH System structure and has made a number of changes directed towards returning operational control to campuses. At this point, he has reduced the UH System structure for student affairs, international programs, and has been working with the chancellors to move research management to the Mānoa campus as well as increase information technology accountability to Mānoa. Most significantly, he has worked with the BOR to delegate authority to the chancellors for hires below the vice chancellor level, with the exception of several critical positions including deans of the schools of medicine, business, and law. The BOR and UH System offices also retain approval over a number of human resources functions and above-threshold salary approvals. We continue to have discussions about how to achieve balance between the efficiency of centrally provided but generic services and the more extensive and expensive needs of individual campuses, and the appropriate level of “devolution” of UH System functions to the campuses, with special reference to Mānoa as the only research extensive institution in the UH System.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#I.C.2

3. Mānoa Reorganization
The most significant change to occur on our campus since March 2003 has been the approval of the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office reorganization by the BOR in February 2005. This approval formally established the Office of the Chancellor and created a plan for staffing the critically needed middle management layer mentioned in the 2003 WASC report. As mentioned above, great progress has already been made in putting the new administrative team in place. Key leadership positions have been filled, and we are recruiting to fill major posts within the vice chancellors’ offices. These vice chancellors have each made significant contributions towards improving campus operations, strategic plan implementation, educational effectiveness, transparency in budgeting, and a number of other issues that will be discussed later in this report. The reorganization has been achieved in part through Mānoa resources and in part through support from the UH System. Mānoa has requested funds to support the reorganization in its biennial legislative budget, and the UH System has provided direct support in the form of personnel reassignments and “dashed” line relationships between the Chancellor and UH
System staff. The staffing level in the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office is still quite low compared to other research extensive institutions (as found the January 2006 “Funding the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa” report), but we anticipate that increased tuition revenues and legislative funding will provide critically-needed staff over the next two years and will create a functionally autonomous campus. The Mānoa Chancellor’s Office reorganization has also led to a productive dialogue concerning the relative roles and responsibilities of the campus and the UH System. This dialogue facilitated further discussion between all of the UH System components during budgeting sessions and in the Council of Chancellors meetings. The Mānoa Faculty Senate has also been an active participant in the discussions of what shared governance means and how it functions both for Mānoa and for the UH System. In short, there is widespread agreement that we need to continue to clarify what autonomy means and the extent of operational independence and interdependence between the campuses and the UH System.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#I.C.3

4. Tuition Schedule Changes
As a result of a downturn in the State’s economy during the 1990s, Mānoa struggled through years of budget cuts. As the State’s budget has grown, Mānoa has received increased state funding, but we recognize the need to become more fiscally independent. With one of the lowest annual tuition levels in the country, we recently worked with the UH System administration to increase Mānoa tuition to peer averages over a six-year period. While this moves us towards firmer financial ground, the increase in tuition means we must be totally committed to better engaging our students and promoting their success, otherwise we run the risk of losing enrollment. We need to focus our resources on the basics of student support, like housing, financial aid, advising, and class availability, while we continue to work to improve capacity in student learning and other needed areas.

Summary
Our 2003 WASC report expressed tremendous optimism because of new leadership, a new attitude, an improved capacity to confront change, and a transition to becoming a self-learning institution. These optimistic sentiments were not misplaced. Despite the leadership changes, governance challenges and natural disasters we have faced since the 2004 UH System special visit, we have made significant progress in moving the campus forward and there is ample evidence of our success. These efforts have been fundamental and are not necessarily highly visible yet, but as our fiscal posture and staffing improve we expect rapid improvement in our educational programs. The changes outlined above have established a strong and stable organizational foundation that we can build on to achieve the bold vision of the future articulated in our strategic plan entitled Defining Our Destiny, 2002-2010. In November 2006, we submitted our Institutional Proposal in preparation for our next round of accreditation. The proposal outlines the next phase of implementation of our strategic plan and directly addresses many of the major challenges we face. We are confident that implementation of the initiatives outlined in the proposal will transform our campus and the educational experience for our students. While we will continue to have challenges along the way, the foundation for the future is in place.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#I.C.4
II. Statement on Report Preparation

