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The vision of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (“Mānoa”) is provided in our strategic plan:

*Mānoa is a premier research institution whose scholars are leaders in their disciplines and whose students are prepared for leadership roles in society. Mānoa strives for excellence in teaching, research, and public service. Mānoa is an innovative institution, comfortable with change. Mānoa celebrates its diversity and uniqueness as a Hawaiian place of learning. We build on our strengths including our unparalleled natural environment and tradition of outstanding Asia Pacific scholarship.* [1.1, 1.5, 1.6]

This vision and our Strategic Plan, Defining Our Destiny, 2002-2010, served as the foundation of Mānoa’s reaccreditation efforts. Building on the imperatives in the strategic plan, the campus identified three themes in our Institutional Proposal to guide our reaccreditation process: 1) Building a Mānoa Community in Support of Student Success; 2) Campus Renewal to Support the Mānoa Experience; and 3) Reform Campus Governance to Promote Communication and Student Success. Each theme focuses on two objectives.

Our Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) report detailed our progress in achieving the six objectives delineated in the three themes. In its report following their December 2009 visit, the CPR Team noted: “The CPR Report articulates clearly how engagement with the issues had led to genuine improvements. UHM has put in place significant new structures and a series of strong programs to support student success . . . These new initiatives along with the attention to the physical student community spaces makes the prospects for success excellent.” In accepting the team report at its February 2010 meeting, the WASC Commission commended “the University for its extensive engagement in the CPR report and the progress that the University has made.” [1.9]

This Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) report begins with a description of Mānoa’s approach to educational effectiveness. This provides the context for examining educational effectiveness efforts at Mānoa. It describes our system of quality assurance and improvement that begins with the planning of new academic programs and moves through a cycle of regular program reviews and assessment and includes an analysis of the effectiveness of Mānoa’s program review process.

The EER report then documents Mānoa’s progress in achieving the objectives in the Institutional Proposal since the CPR visit. We report on what has been accomplished and on the effectiveness of these initiatives. Essays 1 through 6 focus on the objectives in the three themes. Essay 1, *Fostering the Development of a Mānoa Identity*, analyzes Mānoa’s efforts to build a Mānoa community by raising awareness and practicing community. *Enabling and Ensuring Student Success* (Essay 2) examines the effectiveness of Mānoa’s student success programs and efforts to leverage assessment in support of student success. Essay 3, *Constructing an Approach to Campus Master Planning and Facilities Management that Fosters Community Engagement and Student Learning*, and Essay 4, *Expanding and Renovating Student and Faculty Housing and Improving Areas of Student Interaction*, explore the effectiveness of Mānoa’s efforts to build and maintain a physical plant that support student learning and student life. *Forging Meaningful and Long-Term Relationships Among Stakeholders* (Essay 5), addresses the effectiveness of long-range planning and communication between constituent groups in fostering meaningful stakeholder participation in campus governance. Essay 6, *Fostering Student Success through Enhanced Student/Faculty Engagement*, examines efforts to improve student, faculty, and staff retention including an analysis of Mānoa’s retention and graduation rates. A detailed analysis of Mānoa’s retention and graduation data is provided in Appendix B.
The CPR Report outlined Mānoa’s financial situation and discussed the steps that were being taken to deal with declining resources. We noted that while a lack of resources was delaying the achievement of a number of outcomes delineated in our Institutional Proposal, our commitment to meeting these outcomes remained strong. While continuing financial difficulties hamper our ability to meet all the timelines proposed in the Institutional Proposal and are mentioned in several of the essays, we continue to make progress toward meeting these commitments. The CPR Visiting Team Report requested that a financial update be provided with this EER Report. This is included as Appendix D. [3.5]

The WASC Steering Committee, initially appointed to oversee the development of Mānoa’s Institutional Proposal, continued to provide oversight for the both the CPR and EER. To prepare for the EER, three teams were formed during Fall 2009, each charged with the responsibility of drafting reflective essays focusing on the effectiveness of initiatives undertaken to achieve the objectives of the three themes identified in the Institutional Proposal. Each team was comprised of members from the Steering Committee, the CPR writing teams, and faculty, staff, and students who were involved in the implementation of initiatives identified for each theme. The draft essays were reviewed by the Steering Committee and shared with the Mānoa Executive Team and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. A complete draft of this report was circulated for input to the full Faculty Senate, the Kuālī‘i Council (a Native Hawaiian advisory group), the Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i, the Graduate Student Organization, and the entire Mānoa campus in Fall 2010. [4.8]

Each of the essays incorporates WASC Criteria for Review (CFR) that are of particular importance to Mānoa. Essays 2 and 6 address the WASC requirement that a study and analysis of student success be included in the EER report. The links between our thematic essays and the WASC Criteria for Review are bracketed. In addition, our appendices provide the following:

- **Appendix A** provides a crosswalk table that tracks each CFR to our EER report and its data exhibits, our CPR report and its data exhibits, and stipulated policies.

- **Appendix B** examines Mānoa’s retention and graduation data.

- **Appendix C** contains Mānoa’s response to recommendations in the CPR team report and the related Commission action letter.

- **Appendix D** provides the update on Mānoa’s financial situation that was requested in the Visiting Team’s CPR Report.

- **Appendix E** provides a supplemental report on Mānoa’s distance and off-campus programs.

- **Appendix F** contains the data exhibits for this report.

- **Appendix G** provides an evidence guide that documents Mānoa’s policies, procedures, and activities that further support the four WASC standards and 42 CFR.

- **Appendix H** contains the list of web links for all Mānoa policies and regulations identified in Appendix 1 of the WASC Handbook (Stipulated Policies).

The report ends with a Concluding Essay that discusses the next steps to be taken to ensure sustained momentum in meeting our goals. The Concluding Essay discusses the role of the Committee on Enrollment Planning in maintaining Mānoa’s focus on continuous improvement and effectiveness.
The EER report and its appendices demonstrate that Mānoa “evidences clear and appropriate educational objectives and design at the institutional and program level; employs processes of review, including the collection and use of data, that ensure delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate awarded.” (WASC’s Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness)

**Mānoa’s Approach to Educational Effectiveness**

Mānoa’s approach to educational effectiveness is a multi-faceted system of quality assurance and review grounded in our commitment to shared governance. Consequently, the development and approval of new programs, program review, and assessment of academic programs are a shared responsibility between faculty and administration. [3.8, 3.11] Proposals for new academic programs are developed by the faculty in academic units in accordance with Board of Regents policies. Plans for assessing the effectiveness of these new programs is a required feature of each proposal. These proposals are reviewed by the appropriate college faculty review unit, by the Graduate Division, if appropriate, and by the Mānoa Faculty Senate. After successful review by these units and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the new program proposals are submitted to the Chancellor and the Board of Regents for approval. [3.8, 3.9] Newly-approved programs are placed on provisional status and are reviewed for established status by the Board of Regents after sufficient numbers of students have graduated from the program.

College-wide program reviews are conducted on a five- to seven-year cycle. The program review process is described below. Assessment of undergraduate and graduate academic programs is coordinated by the Assessment Office with the advice of the Assessment Committee, a standing committee of the Mānoa Faculty Senate. Program assessment is embedded into Mānoa’s educational effectiveness efforts. Annual assessment reports are required of all academic programs. The Assessment Office provides workshops and consultations for faculty in the development of their assessment plans. [2.4, 3.4] Programs select the evidence appropriate to assess achievement of their student learning outcomes. This evidence includes both direct and indirect measures. Direct evidence includes examinations of theses, oral presentations, embedded assignments, projects, and examinations. Indirect evidence includes student surveys, course evaluations, and interviews/focus group discussions. [4.3] A complete listing of direct and indirect evidence collected for program assessment is provided on the Mānoa Assessment website. The predominant use of assessment data has been to guide changes in courses and curriculum.

The annual assessment reports are integrated into the documentation provided for the program review process. Data Exhibit 7.1, Inventory of Educational Effectiveness, provides a summary of the annual assessment reports submitted in 2009. Data Exhibit 7.2 describes the services provided by the Assessment Office to support faculty and programs in assessing their programs.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is administered regularly to measure student engagement along with the nature and quality of academic and personal undergraduate experiences. NSSE data are online at the Mānoa Institutional Research website. Additionally, the Mānoa Institutional Research Office provides data on admissions, enrollment, retention, and graduation which is available on their website. Both the Mānoa Institutional Research Office and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Students conduct focused studies on student enrollment, graduation, and performance. [2.10]

**Evaluating the Effectiveness of Program Review at UH Mānoa**

Board of Regents’ Policy at the University of Hawai‘i has mandated review of all academic programs since 1973, and procedures have been in place since 1983. Given the long history of program review at Mānoa, it should not be surprising that the process has evolved quite a bit over time. [4.4]
Prior to 2007, a three-person team of Mānoa faculty members reviewed each academic program. In order to avoid conflicts of interest, we utilized faculty from outside the department, and preferably the school or college, which housed the program to be reviewed. While the process was economical, the reviews were not as effective as they could have been for several reasons. The first reason was that it took considerable time to find faculty members available to serve on review teams, which often delayed the start of the review. Once a team was formed, the reviews were often protracted due to the teaching, research and service responsibilities of the team members. Collectively, these two issues meant that the data collected in support of the review, as well as the self-study itself, were often outdated by the time the review was completed, which negatively influenced the credibility of the review and the review findings.