This report was prepared by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA), in collaboration with the WASC Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is comprised of representatives from the Mānoa Faculty Senate, deans and department chairs, the Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i, the Graduate Student Organization, the Kuali‘i Council, and members of the administrative team including vice chancellors and several administrative staff members. In addition to regular meetings with the steering committee, specific briefings on the WASC special visit were provided to the Mānoa Executive Team and the Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The WASC required data elements, stipulated policies, and other information pertinent to the WASC standards were circulated to the campus community electronically (http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/). We consulted with UH System officials and conducted several campus meetings and planning days to bring the WASC issues raised in the 2003 and 2004 reports to faculty, staff, and student constituencies in preparation for this report and for our Institutional Proposal. Input from these meetings provided material for this report. A draft was submitted to the Mānoa Faculty Senate on January 16, 2007, and it was posted online for comment.

The Mānoa WASC accreditation website houses information from previous WASC visits, as well as data and reports prepared for the special visit (http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc). The website includes basic descriptive data, stipulated policies, exhibits and data displays, and other evidence centered on addressing WASC issues. We also maintain an online Mānoa Portfolio (http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/manoa_portfolio/) that provides an overview of the campus, including annual data reports regarding enrollment, personnel, financial information, and research funding.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#II

III. Summary Data Form (See page 21)

IV. Response to Issues Identified by the Commission and the 2003 and 2004 Special Visit Teams

A. RESPONSES TO THE 2004 SPECIAL VISIT TEAM

We are now five years into a major organizational change for the UH System and its attendant campuses and a great deal has happened. Following the 2004 UH System special visit, the March 2004 WASC special visit report stated:

Finally, in good part due to the problems between the BOR and the President, the UH Mānoa campus is currently unable either to enact the organizational plans of the Chancellor nor to resolve second-level problems emerging from the UH System reorganization. This hamstrings UH Mānoa’s ability to manage its affairs.

Specifically, the visiting team was concerned with: 1) the unresolved staffing issues arising from the separation of the UH System and Mānoa administrative offices; 2) the impact of the BOR moratorium on the Chancellor’s reorganization plans; 3) the need for the BOR to recognize the
need for management authority on the Mānoa campus; 4) the inability of then President Dobelle to resolve these issues; and 5) the John A. Burns School of Medicine and its relationship to Mānoa.

The 2004 WASC special visit team made the following recommendations to ameliorate these issues: 1) the President and the Chancellor assess the functional impacts of the UH System reorganization and remedy the staffing gaps; 2) the President and the Chancellor implement an effective organizational plan for Mānoa; 3) the President resolves the Medical School issues; 4) the BOR ends the moratorium on Mānoa hiring so that the campus can become functional.

Many of these issues were addressed by then Interim President McClain in a UH System WASC special visit report in November 2004 in preparation for the December 2004 visit (http://www.hawaii.edu/vpaa/vpaa_memo/UH_Response_to_WASC-finalDec04.pdf). In brief, the appointment of President McClain was followed by dramatically improved relationships between the UH System and the BOR, with growing trust and cooperation between these entities, and the end of the Mānoa hiring freeze and the restoration of presidential approval subsequently followed by delegation of hiring authority to the chancellor level for most executive/managerial hires. President McClain has also initiated a UH System reorganization to streamline operations; facilitated substantial dialogue between the UH System and Mānoa on the Mānoa reorganization and supported staffing issues with commitments of support in the form of lines and funding for Mānoa; improved communications and discussion of management expectations between the campus chancellors and the UH System President; established an ongoing dialogue with Mānoa on the relative roles of the UH System and campuses in management and policy making; and has returned operational control of the Kakaʻako Medical Campus back to the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office. We expect to appoint a new Dean of the School of Medicine in spring 2007.