Another challenge to the internal process was that while there were no apparent conflicts of interest, the lack of disciplinary knowledge of those on the teams meant that team members could not speak effectively to the program's curriculum and requirements. Whether the program was in line with changes in the discipline and other standards in the field were issues that the team could not effectively analyze. There were instances where team members did not necessarily understand standards in the field. This sometimes affected the team's report and recommendations.

In terms of recommendations for programs, members of the team would often find themselves comparing the resources available to the program reviewed with the resources in their own programs. In cases where it appeared that the unit reviewed fared better than that of the team member's, there was sometimes a reluctance to recommend increases in resources or position allocations, even when those increases were warranted.

Moreover, by focusing exclusively on the program/department, it was difficult to separate program-specific issues from those that were college-wide (or campus-wide). For instance, in many schools and colleges, student affairs and advising are overseen by a single office for the entire college, and so recommendations to the individual programs did not necessarily go far enough in addressing the underlying concerns. College-wide policies and procedures that affect programs, such as those regarding faculty workload and research support, were often invisible or not addressed in program-specific reviews.

The most important challenge, however, was that by focusing exclusively on the program or department, we were unable to connect program review to budgeting and planning processes. Budget allocations are negotiated between the dean and the central administration. While the dean was a part of every program review, it was difficult for him/her to make resource reallocations in response to review findings without corresponding reviews of the needs of the other programs and departments within the school/college.

In order to make program review more effective, in 2007 the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA) redesigned the process in consultation with Mānoa deans and directors, the Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the Council of Chairs. [4.8] The initial goal was to create a process to address issues of timeliness, expertise, and accountability (planning and budgeting). Through the redesign process, however, we found additional ways to increase its effectiveness, including better ties to data collection, assessment, and professional accreditation. Finally, to increase accountability and to ensure that the final report did not become simply a “file on the shelf,” the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) revitalized the process for the one-year progress report and has recently instituted a three-year progress report to facilitate continuous program improvement and to “close the loop” in the review process. [1.2, 1.3, 2.7, 4.4]

**Expertise and Timeliness (External Reviewers)**

The Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommended that the administration consider using external reviewers rather than Mānoa faculty members to review programs. Since those
discussions in 2007, the Vice Chancellor for Administration, Finance and Operations has provided an annual allocation to support external reviewers, as well as campus visit costs, for three school/college reviews a year.

By using external reviewers, we now have team members with both expertise in the discipline(s) and administrative experience. We have found that faculty members become more engaged in the review process when the team is comprised of scholars whom they respect, and as a result, the recommendations carry more weight than those received from colleagues outside of the discipline.

With external reviewers, it is easier to control the timing of the review. The VCAA selects the reviewers in the fall, the reviewers evaluate the self-studies and data in the winter, and they conduct the campus visit in the spring. We receive the team report in the weeks following the campus visit, and the VCAA meets with the dean over the summer to discuss implementation of the recommendations and to agree on objectives to address in the one-year progress report. Overall, use of external reviewers has resulted in reviews that are more timely and culminating reports and recommendations that are more insightful than those received through the previous process.

**Accountability, Planning and Budgeting (College-wide Review)**

In the final report, the external reviewers provide analyses of the health of each undergraduate and graduate program, as well as an overall assessment of the school/college. Included in the report are prioritized recommendations, with areas of responsibility clearly identified among the central administration, the school/college, and the department. Through this review process, the dean receives a report on the state of the college, including such issues as, which department(s) would benefit the most from an increase in resources? Are there policies and processes that negatively affect certain degree programs? Are there issues that affect students uniformly across the college, and which ones are unique to certain programs? Are there programs that are falling behind in terms of keeping up with changes in the discipline because of a lack of resources? Are there efficiencies that can be realized, such as the sharing of lab space between departments? In the same way, departments receive reviews and recommendations that are specific to their areas of responsibility, paving a way for department chairs to engage their respective faculty members in addressing issues within their control. [1.2, 1.3, 1.8, 2.1, 2.7]

Because the review provides a comprehensive look at the school/college, the recommendations are viable, and through the dean, are easily linked to existing planning and budgeting processes. Given that the culminating report is available to the entire college, the rationale for such reallocations is transparent. In regards to planning, a comprehensive review provides an analysis of the “state of the college,” thereby making it easier for the dean to engage the faculty in implementing the recommendations and strategic planning in preparation for the one- and three-year progress reports. [1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.7, 4.8]

**Data Collection and Assessment (Mānoa Institutional Research and Assessment Offices)**

In moving to college-wide reviews, it was necessary to create new self-study outlines. The new outlines include a Dean’s Executive Summary, and a Departmental Self-Study. The Dean’s Executive Summary provides the context for the Departmental Self-Study, and covers the mission and vision, budget, governance, administrative support, college-wide programs, facilities, community engagement, and development. The Departmental Self-Study covers the curricula, assessment methods and results, students, faculty research and support, departmental budget, staff support, and facilities. There is a corresponding data set for each section of the self-study. [4.6, 4.8]

In the past, Mānoa relied upon the University of Hawai‘i (UH) System Institutional Research Office to supply data in support of program review. The data provided were established by executive policy, and were in some cases non-negotiable. As the UH System Office is responsible for
providing data for all UH campuses, our requests were often prioritized after other data needs across the ten-campus system. Often the System would balance preferences that Mānoa may have had against System-reporting needs. As a result, there was often frustration with the timeliness of data provided and the way that some indicators were calculated. The Mānoa Institutional Research Office (MIRO) has been operational since 2008. That MIRO is part of the OVCAA has led to greater flexibility in the data available for program review. Furthermore, owing to the increasing profile of MIRO, deans and faculty are now more familiar with the data that are provided because these data sets are now used in other planning processes across campus. Each year, we have been able to expand the data set provided to departments and to the dean, making the self-studies more data-driven than they have been in the past. [2.7, 4.3, 4.4]

Departments have been required to submit annual assessment reports since 2003, and as a result, for most programs, we have five years of assessment reports to include in program review. The Assessment Office reviews the assessment activities of programs scheduled to be reviewed and provides the OVCAA with the status of their assessment efforts. The Assessment Office then works with departments needing assistance to strengthen their assessment activities prior to the review, takes part in the campus visit, and meets with the team to discuss assessment across the college. Following the review, the Assessment Office circles back with units found to have weaker assessment practices, using the report to set the agenda for school/college- and department-specific assessment workshops. Last year, the program review staff collaborated with the Assessment Office to revise the student and alumni program review survey to bring more attention to assessment and student learning outcomes. [2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 3.4]

**Professional Accreditation**

While the OVCAA always coordinated program review with professional accreditation, the focus was on the schedule of the review (normally one year after the accreditation visit). Accredited programs were still required to submit the self-study and undergo review by a faculty team.

Under our current procedures, the OVCAA accepts the self-study prepared for professional accreditation, the team’s report, and the action letter in lieu of the program review self-study. Instead of conducting a separate review, professionally-accredited programs move directly to the exit interview, followed by the “one-year progress report,” concentrating on how the school/college will address any issues raised by the accrediting agency. For the most part, the coordination of professional accreditation with program review has supported the model of reviewing programs college by college. For units with a mix of professionally accredited and non-accredited programs, the outliers tend to be graduate programs. In these cases, the graduate programs are reviewed by the Graduate Council.

One benefit of the coordination of professional accreditation and program review is the joint attention of the central administration and the college in addressing and resolving issues raised by accrediting agencies. [1.9]

**Continuous Improvement (One- and Three-Year Progress Reports, “Emerging Issues”)**

For many years, the review process included a progress report due one year following the review. The level of implementation of recommendations varied widely, and whether or not a program addressed the issues, the report was filed until the next comprehensive review. There was no systematic effort to circle back to programs on the status of implementation beyond the one-year report, and there were no actions taken in response to a lack of progress. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has revised the process to address these issues in several ways.