The December 2004 UH System special visit team report confirmed that the relationship between the BOR and the UH System had improved significantly, that the working relationship between the BOR and the President had been restored, and that the new BOR had made progress. The team advised that the Mānoa organizational plans be moved forward as soon as possible. They also found that there was still considerable anxiety on campus about UH System-Mānoa relationships and noted the outstanding issue of inadequate staffing to support Mānoa operations. The team urged the UH System and Mānoa to have a new campus organization in place for the 2005 special visit (now March 2007 visit), and to clarify the fate of Medical School and other programs that might be housed in the Kakaʻako complex. The status of these issues and responses to the visiting team recommendations follow.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV

1. An Effective Organizational Plan for Mānoa

In February 2005, the BOR approved the Mānoa reorganization plan with the full support of President McClain. The consultation for this reorganization was thorough, with input gained over a year-long period from campus constituencies. The original proposal was revised substantially based on this consultation. The resulting reorganization better aligns the statutory level of Mānoa’s authority and management with the organizational substructure at Mānoa, creates the mid-level management structure necessary for campus operations, and offers a plan to resolve the second-level staffing and organizational issues resulting from the UH System reorganization. The Mānoa reorganization further provides a well-defined set of roles and relationships of senior and mid-level management at Mānoa, as recommended in the March
2003 special visit. Details of the reorganization and other reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.A.1.

2. Assess Functional Impact of the UH System Reorganization
The Mānoa reorganization was estimated to cost approximately $2,400,000. Virtually all of the upper tier administrative positions are filled, and recruitment to complete the reorganization continues. We estimate that the reorganization is approximately two-thirds complete at this time. We are already in the process of conducting minor reorganizations to fine tune the initially approved reorganization. Positions filled include all the vice chancellors, associate vice chancellors and most of the assistant vice chancellors. Other key personnel have been hired for human resources, the Ombuds Office, marketing, international programs, and financial aid. We are currently searching for Assistant Vice Chancellors for Enrollment Management, and Campus Services, and a Director of Student Housing. Recruitment for these positions is estimated to be completed by the end of May 2007.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.A.2

3. Roles and Responsibilities of the UH System and Mānoa Leadership
In the November 2004 town meeting, Mānoa faculty expressed strong sentiments concerning autonomy and a lack of delineation between UH System and Mānoa roles in governance, policy and operations. Mānoa faculty further expressed through surveys and meetings that we had not made adequate progress in establishing an independent campus identity or full operational capacity particularly in the area of hires. This position was reiterated by the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly and the Mānoa Faculty Senate as they offered comments on the Mānoa reorganization to the BOR. Throughout the reorganization process, we have had ongoing discussion with the UH System about the role and scope of campus and UH System responsibilities. Although we have not yet achieved clarity in all details regarding roles, a continuing dialogue has been instrumental in moving the governance and roles issues forward. President McClain has taken steps to streamline the UH System’s administrative structure, and has defined their major role as leading the campuses in policy and planning. We are currently discussing how to balance the need for efficiently-delivered operations administered centrally against the needs of individual campuses to guide their own operations. As a result of these discussions, we have reached agreement that the UH System will continue to provide legal counsel to the Mānoa campus, and we are in the process of negotiating other such service-level agreements.

While the role of the UH System in Mānoa affairs has not yet been fully delineated, the President has expanded his staff advisory committee which meets weekly to include representatives of the campuses, including the Chancellor of Mānoa. These meetings offer a forum to discuss the specifics of how we coordinate UH System and campus functions and have facilitated better working relationships between the campuses and the UH System. Thus, we have in place a continuing dialogue as the Mānoa reorganization moves forward that should help resolve governance issues as they arise. It is generally accepted that as the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office is staffed and grows in capacity, many of the issues currently in question will be resolved.