First, the dean is responsible for presenting to the administration the progress report, which facilitates accountability between the dean and the departments, and between the school/college and the administration. The Vice Chancellor returns progress reports that do not sufficiently address...
the issues raised in the review. This provides feedback to the dean that the college has not made adequate progress in implementing the recommendations. The dean is then required to revise and to resubmit the report including discussing plans for implementation of the recommendations. Finally, the VCAA comments on the approved report in a written document. [1.3]

Second, the Vice Chancellor has integrated a “Three-Year Progress Report” into the review process. Comprehensive program review is mandated to occur every five-seven years. The goal of the three-year progress report is to bridge the gap between the one-year progress report and the next comprehensive review. To facilitate the bridging of these reviews, the Vice Chancellor and dean discuss issues that have emerged since the initial review. These “emerging issues” are included in the Vice Chancellor’s follow-up memo to the dean in response to the one-year progress report and are included in the assigned set of issues to be addressed in the three-year progress report. Areas that remain unaddressed from the initial set of recommendations come under greater scrutiny in the three-year report and could direct the focus of the next comprehensive review. [1.3, 2,7]

**Conclusion**

Feedback on the new process has been very positive. Faculty members and administrators in the units reviewed have been impressed with the knowledge and expertise of the external reviewers, and all reviews have concluded on schedule. The team reports have provided a good balance of breadth and depth of analysis of each school/college and department. The reviews have been invaluable in drawing attention to campus-wide issues affecting undergraduate and graduate education that may not have come to light without a review of the entire college. Owing to these findings, new policies and campus-wide initiatives have been implemented that are making real progress in addressing the underlying issues. The one- and three-year progress reports keep the review findings on the minds of those reviewed, which facilitates implementation and improvement. Finally, we are finding that deans are addressing review recommendations through internal planning and budgeting activities, a connection that had been lacking under the previous procedures. We are confident that these measures have made program review more effective, and we will continue to evaluate the process and implement adjustments as necessary to ensure that program review remains a useful tool in program improvement. [1.2, 1.3, 2.7, 4.8]

A diagram of the review process may be found on the [program review website](#).
Building a Mānoa Community in Support of Student Success
Essay 1: Fostering the Development of a Mānoa Identity

Mānoa has been mindful of two central questions implied in the WASC response to our Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR): 1) how do faculty, staff, and administration work together to reflect the shared values that create community and emphasize our community’s unique identity and 2) how can we fully integrate sustainable, multi-level assessment of our efforts to create that community? This essay reports on the outcomes from our community building efforts, the evaluation and assessment of those outcomes, and our use of evidence from outcomes to continue to achieve realistic goals for student engagement and success. [1.9, 4.8]

Defining Our Destiny 2002-2010 began the process of developing a more cohesive Mānoa identity, emphasizing the campus’s uniqueness as a Hawaiian place of learning while reaffirming its status as a premier research institution. Mānoa is one of only 33 universities designated as a land-, sea-, and space-grant research institution; we are also classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Research University with “very high” research activity. The National Science Foundation ranks Mānoa among the top public universities in federal research expenditures for engineering and science. As we noted in our CPR Report, Mānoa strives for excellence in teaching, research, and public service while recognizing our kuleana (responsibility) to honor the indigenous people, culture, and values of our island community. Our reputation for excellence in oceanography, astronomy, Pacific Islands and Asian area studies, linguistics, cancer research, international business, and tropical agriculture is recognized nationally and internationally. In addition, our commitments and core values clearly identify aloha, diversity, fairness, equity, institutional integrity, and service alongside more traditional academic values like academic freedom and intellectual rigor. We are a university embedded in a unique environment with key cultural values and practices that are informed by a diverse community that has grown out of the history of Hawai‘i. [1.1, 1.4, 1.5]

Our commitment to understanding what it means to create a Hawaiian place of learning has engendered an important conversation about what is integral to the idea of a Mānoa community, a community whose identity can both shape students’ campus experiences and provide a campus profile recognized by Hawai‘i’s citizens. [4.1] Mānoa’s Institutional Proposal outlined two major initiatives designed to more fully articulate the Mānoa experience by developing a cohesive campus experience aligned with core values derived from the concept of a Hawaiian place of learning: raising awareness and practicing community. This essay discusses our progress in achieving these two initiatives. [1.1, 4.2, 4.3]

Raising Awareness
Creating a more cohesive Mānoa identity encompasses two inter-related spheres of operation. Not only is the Mānoa community committed to forging a new and distinctive experience for stakeholders on campus, but significant efforts have also been made to shape an identity in the collective mind of the larger community beyond the campus. Public imaging and outreach, faculty and student enculturation, and improved communication have been undertaken to raise awareness and stimulate students, faculty, staff, and the broader community to engage with and contribute to the ongoing conversation and development of a more refined Mānoa identity. [1.3, 1.7, 4.1]

The Chancellor’s Advancement Team spearheaded the effort to shape a clear and more attractive Mānoa identity in the public’s mind with new television ads to support student recruitment and brand Mānoa as a destination of choice for Hawai‘i’s high school graduates. These ads have reached a significant share of their expected audience. Four 30-second television ads are estimated to have reached 86.9% of Hawai‘i’s 433,240 households an average of eight times over the three-month period of its initial run, as estimated by Nielsen ratings. Of roughly 225,000 possible viewers within the 18-24 age group (potential students), more than 52% viewed the ads an average of 3.7 times. Of the approximately 504,000 potential viewers between the ages of 35 to 64 (parents, opinion
leaders), roughly 86% viewed the ads an average of 5.4 times. One of the ads was a finalist in the cinematography and best commercial categories in the 2009 Pele Awards (the State’s top advertising competition) and won the gold medal for music score. [1.7]

The communication infrastructure to expand public awareness of Mānoa has been significantly upgraded with a new website, a Facebook initiative, and a YouTube site. The Mānoa website functions as the main virtual portal to the campus. Since its launch in Summer 2008, the website has increased daily average page views 34% (23,058 in July 2008, 29,604 in July 2009, 31,114 in July 2010). To sustain and improve our success, a web coordinator position was filled in March 2010, and the website's use as a multi-media communications platform for internal and external audiences has been expanded. For example, in April 2010 Mānoa added a multi-media link featuring our television ads. In addition, two information resources for families have been added to the Mānoa homepage: 1) a Parents and ‘Ohana focus was created in August 2009 that includes a Parents and Family newsletter; and 2) in May 2009 a periodic column by Mānoa’s Communications Director, was created. As of April 2010, 669 UHM parents have asked to be included in all e-mailings to the Mānoa ‘Ohana. [1.7, 4.8]

Our Facebook initiative debuted in September 2008, and has enjoyed steady growth from 1,000 “friends” in February of 2009 to our current 3,700 “friends.” We will sustain this initiative as a communications and marketing tool for current and potential students, while monitoring other forms of social networking for possible expansion. In Fall 2009, Mānoa complemented its presence on Facebook with a YouTube site, which features fourteen videos viewed by more than 7,000 individuals by that year’s end. Mānoa continues to add new content to YouTube, e.g., its television ads.

Additional virtual infrastructure to support recruitment and shape public perception about Mānoa includes a “Campus Talk” blog, launched October 2009 on the website of the Honolulu Advertiser. Steering readers to Mānoa websites, the blog averaged about 2,000 page views per month, which the Advertiser considered very strong for a new blog. Unfortunately, the newspaper ended its operation on June 6, 2010. Due to its positive reception, we will continue the Campus Talk blog on our own website with articles contributed by the Mānoa communications team.

A crucial aspect of our efforts to transmit a recognizable identity to the public has focused on our relationship with the state legislature. In Fall 2009, Mānoa’s Government Relations Manager initiated bi-monthly meetings with more than twenty-five legislative coordinators from schools and colleges to provide information and coordinate resources. The coordinators found these meetings extremely informative, so they continued during the legislative session, from January to May. [4.8]

To generate awareness of the rich cultural menu Mānoa routinely offers to the larger community through its departments of Theatre, Music, and Art as well as Outreach College, “Mānoa Arts and Minds” was inaugurated in Fall 2009. This initiative utilizes several tools to build community awareness, such as KGMB-TV public service announcements, advertising, and emailed announcements to 80,000 alumni on O‘ahu. Measures of effectiveness of this project will be developed as it continues. [2.9]

Using 21st century technologies to shape Mānoa’s identity among the public at large is the first step in recruiting high school students. Mānoa’s identity next manifests itself in campus events displaying what makes our campus a destination of choice for new students. The prime example here is the “Mānoa Experience,” an annual campus-wide open house for prospective students and their families, which attracted more than 600 participants at the October 2009 event and included participation from all Mānoa colleges and schools.
Enhanced communication and public imaging efforts have yielded an increasing number of applications to Mānoa. In 2007, 11,541 applications were received; this increased to 11,648 in 2008 and 12,256 in 2009. Applications for 2010 totaled 12,035 with an additional 800 Fall 2010 automatic admission students from the various UH Community Colleges under the University’s new automatic admission policy. Automatic admission students do not submit application forms and thus are not included in the 2010 totals.