The 2004 WASC special visit team recommended that the President make campus management expectations clear for the chancellors. While the Chancellor is the chief executive
officer of the campus and is ultimately responsible for managing all campus academic and business decisions, many of these decisions still require the approval of the President or BOR. Because the chancellors report to the President, it is equally clear that the President offers broad guidance and sets expectations for performance in a number of areas in response to the BOR, and legislative and broad strategic needs of the UH System. This is achieved through individual meetings and group discussions between the UH System and chancellors, including the biennium budget committee, the Council of Chancellors, and regular staff meetings. Additional interaction between the UH System and the campuses occurs through the Council of Chief Academic Officers, the University Council on Articulation, and meetings between campus administrative officers, research officers and appropriate UH System personnel. Further, actions requiring BOR or presidential approval now proceed directly from the chancellors to the President, rather than routing through three UH System administrators as had been the case under the previous administration. While this process has improved since the last UH System special visit, we continue to be challenged by the number of control points and oversight in key operational areas, which often slows the implementation of important decisions and hinders college level operations and personnel actions.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.A.3

4. Lines of Authority for Hiring
As noted above, the BOR acted shortly after the appointment of Interim President McClain to lift the moratorium on hiring for the Mānoa Chancellor's Office and to restore managerial appointing authority to the President. While these were positive steps and certainly helped to support the implementation of the Mānoa organizational plans and to restore our operational capacity, they fell short of establishing the level of authority embodied in most campus chief executive officers to hire and release managerial and executive appointees, which is needed for effective operations. In October 2006, the BOR further approved the delegation of hiring authority to the chancellors many positions that had once needed presidential approval. These include all campus hires excluding vice chancellors and certain dean positions (e.g., law, medicine, business). While this significant delegation improves our ability to manage the campus, owing to restrictive policies on compensation, many above-threshold salary requests still require the approval of the President or BOR. One of the fundamental tools for creating change is the ability of the campus chief executive officer to quickly and effectively hire (or replace) staff to support his or her vision and to work with staff as a team. When this authority is abridged and extra layers of control are added to campus decision making, it is difficult to facilitate change.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.A.4

5. School of Medicine Relationships
In June 2005, the UH System President recommended that the BOR not separate the John A. Burns School of Medicine from the Mānoa campus. As stated above, the search is underway for a permanent dean for the School of Medicine. While we still face fiscal challenges involved in operations of the Kakaʻako complex, the issue regarding the management of the complex has been resolved.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.A.5
B. RESPONSES TO THE 2003 SPECIAL VISIT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Mānoa 2003 WASC special visit team report was generally positive and cited significant progress and improvements since the 1999 review. The 2003 WASC Commission letter to then Chancellor Englert requested that we submit a progress report addressing issues regarding planning, leadership and governance, financial management and resource allocation, and educational effectiveness. The leadership and governance issues replicate those cited in the 2004 Commission letter and have been addressed in the earlier sections of this report. The remaining issues of planning and financial management and resource allocation are addressed below.

1. Planning

a. Align the Strategic Plan to Address New Directions

The 2002 Defining Our Destiny planning exercise created a plan that has been endorsed by the Chancellor and vice chancellors, Mānoa Faculty Senate and the UH System. The OVCAA maintains a website to chronicle our progress and developments in implementing the plan. In general, the plan embraces a variety of broadly-defined imperatives that cover most educational and scholarly progress on the campus without requiring a great deal of major realignment as we move forward in new directions set by new campus leadership, by budgetary considerations, and by new opportunities.

Over the past three years we have held a series of planning events to further align the strategic plan with current issues and needs, including a town hall meeting to discuss special visit topics (November 2004); a Strategic Plan Implementation Workshop (April 2005) reported our planning progress to date which includes a large number of specific achievements towards our planning goals; and two Campus Planning Day meetings (November 2005, December 2006) to better integrate and communicate our fiscal and planning activities for faculty and student constituencies. This openness has created a better working understanding of how we will finance and execute major planning initiatives.

In addition to these meetings, we have recently submitted our WASC Institutional Proposal following an extensive self-review process conducted during the 2005-2006 academic year. This process engaged virtually the entire campus. During development of the proposal, students, staff, faculty and administrators formed a consensus agreement that our campus needed a better sense of community around a set of core values and educational objectives that defined the Mānoa Experience. They further saw the need to support this vision through changes in how we plan and manage the physical environment of our campus. Finally, in consideration of the recent establishment of the Mānoa Chancellor’s Office, they felt that creating a sustaining governance system would be necessary to achieve these results. The proposal provides the background and institutional context that led to this stage of our evolution, identifies our strengths and the challenges, and offers an interrelated set of thematic initiatives that will guide us through our next round of WASC accreditation, including the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the Educational Effectiveness Review, and attendant visits. Most critically, the Institutional Proposal is integrated into our budgeting process via our current biennium budget requests to the State, and through our annual allocation exercises.
b. **Align the Strategic Plan with Priorities Developed through the UH System’s Strategic Plan and Budget Priorities**

The UH System strategic plan is predicated on Native Hawaiian values and embraces three fundamental strategic imperatives:

The quality of life and improvement in the social, economic, and environmental well-being of current and future generations are critically dependent on the education, training, research, and service provided by the UH System.

Positioning and branding the unique and special strengths of the UH System and successfully communicating these strengths are essential to the vision of a UH System that is respected in Hawai‘i and recognized for unique excellence throughout the world. Access to public higher education is critical to the future economic health of Hawai‘i, and public financial support is essential to keeping access affordable. More recently, the “Second Decade Project” represents a UH System-led effort to better integrate higher education with the needs of our state for increasing its educational capital, expanding workforce and economic development, improving going rates, and increasing enrollment and retention of underserved populations in the state.

All these elements dovetail nicely with the Mānoa strategic planning imperatives, which was readily apparent during this year’s UH System-wide stock-taking exercise, which highlighted plans that matched UH System planning priorities. This stock-taking exercise is described further in the Financial Management and Resource Allocation section below. Thus UH System and Mānoa planning and budgeting appear to be well aligned.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at [http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV_B.1](http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV_B.1)

2. **Financial Management and Resource Allocation**

a. **Clarify the Amount of and Rationale for Resources from the System to Mānoa**

The UH System assembled a biennium budget committee that developed a stock-taking approach to formulating a UH System-wide budget. The committee met throughout the year to begin assembling a list of priorities from each of the campuses. For Mānoa, these were derived from prioritized budget requests submitted by each of the units. The units were asked to provide requests with justifications and were also asked to show which of our planning priorities and objectives were met by the requests. The vice chancellors met to arrange campus-wide priorities from these requests, using the rankings of the deans, faculty advisory committees, and basic enrollment data. This process produced a set of requests for the biennium budget that was posted on the web, announced and debated at our Mānoa Executive Team meetings, and submitted to the UH System. This was the first time legislative budget requests have been done in this fashion, and the process, while not perfect, was transparent.

The composite requests from all the campuses were assembled by the UH System, and in subsequent meetings, the requests were scaled back to a figure that more closely matched the governor’s recommendations. Priorities were taken in order to achieve the scaled-back list. All requests were grouped around the UH System planning priorities (which closely match Mānoa groupings), thus assuring that all requests matched strategic imperatives. The UH System budgeting process did not appear to use any quantitative metrics to create a rough allocation
between components. There was a general decision that Mānoa should depend more on increasing tuition revenues (which were not part of the general fund requests to the legislature), while the strategic goal of the UH System was to maintain the access mission of the community colleges through increasing general fund allocations. The process, again, was transparent and all parties were at the table for the decision making. It is hoped that the recent appointment of a UH System Vice President for Budget and Finance will result in a more quantitative allocation model next session.