Mānoa shows its aloha for newcomers to the campus in several ways. The Newly Admitted Student Portal was launched in January 2010 for the entering Fall 2010 undergraduate class. As the second generation to the 2009 Newly Admitted Student website, the portal provides newly accepted Mānoa students with a single point of entry to vital information for the transition to the campus. The portal was designed to encourage early connections and exposure to the Mānoa community through the following key features: 1) an interactive checklist of campus-based information and approaching deadlines (financial aid, housing, health clearance, etc.) requiring critical early action by student applicants, thereby guiding them in their progress towards attending Mānoa, 2) student testimonials in the YouTube channel, 3) campus opportunities and services through the pictorial rotating banner of institutional facts, 4) a poll about Mānoa facts, and 5) access to their university email account. Early indicators of the portal’s success reflects that 70% of all admittees who accessed the checklist proceeded to pay their tuition deposit. Further analysis of student usage and portal enhancements will be conducted in Fall 2010. [1.7, 2.12, 3.7]

Campus orientation programs routinely provide opportunities for newcomers to acculturate to the campus and to Mānoa’s core values. New Student Orientation (NSO) sessions are offered regularly for freshmen, transfer students, and their parents. One-day orientation sessions, geared primarily to entering freshmen and their families from in-state, are conducted beginning in late July and continue through early August. An orientation session designed specifically for transfer students from O‘ahu is also offered. [2.14] NSO sessions provide information about academic advising, campus resources, and the new campus environment. NSO participants are also provided with early registration. The Warrior Welcome Week for new students is held the week before the Fall semester begins. The scheduled events include a welcome dinner for parents hosted by the Chancellor. Targeting neighbor island, continental U.S., and international students and their families, Warrior Welcome Week is designed to conveniently minimize the travel time for students from out of state and is coordinated to facilitate the students’ move-in to the residence halls. In addition to sessions on academic advising and procedures, Warrior Welcome Week assists students with the transition to Mānoa by including sessions on local island style and culture, indigenous perspectives of life in Hawai‘i, the Honolulu scene, tours of Ka Papa Lo‘i o Kānewai, Mānoa’s functioning kalo farm and cultural resource center, and other unique Mānoa campus facilities and features. NSO sessions are regularly evaluated by participants. In the last two years, over 90% of the respondents consistently agreed that the NSO session helped to prepare them for their Mānoa journey; approximately 85% felt that NSO helped them chart their course of study. [1.5, 2.13]

The Graduate Division hosts a new graduate student orientation in the Fall semester. In addition, at least 50 graduate programs provide program specific orientation for their students. Twenty-four of the programs conduct assessments which are used to improve the orientation sessions.

Incoming students receive help acclimating to the campus from facilities maintenance and custodial staff who volunteer to participate in an “Aloha, Ask Me” program. Wearing “Aloha, Ask Me” buttons to encourage students to ask for assistance, staff provide campus directions and answers to frequently asked questions. Both students and staff reported strong satisfaction with the program when it began in Fall 2009, so it was adopted as a regular Fall program.
Students are not the only newcomers to Mānoa each year. The Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support (OFDAS) has been conducting orientations for new faculty since 1996. Between 40-60% of incoming faculty voluntarily participate each semester. The focus of the OFDAS faculty orientation has been to provide Hawai‘i- and Mānoa-specific information that exposes new faculty to unique aspects of living in Hawai‘i and teaching at Mānoa. The recent creation of the Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge has contributed to expanded cultural competency segments of the orientation, rounding out an intensive, day-long series of panels. [1.5] New faculty are introduced to the menu of faculty support services OFDAS provides. [3.3] The majority of incoming faculty who participate also sign up for ongoing services, including mid-semester evaluations of their teaching, faculty mentoring, and special sessions focusing on various aspects of scholarship and teaching. [2.9] Participant evaluations suggest that faculty value the diversity of information received and individuals contacted. Copies of completed evaluations will be available in the EER Team Room for review. [3.4, 3.6]

The challenge for these multi-faceted efforts to bring newcomers into the Mānoa community of learners is to better articulate how being a Hawaiian place of learning informs that community and its identity and to coordinate facets of orientation so they center on core values. [1.1] A second challenge is to sustain the sense of a Mānoa community during the year, for new as well as continuing members of our community.

The Chancellor’s office has implemented a number of initiatives meant to contribute to an on-going sense of community. Two campus-wide town hall meetings were held in 2009 and “Chancellor’s Updates” are regularly emailed to all Mānoa students, faculty and staff. In 2009, eleven updates were issued on a variety of key subjects. In response to one “Budget Alert” in March 2010, dozens of Mānoa students, faculty, and staff testified in the Legislature against a budget cut measure, helping lead to its defeat. [4.2]

The Chancellor’s Advancement Team has also provided support for a special initiative, “Mānoa Makeovers,” which organizes volunteer campus and community improvement and beautification projects, such as cleaning, planting, and painting. Since Mānoa Makeovers began in Fall 2008, more than 600 participants have engaged in twenty events. These activities are strongly supported by several campus organizations—Athletics, Outreach College, College Opportunities Program, Music, Campus Center, and others—that have made Mānoa Makeovers an annual tradition in their units. Core values of community and local responsibility are conspicuously visible in these events. [2.9, 4.1]

The multi-leveled efforts to shape a Mānoa identity before and after students come to the campus are being assessed by individual units responsible for their share of the process. [2.11] Mānoa also employs the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to measure student engagement along with the nature and quality of academic and personal undergraduate experiences. A review of Mānoa’s recent NSSE reports indicates that despite our increased attention and effort, more must be done to enhance students’ experience and awareness of core Mānoa values. [4.3] As noted in our Institutional Proposal, these values include a focus on developing an awareness of and sensitivity to diversity and commonality, a focus on global awareness and local responsibility, and a focus on sustainability. [1.1, 1.5] In four of the NSSE questions that speak to the first focus (How often have you included diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments? Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity? Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values? Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective?), mean scores from seniors are consistently higher than those of freshmen. However, senior responses are regularly lower than 3.0 (the “often” level), indicating less frequent occurrence on campus than desirable. In addition, neither freshmen nor seniors feel that Mānoa actively encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or
ethnic backgrounds. Further, only 54% of seniors report being involved in community service or volunteer work prior to graduation. NSSE weighted mean responses regarding “student-faculty interaction” show slight increases in the first year from 30.3 in 2001 to 32.8 in 2009, with a similar slight increase in senior-year scores from 40.2 in 2001 to 41.2 in 2009. A slight decrease in scores for both groups between 2008 and 2009 (35.4 to 32.8 for first-year students; 43.5 to 41.2 for senior-year students) bears watching. [1.5, 2.10, 4.5]

Beyond simply making NSSE and other data more publicly accessible, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs held presentations in Spring 2010 to the academic deans, the WASC Steering Committee, and Mānoa Peer Advisors to share what NSSE responses indicate about Mānoa’s undergraduate experience. Additional presentations were made in Fall 2010 to the Mānoa Executive Team, the Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i, the Graduate Student Organization, the General Education Committee, and other groups. The goals for the NSSE presentations have been to: 1) improve campus awareness of NSSE results through regular information sessions; 2) provide public access to data and encourage analysis by faculty, staff and students; and 3) produce reports for campus constituencies that analyze NSSE results and suggest practical use. Specific outcomes from NSSE discussions to date include a four-fold increase in traffic to NSSE data web pages on the MIRO website; awareness of NSSE by academic unit leaders and academic advisers; and establishment of annual baseline attendance figures for NSSE presentations. [2.13, 3.1, 4.3, 4.5]

Practicing Community

Our Institutional Proposal posed the following questions. What makes the Mānoa experience unique relative to other university experiences? In what distinctive and fundamental manner should students be changed by virtue of their experience with Mānoa? What core values and competencies should students develop by way of the Mānoa Experience? [1.1] Practicing community in ways that encourage stakeholders to invest in the emerging campus identity and its core values is occurring through a combination of infrastructure improvement and curricular innovation. [4.1]

Kaiāulu (community) happens when people practice shared values, making them visible to all. For Mānoa to be perceived as a Hawaiian place of learning, core values must be manifest in all areas of endeavor to establish a foundation for the Mānoa experience. Building on that foundation occurs in many formats across the campus. [1.5]

One important implication of our emphasis on Mānoa as a “Hawaiian place of learning” is our renewed sense of urgency in meeting goals for increasing the number of Native Hawaiians attending Mānoa and supporting their academic success. Addressing the differential rates of enrollment across Hawai‘i’s population, including the Native Hawaiian population, is one of Mānoa’s four enrollment goals. [2.10] Programs for Native Hawaiians conceptualize and engage in community and community building in several different ways. Central to the pedagogy of Native Hawaiian programs is engaging Native Hawaiian students as scholars and experts with the broader community through sustained academic/professional engagement with community service, service learning, and research. A description of Native Hawaiian serving programs is provided in Exhibit 1.