The budget was approved by the BOR and submitted to the legislature. The legislative allocation method does not generally respect the priorities established by the UH System, however, suggesting that we need to form better and more trusting relations with the House and Senate Higher Education Committees.

b. Increase Understanding within Mānoa of Internal Resource Allocations

There has been a concerted effort to create a transparent process for the biennium budget. As described above, the legislative budget was derived from an inclusive process rising through the units, oriented around strategic imperatives. The budget planning and expenditure data along with the Chancellor’s instructions for budget preparation and our priorities may be found online. [http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/mco/initiatives_issues/biennial_budget/budget_planning.htm](http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/mco/initiatives_issues/biennial_budget/budget_planning.htm)

In addition, a presentation outlining the use of different funding categories and data used to make strategic decisions was made to the Mānoa Executive Team and can be viewed from the same site referenced above. Details of the process based on unit and vice chancellor recommendations and presidential and BOR recommendations are also available online. [http://manoa.hawaii.edu/mco/initiatives_issues/biennial_budget/President-BOR_workshop.htm](http://manoa.hawaii.edu/mco/initiatives_issues/biennial_budget/President-BOR_workshop.htm)

Similarly, we have initiated spring budgetary discussions with each of the deans and their administrative officers to determine allocations for FY08 and to determine budget priorities. Previous fiscal year allocation data are available online. [http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/budget_office/](http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/budget_office/)

Budget priorities for all units must reflect planning imperatives and/or workload needs. Allocations should be made in the beginning of our fiscal year (July 1), rather than in the fall as has been done in the past, to allow departments to better plan their expenditures. We anticipate little change in next year’s budget nor do we expect major reallocations for the next fiscal year. However, owing to tuition increases, we are consulting on a process for rational budget assignment that will be used to guide allocation of additional revenues. This process has elements of responsibility-centered management to make it easier for units to understand the major variables that will impact their budget. This process will continue to evolve over the next few years with ample opportunity to adapt it to our needs and the needs of the community. All allocation data down to unit levels will be made online after this year’s meetings in July and will be discussed in leadership meetings (for deans and directors). At this time, our major concern is that these new procedures have not become common knowledge across campus, thus we plan to hold briefing sessions for department chairs, and we will discuss this further at a campus-wide budgeting workshop in September (in conjunction with a strategic plan implementation prioritization workshop). In summary, we have made significant progress in establishing a more coherent, consultative and transparent budget process.
c. **Activate a Campus Committee on Budget Development and Resource Allocation**

The Mānoa Budget Advisory Group was formed in December 2003 by the Chancellor to help develop guidelines for the budgeting process and for budget consultation. The group’s charter was to serve in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor for budgetary matters including, but not limited to, budget restructuring, planning preparation and prioritization. This faculty-led group developed a series of recommendations for budgeting and submitted them to the Chancellor and the Mānoa Leadership Team (now Mānoa Executive Team). These recommendations may be found online at [http://www.hawaii.edu/Mānoa/mbag/](http://www.hawaii.edu/Mānoa/mbag/). We are in the process (as described above) of implementing their recommendations. The group continues to meet with the vice chancellors, under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Administration, Finance and Operations. The focus of activities at this time is to automate expenditure data available by quarter down to the school/college level. By next year, the expenditure data should be available at the department level. When we have high-quality data and an office conducting institutional research, the advisory group will be able to begin working towards a more rational allocation model. We are also working with the UH System and the University of Indiana to create an open-source financial management information system to improve our ability to track expenditures and to handle various transactions. We anticipate that the new UH System Vice President for Budget and Finance will help to facilitate progress in this area.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at [http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.B.2](http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.B.2)

3. **Educational Effectiveness and Assessment of Student Learning**

In the Mānoa 2003 WASC special visit team report, the team stated that “[f]aculty 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. There is a strong willingness to work hard and collaboratively to improve the quality of Mānoa’s undergraduate education and to make it distinctive and appropriate to the region.” Several challenges were identified by the 2003 WASC special visit team and/or addressed by the 2003 Commission action letter.

a. **Continue to Build the Assessment Infrastructure and Deepen Campus Understanding of the Value and Methodologies of Assessment and Create Opportunities for Dialogue within Campus to Improve Courses, Pedagogy, and Student Learning**

In 2004, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs appointed an Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who was tasked with coordinating assessment activities and engaging departments in a dialogue about the purpose and means for using student learning outcomes to modify curricula. As funds become available for the reorganization, the assistant vice chancellor will provide leadership in general education assessment and oversee the establishment of an assessment office as well as an institutional research office.

OVCAA has significantly increased its involvement with school/college and program assessment efforts by meeting independently with each program’s assessment coordinator and the associate deans of the respective schools/colleges. Discussions with these deans focused on how their offices might play a more influential role in coordinating and supporting programs’ assessment efforts. OVCAA meetings with program assessment coordinators focused on ways they might improve their assessment efforts and use of assessment data. An additional goal of
these meetings was to help the programs see their assessment efforts as more than just a regular pedagogical health report. Assessment was presented as part of a larger plan designed to help programs maintain their status within their disciplines; keep their curricula current within their discipline’s knowledge base; help their students stay current with the demands of the professional world; maintain contact with their alumni; and establish mutually beneficial relationships with their alumni. These latter efforts were intended to facilitate the enculturation of assessment practices. Certainly departments are finding value in assessment to the extent that they are learning about their programs through their efforts. As the results help them see how to better their practices, assessment is increasingly seen as a valuable tool. However, departments are also learning to value assessment through the benefits that come about from trying to monitor and contact alumni and their employers. In addition to these unit level meetings, the Academic Procedures Committee, General Education Committee, and Mānoa Writing Program have been involved in cross-unit discussions about assessment. Student assessment was a major topic in our Strategic Planning Implementation Workshop in April 2005 and our Campus Planning Day in December 2006. Results of these discussions and other reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.B.3.a

b. Embed Systemic Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, including General Education Outcomes, within Campus Culture; Incorporate Assessment into Departmental Reviews Assess Graduate Programs

1) Assessment of Student Learning
The current state of student learning assessment has improved since Mānoa’s 2003 special visit. Departmental assessment of student learning at both the undergraduate and graduate levels has advanced considerably. Three years ago, when data were compiled for the 2003 WASC special visit, many departments were still in the research and planning stages in their assessment programs. Today almost all departments have active assessment programs in place and have collected multiple data sets over the past few years (see Data Table 6). Departments have implemented assessment programs incorporating a variety of measures that assess not only the specialized content or skills of the discipline or field of study, but the information-accessing and information-processing methods, the problem-solving and oral communication methods, and the inquiry and analysis methods of the area of study. There is still variance in the quality of assessment programs departments have developed, and departments vary in the extent to which they have “closed the loop” of assessment by using assessment data to inform their curricula. Still, assessment is widespread, departments are expanding their repertoire of assessment methods, and programs are becoming increasingly data-driven in their decision making.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.B.3.b

2) General Education Assessment and Faculty Involvement
In 2005, the Mānoa Academic Assessment Council (MAAC) was instituted. The Council consists of faculty with experience developing assessment programs in their own departments and schools/colleges, faculty from disciplines that make extensive use of psychometric practices, and faculty who understand program evaluation, experimental design, and data analysis – in short, faculty best equipped to help our campus achieve our assessment goals. MAAC was asked to serve in three capacities: 1) as liaisons to departments and schools/colleges in need of assessment help; 2) as reviewers of departmental assessment
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efforts; and 3) as designers of our general education assessment efforts. MAAC has met multiple times in the past year. The members have spent a considerable amount of time reviewing the 2005 assessment reports and producing written feedback to each department on their efforts, using a model based on the peer review process of scholarly publication. The review of the 2006 assessment reports will begin early in 2007. We intend to post the results of the assessment reviews online to accompany the departmental assessment reports.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV_B.3.b

3) Assessment of General Education
Data relating to the assessment of student learning as a function of general education coursework currently is collected primarily at the class level. Instructors collect self-reports of students’ experiences with perceptions of, and attitudes toward, their general education classes. These data provide direct feedback to instructors; they also provide baseline data that can be put to later use. Examples of instruments used for this purpose can be found at https://www.hawaii.edu/gened/assessment.htm.