Native Hawaiian programs have already demonstrated their critical support for Native Hawaiian student success with the steady increase in numbers of Native Hawaiian students in undergraduate and graduate programs that house Native Hawaiian-focused programs. It is of note that the same trend of increasing numbers has been occurring in disciplines in which Native Hawaiian students are traditionally underrepresented. [2.10] For example, enrollment in Engineering has increased since the inception of the Native Hawaiian Science and Engineering Mentorship Program (NHSEMP). Between Fall 2001 and Fall 2008, the number of Native Hawaiians in the College of Engineering more than doubled (from 41 to 90), increasing the percentage of Native Hawaiians...
from 7% to 12%. Of the 93 undergraduate participants who entered the program between 2002 and 2006, 66% had graduated as of Spring 2010. Additionally, 10 of the 14 from the Fall 2004 cohort had graduated as of Spring 2010. This six-year graduation rate of 71.4% exceeds Mānoa’s 54% rate. Another exemplary program is ‘IKE AO PONO’ in the School of Nursing and Dental Hygiene. Starting with six students in Fall 2001, the program has grown to 104 students in Fall 2010. In Spring 2010, ‘IKE AO PONO graduated its 100th Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander nurse. In addition, seven ‘IKE AO PONO students who matriculated at Mānoa graduated from nursing programs elsewhere. The “Native Hawaiian Student Profile” prepared by the Kōkua a Puni Program details overall enrollment of Native Hawaiian students at Mānoa which grew from 1,810 students (8.8% of enrollment) in Fall 2005 to 2,588 (12.7%) in Fall 2009. [2.10, 4.3, 4.5]

Over the last year, Native Hawaiian programs have taken significant steps to enlarge Mānoa’s vibrant Native Hawaiian student community. In July 2009, representatives from Native Hawaiian-focused student services programs across Mānoa attended a one-day retreat, “Promoting and Sustaining Native Hawaiian Student Success.” The retreat provided Native Hawaiian programs with a venue to network and to discuss issues facing Native Hawaiian students and, in turn, the scope and implementation of our services to address those issues. An outcome of this retreat was the creation of a Native Hawaiian student services working group dedicated to improving services for Native Hawaiian students through better coordination, networking, and information sharing among programs. [1.5]

Further undergirding community building for Native Hawaiian students is the opening of two student-dedicated spaces on campus, both of which are integral to creating a true sense of place for Native Hawaiian students at Mānoa. These spaces located in the Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies and the Queen Liliʻuokalani Center for Student Services are described in more detail in Essay 4.

Community building opportunities for Mānoa students are also found in co-curricular modes. For example, the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources sponsors several annual events that contribute to connections between the campus community and the civic community. These events are intended to strengthen the culture of the college and its departmental units as students, faculty, and staff work on projects. Events also raise dollars for various community causes including the Hawai‘i Children’s Cancer Foundation and American Red Cross’s Haiti Relief Fund. Metrics used to evaluate events include number of participants, donations raised, and feedback from participants. Results suggest that students who participate have a greater connection with their departments and academic programs, while all participants demonstrate greater awareness of and appreciation for local community causes. [2.9, 2.11, 4.8]

Student Housing Services is building community by introducing a new co-curricular programming model in Mānoa residence halls tied directly to a student development and community development theory. This model enables a more precise measurement of residential programming effects on students. Two specific initiatives were a re-designed “Mānoa Move-in” experience (August 2009) with a stronger emphasis on community and identity building and newly-funded late night programming (Fall 2009) that incorporates events emphasizing community. A “pre” assessment was completed in August 2009, and a “post” assessment was completed in May 2010. Initial results show a high level (81%) of satisfaction with the activities provided. [2.11] These results also show a need to diversify programming to reach a broader spectrum of students. A detailed analysis shows freshmen students are the most satisfied with planned activities, while juniors and seniors are the least satisfied. Students in apartment complexes also appear to be less satisfied than those in residence halls. These data suggest that student housing at Mānoa does a good job serving students new to the institution, but that more effort will be needed to evolve the programming model for continuing students and students who reside in apartment environments. To that end, the Residential Life Program is being split into two units: a “Residence Life” unit for residence halls and...
an “Apartment Life” unit for apartment complexes. Each unit is responsible for developing community building activities and other initiatives that pertain to their particular demographic of students. Additional findings and implications of Student Housing Assessment studies are detailed in Essay 4. [2.9, 2.11]

**Next Steps**

Defining the Mānoa Experience is integral to our efforts to practice community based on a known campus identity. In Fall 2009 the WASC CPR Visiting Team noted: “We sense a great deal of excitement about the unique place of Hawaiian Learning . . . We did note that the theme needs to be more clearly articulated and some means of insuring that it is understood and embraced by the entire campus.” In Spring 2010, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs formed the Mānoa Experience Working Group consisting of faculty from the Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge, members from each WASC EER team and from the WASC Steering Committee, representatives of the faculty senate, and administrators and charged the Workgroup with facilitating a campus conversation about what constitutes the Mānoa Experience and how to reflect this in our curriculum and student and campus life. An alumni survey was completed in Summer 2010 with over 800 responses spanning graduates from 1950 through 2010. The survey solicited alumni feedback regarding the quality of Mānoa’s academic programs, student engagement in research and creative activities, artistic and cultural expression in the curriculum and campus life, appreciation for world cultures, incorporation of principles of sustainability, respect for indigenous knowledge and practices, and infusion of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific traditions, values, and perspectives in the curriculum and campus life–commitments that are reflected in the Mānoa Strategic Plan and in our Institutional Proposal. Alumni responses to all of these issues were overwhelmingly positive. Open-ended questions asked alumni to recall their positive and negative experiences at Mānoa and to suggest areas for improvement. The responses from the survey were used as a springboard for a wider conversation during a November 2010 focus group session that included alumni, students, faculty, and staff. A similar focus group session is planned for Spring 2011. We will report further on our progress during our EER report. In the future, NSSE responses will be analyzed to determine if such initiatives are having the anticipated outcomes. The articulation of what should comprise the Mānoa Experience, arising from these various campus conversations, will inform decisions about curriculum and campus life, building a stronger consensus about the Mānoa identity. This articulation will strengthen our efforts to both build awareness about the Mānoa Experience and to practice community. [1.7, 2.2, 2.4, 4.1]
Building a Mānoa Community in Support of Student Success
Essay 2: Enabling and Ensuring Student Learning Success

We are well on our way to developing a cohesive student academic support structure. New and improved infrastructure is again key to advancing our goals. However, just as crucial to enabling and ensuring student learning success is effectively assessing the extent of student learning and articulating necessary educational improvements. With the creation of the Assessment Office (AO) in 2008 and the Mānoa Institutional Research Office (MIRO) in 2009, we have significantly enhanced our ability to understand the strengths and weaknesses of our efforts to promote student learning. [1.2, 2.9, 4.5]

Our Institutional Proposal identified two initiatives to enable and ensure student learning success: 1) enhancing student support by improving advising, instituting a Student Success Center, establishing first-year programs, and building an undergraduate research emphasis and 2) ensuring student learning success by leveraging assessment through faculty development, coordination of assessment activities, and helping campus constituents engage in assessment. This essay reports on the effectiveness of our efforts in achieving these initiatives.

Enhance Student Support

Improving Advising

Student learning success begins with students knowing their options and obligations, which means having the best possible network of campus advising. The Council of Academic Advisors (CAA) promotes consistency between colleges/schools, sets policies and procedures, and coordinates campus-wide initiatives such as mandatory advising, with a focus on improving advising services to students. The Council also works to improve the quality of academic advising at Mānoa by providing a cohesive network of advisors and of advising information, offering professional development, and assisting individual advising offices with the development of assessment plans. Many of the new initiatives described in this essay have been an outgrowth of the collaborative thinking of the CAA, which has initiated an annual conference of all advisors on campus that has increasingly drawn faculty as well as full-time advisors and representatives from other campuses in the UH System. [2.12, 2.13]

The other major structural change involving advising has been the creation of the Mānoa Advising Center (MAC) in June 2008 which provided undecided and pre-major students with an advising office specifically dedicated to supporting their particular needs. Walk-in feedback by students has been positive. In 2009-2010, for example, 92% of MAC students strongly agreed that the advisor with whom they worked was approachable, informative, listened carefully, and understood their questions and concerns. [2.13, 3.1]

Two important policies were implemented in 2006 to reinforce the importance of advising, and the Mānoa Advising Center has been instrumental in the implementation of these policies. The first policy requires mandatory advising for a student’s first two years to emphasize to students the necessity of regular advising, to engage them in academic planning, and to ensure they consistently receive regular advising from their respective colleges and schools. Students who do not fulfill the requirement that they see an advisor face a hold on their registrations until they do. This has not been a major problem as completion rates are high: Fall 2008 = 94%, Spring 2009 = 90.6%, Fall 2009 = 96.8% and Spring 2010 = 88.7%. This does not mean, however, that students must go to MAC. Students advised in other offices (such as the Honors Program, the College Access Program, Access to College Excellence, Pre-Health and Law Advising) can use those advising sessions to meet this requirement. Moreover, MAC has worked with pre-major schools and colleges to refer students directly for assistance. In addition, MAC provides advising sessions in different formats (online, individual appointments, group sessions). Efforts are currently underway to ensure that the mandatory advising requirement is enforced consistently across campus; all schools and
colleges now use the same list for mandatory advising and report completion rates annually. Now that the basic policy structure is in place, the next steps involve assessing the success of the policy by tracking student retention, graduation rates, and time to graduation to determine what happens to those who do not clear mandatory advising holds, assessing the mandatory campus-wide advising initiative, and working towards full coordination of the mandatory advising efforts. [1.7, 1.8, 2.2, 2.10, 2.12]

The second policy requires students to declare an academic major by the end of their second semester as a sophomore; transfer students must declare a major after two semesters at Mānoa. Implementation of this policy began in Spring 2008. The policy is intended to facilitate timely graduation while allowing students to take full advantage of the curricular and co-curricular opportunities Mānoa has to offer. In their fourth semester, sophomores who receive advising support from the MAC must attend a lecture after which they must declare an interest area. These students are required to turn in a plan that demonstrates how they will qualify for their chosen major. [1.2, 1.7]

This second policy change has encountered more complexities during implementation than the first. One challenge is that students subject to mandatory advising with a GPA of below 2.0 cannot declare a major; there were 222 students in Spring 2010 in this category. Another problem is that a number of programs (Nursing, the Shidler College of Business and the College of Education, most notably) do not accept entrants until they have 55 credits. Students not admitted to their programs of choice on the first try face some difficult choices that may impede their declaration of a major. In both Fall 2008 and Fall 2009, around 35% of juniors had not declared a major. While the percentage of undeclared juniors decreased to 28% in Fall 2010, it is still far from our goal of having 90% of juniors declaring a major by 2010. While progress is being made, and mandatory advising will help, we will also need to tackle issues involving access to popular majors that are difficult to address in times of budgetary shortfall, and we will need to address at-risk students more systematically and successfully. We, therefore, announced to the campus in August 2010 that we are delaying the implementation of this policy for at least a year so that we can be sure it is successful. [4.5]

Students play an important role in Mānoa’s advising process. In Fall 2009, the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs and Students created new “Student Success Fellowships” to encourage students assisting fellow students’ academic success through their work as peer advisors/mentors. Funds were awarded in Spring 2010 to student peer advisors at two centers devoted to student success: the Mānoa Advising Center and the Pre-Health/Pre-Law Advising Center. In this first year, $65,000 was awarded to 13 students; funding for 2010-2011 has been increased to $250,000, half of which will be directed toward Student Success Fellowships that recognize outstanding Mānoa peer advisors working in student development programs run out of the Office of Student Affairs. The other half of the funding has created a “Mānoa Peer Advisors Fellowship” program which will place peer advisors in advising offices in academic units on campus. Peer Advisors undergo a rigorous selection process (including an application, an individual interview, and a group interview) and train for three weeks during the summer before being placed with student academic service units across campus. All awardees are required to attend training meetings throughout the year. As this is a new program, we do not yet have a clear approach to its assessment, but given the interest in it across campus, we plan to increase its funding by $250,000 over the next two years. [2.13, 3.6]

Assessing the success of all these initiatives is an important and on-going issue. NSSE data have been useful in studying the impact of our new academic policies that address longstanding problems regarding academic advising. [2.11] Our most recent NSSE data demonstrate a steady positive shift in students’ attitude toward academic advising following implementation of practices that actively engage students in their academic planning by employing mandatory advising and deadlines to declare a major. After four years of slightly declining responses, first-year students’
evaluation of the quality of academic advising at Mānoa increased from 2.59 in 2007 to 2.82 in 2009. While the scores of senior-year students also increased from 2.59 to 2.69 over the same period, the larger increase in first-year student responses may indicate that mandatory advising and declaration of major policies are yielding positive results.

These are all Mānoa-specific programs, but the full context for advising at Mānoa involves attention to the other campuses in the System, particularly given the growing number of transfers. One of the crucial building blocks in a 'systematic’ approach to advising has been STAR, which though developed at Mānoa, is now used across the System. We view STAR as a crucial part of the advising picture because it allows students to view and track their progress towards a degree in real time. STAR is effective because it helps to make actual advising sessions more productive since students can (and generally do) come in with a clearer picture than before of degree requirements and their progress. [1.7, 2.14] STAR also provides students with an assessment of their progress to degree, reports their percentage of completion of both the General Education requirements as well as the academic major. [2.2] Additionally, STAR has a “what if” component that allows students to explore other majors and minors that interest them by providing a report of additional requirements. STAR has also assisted students with academic planning by assisting students with registration and selection of courses. [2.12] In Fall 2010, STAR introduced a new component, a result of cooperative academic planning across the campus. The Council of Academic Advisors, working with all academic departments, has generated four-year academic plans for all baccalaureate degrees at UHM. [2.2] Every incoming student is provided, through STAR, a plan that if followed would result in the student completing his or her degree in four years. We will be closely monitoring the impact of these four-year plans on both retention and graduation rates. [3.7]

In addition, Mānoa is engaged in a serious conversation with the UH community colleges about how to improve advising for students planning on transferring to Mānoa. A specific example is “Ka ‘ie ‘ie, the Degree Pathway Partnership Program,” which was implemented in Fall 2008 and has just admitted its fifth cohort of students transferring from Kapi‘olani Community College. All Ka ‘ie ‘ie students receive mandatory advising each semester, declare their major before transferring, and draft an academic plan through graduation. To improve students’ time-to-degree, as well as communication with advisors and students throughout the UH System, Ka ‘ie ‘ie has compiled a database with standardized program sheets for every undergraduate degree offered at Mānoa. [2.2] The Ka ‘ie ‘ie program has clearly improved students’ GPA, retention, and graduation rates. [2.12] In the first four semesters (Fall 2008, Spring 2009, Fall 2009, Spring 2010) 307 students enrolled in Ka ‘ie ‘ie (5.9% of all newly enrolled classified transfers). Of those 307 students, 61 enrolled in Kapi‘olani and 246 enrolled at Mānoa; 235 remain enrolled. Compared to other classified transfer students, Ka ‘ie ‘ie students are on average enrolled in slightly fewer credits per semester (11.84 compared to 12.11) but have a higher average GPA (3.08 compared to 2.81). In the first three cohorts (Fall 2008, Spring 2009, Fall 2009), there were 191 students in Ka ‘ie ‘ie at Mānoa. Of those 191 students, 11 have stopped out (5.7% compared to 10.0% in the comparison group of all newly enrolled classified transfers) and three have graduated (1.5%, compared to 1.9%). We are carefully reviewing the future of this program given its limited focus on one community college and our new initiative regarding automatic admission to Mānoa. The automatic admission program identifies all UH System Community College students within their last semester of successfully completing their Associate of Arts degree and automatically admits them to Mānoa or one of our sister baccalaureate campuses. The key to both of these initiatives is offering academic advising to make the academic transition as smooth as possible. [1.7, 2.10, 2.14]

A common theme running throughout all of these efforts at improving advising has been to focus on giving the students the tools they need to succeed. This involves both high-touch methods that break down the large Mānoa campus into smaller units and hi-tech methods that use new technology to connect to students. [3.7] Above all, we want to deepen and thicken our students’ engagement with their education at Mānoa.
First-Year Programs
This strategy of engagement begins with a suite of programs designed to engage first-year students. The most comprehensive of these is Access to College Excellence (ACE). ACE increases student engagement by bringing diverse groups of first-year students with similar interests together to study, learn, and build community through initiatives committed to supporting their educational, developmental, and social needs. [1.5] ACE learning communities offer a combination of three general education courses and a small group, one-credit integrating seminar. [2.9] Courses are grouped to provide freshmen with an introduction to various academic perspectives. The integrating seminar is led by an upperclass student mentor who assists students in the development of successful academic strategies, creation of social and interpersonal networks, and involvement in a variety of campus events. ACE assessment and evaluation measures student learning outcomes through pre/post-surveys (student expectations, student engagement, and program feedback), written assignments and worksheets (journals, reflections, classroom activities, etc.), and focus group feedback. [2.11] In addition, retention and transfer rates are calculated utilizing STAR and the National Student Clearinghouse database. First-year retention rates for Fall 2008 ACE students was 86.3% compared to the Mānoa average rate of 78.5%. Since Fall 2006, ACE learning community participation increased by 60%. In Fall 2009, 20% of Mānoa’s freshmen participated in an ACE learning community. These 392 freshmen were supported by 38 peer mentors across 35 learning communities. In Fall 2011, new ACE communities will be offered through the Honors Program and the School of Nursing. The ACE Program hopes to reach 25% of the incoming first-time freshmen class by Fall 2012. [3.11, 4.7]

The First-Year Experience at Mānoa has also been shaped by Residential Learning Programs (RLP) that were first offered in 2007-2008. Students with similar majors or interests live together on selected residential floors, studying, working, and learning from each other. RLP staff focus on programming elements to connect classroom learning with out-of-class experiences. A full description of these programs, assessment, and outcomes is detailed in Essay 4. [2.5]

Another program leveraging strong support for student success during the first year is the English Department’s Writing Mentors program. More than 1,800 students worked with a mentor in Composition I in 94 course sections from Fall 2007 to Spring 2010. Student participation and successful engagement with a mentor was assessed in several ways: conference logs by mentors (n=5,000+); end-of-semester anonymous evaluations by students (n=1,350+ with a rate of return of 75%); end-of-semester evaluations by mentors (n=60+) and instructors (n=60+); and focus group interviews with students (n=2), instructors (n=3), and mentors (n=5). The learning outcome of writing successfully for purpose and audience was assessed by primary trait scoring of sample writing from mentored and non-mentored students. Results show mentored students outperforming their peers: 86% of mentored students were prepared or well-prepared for future writing tasks versus 71% of non-mentored students. In addition, 62% of mentored students provided either somewhat specific or specific/complex descriptions and analysis of purpose and audience as compared to 38% of non-mentored students. 90% of student respondents rated their experiences as either “very satisfied” or “satisfied,” and in response to the question, “Did your mentor help in your transition to college?,” 75% of the first-year students in Fall 2008 through Spring 2010 answered “yes.” [2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 2.10, 4.7]