Assessment of performance outcomes related to general education experiences is a topic that has generated extensive discussion. While the discussions have involved a wide range of opinions, there is an emerging consensus: much more needs be done in order to assure that assessment findings can be used to improve the overall general education program. To this end, the Mānoa Faculty Senate, in late 2006, formed a task force to recommend specific ways in which the faculty and OVCAA’s developing Institutional Research and Assessment Office, working in collaboration, can design and implement meaningful assessment of general education. Policies and practices relating to such assessment, involving both local and standardized instruments, have to inform both departmental and Faculty Senate efforts to improve student experiences in the general education program.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV_B.3.b

4) Program Review
The Council on Program Reviews (COPR) continues to review academic programs on a regular basis. The time required to complete a review has been problematic in the past. In order to reduce the time-to-completion for COPR reviews, OVCAA has introduced a new practice of regular meetings with COPR review team conveners. These meetings allow conveners to share their experiences and identify problems in gathering program data and establish standards of progress that keep independent review efforts more uniformly on track. In addition, guidelines for conducting reviews have been rewritten, updated, and standardized. Changes include a greater attention placed on reviewing programs’ assessment efforts. Review teams no longer limit their assessment interests to establishing the presence or absence of such efforts. Review teams examine the extent to which assessment has become a routine part of a program’s ongoing activities and the extent to which assessment has led to changes in program curriculum and pedagogy.

The Graduate Division conducts annual assessment of individual graduate programs. Data evaluated include number of applications, number and quality of students admitted, number of students enrolled, number of graduates, average time to completion of degree, number of graduate faculty, support for graduate students, etc. In addition, graduate programs are reviewed as part of Mānoa’s regular cycle of program review, and depending on the program,
by the relevant national professional organization or accrediting body. Current COPR review teams also focus greater attention on graduate program assessment as well. COPR reviews complement reviews conducted by the Graduate Division by focusing more directly on program student assessment practices.

Reference materials in support of this section of the report may be found online at http://manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/appendices/specialappendices.htm#IV.B.3.b

V. Other Changes and Issues Currently Confronting the Institution

Many of the items discussed in this report require significant resources. The reorganization, repairing our infrastructure and reconstruction following the flood all require substantial funding. We are further challenged by $130 million of deferred maintenance and must substantially increase our repair and maintenance budget to keep the campus running. Given a relatively flat legislative budget, our only reasonable means of funding these activities was to raise tuition. We currently are one of the most affordable campuses in the country and are far below national averages for comparable institutions. The recently BOR-approved tuition schedule brings Mānoa to national averages in six years, which will help the university to implement its plans. In addition, we expect an announcement of a new Chancellor in March 2007.

VI. Institutional Plans to Address the New Expectations of the 2001 Handbook

All activities undertaken in the past three years have been centered around the new 2001 Handbook. Most notably, our recent WASC proposal addresses not only changes requested for accreditation in the new handbook, but the recently executed changes to the proposal development section WASC released in 2005. Our planning processes and WASC steering committee activities as well as our surveys have all been conducted around the new standards. We have created and maintained our institutional portfolios, data tables and stipulated policies as recommended. We feel we are well prepared and that all our activities are consistent with new handbook requirements, and have been five the past 4 years.

VII. Conclusion

In the face of tremendous institutional change, we have managed to maintain and build our commitment to becoming a self learning institution and have focused on the WASC principle of dealing with our most significant challenges to better meet the demands of accreditation. The past three years would have been difficult for almost any institution, but we faced them positively. We have grown steadily in strength and stature; we have overcome financial challenges to a better fiscal future; we have dealt with the important issues facing our institution, and continue to grow. We are now on the verge of stable leadership, governed by a board that is aligned with and committed to supporting its flagship campus. Our institutional proposal is an affirmation that open discourse and shared values (those outlined in our Strategic Plan) can create an environment that improves education and builds community. The University of Hawaii at Manoa is a robust institution that has found the means to move forward and emerge as an internationally renowned institution. We are proud of our community of scholars and our students, and look forward to our Special Visit and subsequent accreditation visits so that we can share our progress with the world.