Our focus on student success also has led to a number of programs focused on specific populations and can begin even before the freshman year. The College Opportunities Program (COP) continuously evaluates its summer and first-year academic and residential programs designed to prepare at-risk Hawai‘i residents for a successful first year at Mānoa. A majority of COP participants lack the minimum requirements for regular admission to Mānoa, are typically the first in their families to attend college, and are members of underrepresented groups. Over the past ten years, the average completion rate for the COP summer program has been 91%. Of those who
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passed the summer program and enrolled at UHM in the fall semester, 96% complete their first year in college. Persistence to the second year is about 81%. This rate compares favorably to the Mānoa average first year retention of 78.6%, particularly when one realizes that participants are drawn from an at-risk population. Participants consistently judge their summer program experience very helpful in preparing them for their first semester. All COP programs are assessed. In planning summer program curriculum, COP staff utilize results to fine-tune existing curriculum and implement new learning strategies. For the 2010 cohort, COP increased the number of participants from 75 to 132 students. Eighty-four percent (111) of the 2010 cohort successfully completed the summer program; 110 of the completers are enrolling in Mānoa or a community college for the Fall 2010 semester. [2.4, 2.5, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13]

The Manawa Kūpono Scholarship Program (MK) provides college preparation outreach activities to Native Hawaiian high school students from at-risk communities. MK strives to increase the first-through fourth-year retention and six-year graduation rates of Native Hawaiian students at UHM by establishing academic learning communities, expanding financial support, and providing tutoring and academic advising. Program assessment occurs in several forms. Student academic progress towards graduation is tracked through individual semester meetings and grade-checks. Retention and graduation rates are also tracked. The Manawa Kūpono Native Hawaiian Grant Program provided scholarships to 120 students between academic years 2007-2010. Scholarships were not automatically renewed; however, an applicant could reapply each year to be reconsidered. Seventy-one percent (85) were one-year recipients; 22% (27) received scholarships for two academic years; and the remaining 7% (8) were awarded a scholarship in each of the three years of the grant. During the grant period, 8% (10) of the scholarship recipients graduated. In Year One, 78% of the recipients (36) persisted to the next year; 11% (5) graduated; and 11% decided not to return to Mānoa in the next semester, however three of those students enrolled at a community college. In Year Two, 88% (57) persisted to the next year and one student graduated. In Year Three, 84% (43) persisted to the next year and 8% (4) graduated. Student surveys evaluate culturally-relevant, monthly learning community meetings (Hui Kama ‘ilio). At every meeting, students are also asked how effective the support they receive has been and if they have any suggestions for improvement. [2.5] Written reflections about community service measure involvement in both on- and off-campus communities. In addition, MK annually hires a professional grant evaluator to conduct focus-group evaluations. Finally, MK submits annual reports to the U.S. Department of Education. Assessment shows that financial support through the Manawa Kūpono Scholarship is more effective for students’ success when combined with academic, personal, and cultural support.

These programs should not be considered as stand-alone programs. Illustrative of the connections among these programs, the English Department has strengthened its coordination of Writing Mentors with ACE and other programs (such as College Opportunities Program and Manawa Kūpono) as well as with other entities in the Student Success Center, where mentors work regularly with their mentees. Other changes made in response to assessment results include better advertisement of the mentoring program for undergraduates as well as workshops with the KOKUA program which provides support services to students with disabilities, Counseling and Student Development, and with Hamilton Library. Hamilton Library has now created workshops tailored to Composition I students. Ongoing workshops with faculty have incorporated findings to make recommendations for instructors on how to integrate mentors into syllabi, classroom activities, and writing assignments. A support website for instructors, mentors, and students has been set up on Laulima, the University’s web-based course management system. [3.2, 3.4, 3.7]

To put it simply, students succeed if they pass the courses they take, and this means that the activities of the Learning Assistance Center (LAC), which is physically located in the Student Success Center, is key. The LAC offers several co-curricular programs to enhance and enrich students’ intellectual development, with the two primary programs being supplemental instruction
(SI) and tutoring. LAC regularly offers SI for six traditionally challenging courses (CHEM 161; ECON 130, 131; MATH 100; PHIL 110; PHYS 151) and tutoring for over 30 courses and areas. SI is a regularly scheduled, out-of-class, peer-facilitated session. SI leaders attend all class sessions, take notes, and read assigned materials in order to integrate how to learn with what to learn for a one-hour per week SI session. In addition, LAC also provides students, in individual and group sessions, with study skills that enhance learning. Students with effective study strategies gain more from tutoring sessions. The goal is to develop effective, independent learners, who can transfer these skills to other courses. [2.13, 3.1]

To ensure the quality of these services, LAC is developing a College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) Level III certifiable tutoring program. CRLA certification points toward LAC’s programmatic accountability in the fields of SI and tutoring services. A feedback survey is distributed to every student who utilizes LAC services, to locally assess student development, peer tutor competence and performance, as well as overall SI and tutoring quality. LAC uses the feedback survey results to reveal student development as well as student needs, to inform tutor training and development, and to address program effectiveness. Additional measures of assessment include, but are not limited to, a comparison of mean course grades for students who use LAC services (i.e., SI and tutoring) with those who do not for a particular course, as well as direct observation and consultation between LAC supervisors and tutors. Hence, both quantitative and qualitative assessments are integrated into LAC programming to ensure a thick description of program effectiveness. Feedback survey categories with the lowest means are targeted for improvement. [2.11]

All of these results indicate that LAC is highly effective in helping students achieve success in these key gateway courses. For example, grade comparisons of students in MATH 100 show LAC SI and tutoring programs in mathematics are highly effective. In Fall 2009, the mean grade for the course was 1.47. The mean grade for non-LAC students was 1.29, for LAC students it was 1.72. LAC students who attended more sessions showed higher mean grades: 1.78 for two to four visits, 2.03 for five or more visits. Grades for Spring 2010 were higher overall but revealed the same results: 2.20 for the courses, 2.28 for non-LAC students, 2.40 for LAC students. The mean grade for LAC students who attended five or more sessions was 3.26.

In 2007-2008, when the LAC was housed in the Queen Lili’uokalani Center for Student Services building, it had 897 contacts with students. In the 2008-2009 academic year, when the LAC moved into the Student Success Center, LAC contacts increased to 2,004. Access to greater physical space coupled with a professionally trained staff likely account for the continued increase in LAC services. In the 2009-2010 academic year, the LAC’s tutoring and SI programs had 3,902 contacts.

Looking forward, with the expected CRLA certification of the LAC tutoring program, the LAC can extend its certification to tutors to include anyone who participates in LAC-sponsored tutor training activities. Additionally, efforts will continue to work collaboratively with other Manoa programs that support student academic success in order to create a campus network which not only promotes, but excels at, producing successful students and graduates. At the request of the Manoa Advising Center, the LAC provided regular workshops to motivate and to develop skills needed to raise one’s GPA. Although a relatively small number of students (38) participated in the pilot program, 79% of these students experienced an increase in GPA ranging from 1.00 to 2.66 points. The LAC also worked with the Manoa Advising Center to provide testing awareness workshops and student panels to facilitate choosing a major.

Individual student success is most effective when a program can address students’ needs in a personal and individualized manner. Thus, the LAC plans to set up a system to monitor academic progress of students who utilize its services and follow-up with personal contact as appropriate. To move on to the next level of response, the LAC plans to launch a program to reach out to students
in good standing who have chosen not to return and work on their degree. These students will be contacted and, if appropriate, be encouraged to return with the support and/or advocacy needed to overcome barriers or address problems that led to their decision to leave school. Essentially, this program will seek to provide what is needed to get these students back on the path to earning their college degree. [2.11, 2.13]

Fundamentally, developing a learning community in which students have formal and informal contacts with trained personnel is essential to student success. The LAC will continue to expand services with continuing collaborative efforts with other units and creative approaches like a strong volunteer tutoring component. [3.1]

**Student Success Center**

As should be clear from a number of prior references, a strong focal point for Mānoa’s efforts to provide students with the infrastructure needed to support their academic journey can be found in the [Student Success Center](#). Just as physical spaces on campus have been recognized as important contributions to a sense of community, the space dedicated to enabling student success has been crucial to demonstrating Mānoa’s commitment to its undergraduates. Located in the Sinclair Library, the Student Success Center (SSC) has been a collaborative effort since its inception in 2006. Changes throughout the first floor of the library were designed to promote a Mānoa identity by making the SSC an attractive, inviting, and highly-used space by students and faculty. The SSC identified tremendous growth in the use of laptops and, in response, purchased modular furniture with power outlets, to create fifty laptop stations. [2.13]

The SSC has in place an aggressive quantitative assessment of its usage. The SSC support staff and security guards take a population count every hour, recording the area in which patrons are working and also counting the number of laptop computers in use. With this information, SSC monitors the areas of heaviest usage, the fluctuation of use, and the computing needs patrons have. When recent budget cuts triggered a reexamination of the hourly operation, these data enabled a cut in hours with minimal impact on users. [2.10, 2.11]

A comparison of average hourly use by students of the SSC from 2006 to 2010 demonstrates usage growth. These averages were calculated for a normal day during the semester and omit finals week during which the usage usually doubles: 2006 (n=60); 2007 (n=142); 2008 (n=175); 2009 (n=193); 2010 (n=210). Student use of Sinclair Library has almost doubled since the establishment of the Student Success Center in 2006 (from 370,223 in 2006 to 528,303 in 2010) and is now almost on par with the users of the larger Hamilton Library.

Despite the inability to hire staff to implement the SSC assessment plan fully, the SSC staff is moving forward with qualitative assessment of facilities and services. The staff reviewed SSC’s mission and vision statements and created a grid of objectives that include student expectations and satisfaction with tutoring and study skills services, test proctoring services, study room facilities and services, ability of staff to meet informational needs, and effectiveness of SSC marketing efforts. Once fully implemented, assessment will be ongoing and will provide continual feedback on SSC’s operations. The Library has also participated in a longitudinal study over the past nine years called “LibQual” to monitor user expectations versus user satisfaction. The most recent results in 2009 indicated a marked increase in satisfaction with the Library as place suggesting that the Library’s efforts for improve facilities to meet learning needs have been effective. [2.10, 2.11, 3.6, 4.4]

During the 2010-2011 year, the Student Success Center will work on expanding the number of meeting spaces by at least two additional rooms. This can be done most cost effectively through the use of modular partitions to enclose spaces for classes and student study sessions. Demand for these rooms is high; currently, the First-Year Programs schedule approximately 40 classes meeting
each week. We must provide more meeting space if the Center is to meet the demands of our ever-growing population of users and the expanding services we provide.

Another student success program housed in Sinclair Library is the Honors Program. Integral to the undergraduate experience at Mānoa from the time of its founding in 1960, the Honors Program lost enrollment and some momentum over the succeeding decades. Over the last decade, however, it has been strengthened and is positioned to play a key role in our student success initiatives. The Selected Studies Program, the lower-division segment of Mānoa’s undergraduate Honors Program, provides opportunities for talented and motivated undergraduates to excel in their academic studies by completing a challenging inquiry-based curriculum that encourages independent research and creative expression. Beginning in Fall 2008, the First-Year Experience program lent the Honors Program an advising position. This freed the director from being the only adviser for Honors and Selected Studies students and allowed the program to begin evaluating its role on campus. In Fall 2010, the advising position was moved permanently into the Honors Program. This is essential to the program since Honors students must attend advising every semester in order to earn “priority registration.” Since Fall 2009, as part of a new “Engagement Requirement,” students in the program have had to submit a curriculum vitae detailing scholarship and career development, leadership and service, intercultural appreciation and personal well-being. This requirement has allowed the program’s advisor and director to gauge levels of student involvement, improve and individualize advising strategies, and assist with retention of high-achieving students. The number of students earning Sophomore Honors or higher has significantly increased, from an average of fewer than ten per year in academic years 2001-2007 to 65 in AY 2008.

Exciting new things are in store for the Honors Program in the near future. We have just appointed a new director and will increase the budget of the program 50% over the next two years. This enabled us to expand the level of course offerings in the program and provide support for the program’s recruiting efforts and for the Undergraduate Research Symposium that the program has offered for the past several years. Our expectation is that this will enable Honors to continue its growth pattern of recent years. [3.1, 3.2]

Research Opportunities for Undergraduate Students
Central to the Institutional Proposal was a plan to strengthen undergraduate research emphases. Engaging undergraduate students in research underscores the benefits of research both to the students’ education and to society. Communicating the values and practices of research effectively to students who are unfamiliar with research design and methodology is critical if we want them to incorporate and apply modern research in their studies.

The CPR report included the inventory we compiled of undergraduate research opportunities on campus. Mānoa’s large portfolio of funded research enables a number of such opportunities. The CPR Visiting Team noted that, “As a Carnegie research 1 intensive university, UHM has the ability to provide undergraduate students with hands-on research opportunities.” Further, the Team has acknowledged that “finding means to continue to build on the incredible research productivity of Mānoa to strengthen the undergraduate experience appear very important for the campus.” Student involvement in research at the undergraduate level is strongly encouraged and supported across Mānoa. One measure of this support is enrollment in upper division research courses, which continues to increase–3,929 students in 2007-2008, 3,775 in 2008-2009, and 4,593 in 2009-2010. [2.5, 2.8, 2.9]

The results of student scholarly inquiry and research are highlighted each year in a variety of formats. The College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources (CTAHR) and the School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology (SOEST) sponsor annual student research poster competitions. [2.9] The CTAHR Student Research Symposium provides undergraduates an opportunity to strengthen communication skills as they present their scholarly work in a friendly yet
professional setting similar to national and international conferences. More than 30 students win awards, and the top awardees receive funds to make presentations at national and international professional conferences, further enhancing communication skills and providing a valuable experience in a professional arena. Debriefing meetings after each symposium evaluate achievement of the desired outcomes. Metrics used in the evaluation include number of student presenters and feedback from faculty, students, and judges.

Several departments as well as the undergraduate Honors Program have capstone research courses/projects. In addition, Honors students present both their research proposals and finished project reports in the form of both posters and oral presentations at their Fall Forum and Spring Symposium. The Colleges of Arts and Sciences offer annual scholarships to students who successfully do research in various fields. The Department of Anthropology conducts summer archaeological field schools in Rapa Nui (Easter Island), the Marianas Islands, Kaua‘i, Guam, Egypt, and Bolivia. The Shidler College of Business sponsors an undergraduate business plan competition. Participation in these events increased from 273 students in 2007-2008 to 375 students in 2008-2009 but showed a slight decrease to 351 in 2009-2010. [2.5]

Undergraduate overseas research activity is made possible through the various UHM Study Abroad programs. The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education sponsors an annual Undergraduate Summer Research Award program that provides up to $3,000 to winning applicants across the campus to help defray the costs of their independent research projects.

To coordinate and intensify these efforts, a campus-wide Undergraduate Research Initiative was launched in Fall 2010 under the leadership of the Honors Program director. The engine for the initiative is an Undergraduate Research Council, composed of representatives from the Mānoa Faculty Senate, the Honors Program, the Offices of the Vice Chancellors for Research and Graduate Education, Academic Affairs, and Students. The Council is tasked with designing, developing, and overseeing an Undergraduate Research Office, which will serve as a one-stop support unit for students interested in research opportunities so that they can go to one office and learn about the myriad of opportunities available on campus. We have committed $250,000 in recurring monies for this office, and the first task of the Undergraduate Research Council is to design a process for awarding these monies in such a way as to maximize its impact on a range of departments and programs, complementing the already existing programs funded externally. In addition, we hope that this office will help draw in additional external support, both for campus-wide programs and for specific departments and programs. [2.9]

**Leveraging Assessment**

We have made rapid progress towards a comprehensive, campus-wide assessment program at Mānoa during the past few years. The Assessment Office, created in Summer 2008, is a faculty-staffed office that helps academic programs engage in program assessment activities by providing technical expertise and other services. The Assessment Office communicates, consults, and educates the Mānoa community on how to assess, what to assess, and how to act on the results. Academic degree programs have undertaken student learning assessment and are making significant progress on the “assessment cycle.” [2.3] One hundred percent (N=226) of degree programs submitted a 2009 assessment report, which was an increase of 12% from the previous year. Eighty-eight percent (N=198) have quality student learning outcomes, an increase of 11% from 2008. Course learning outcomes have been produced for a majority of the programs’ courses. Two areas of focus for the Assessment Office in 2010 are curriculum mapping and effective use of results: 44% of programs submitted quality curriculum maps and 55% used assessment results to “close the loop” in 2009. Additionally, 69% of programs reported using assessment results at least once since 2005. We have begun charting the rate at which schools/colleges are engaged in all these activities year by year, and there has been steady progress in each of these metrics college-by-college since the creation of the Assessment Office. [2.3, 2.6, 3.4, 4.6, 4.7]
The Assessment Office models high-quality assessment practices and evaluates how well it achieves its outcomes by gathering direct and indirect measures of faculty learning and satisfaction for each workshop, surveying those who receive assistance, annually surveying all Mānoa programs regarding assessment activities; and monitoring visits to its website. Since August 2008, over 400 faculty and staff members attended a workshop or met with Assessment Office faculty for a consultation. Over 85% rated workshops as useful/very useful or effective/very effective. In all workshops except one, over 78% of participants met the desired learning outcomes. The Assessment Office website receives over 300 visits each month. Based on evidence from workshop evaluations, workshop content, activities, and scheduling have been modified. The Assessment Office analyzed all degree programs’ annual assessment reports and responses to the reporting system and addressed issues by creating a new, more user-friendly online reporting system in late 2009, with questions better aligned to the assessment cycle. In addition, eleven small group, interactive sessions on how to complete the online form were conducted to ensure assessment coordinators understood the system and questions. In Spring 2010, Mānoa expanded program assessment to include co-curricular programs. [2.11, 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 4.6, 4.7]

In Fall 2009, the Faculty Senate established the Mānoa Assessment Committee with faculty members from across campus. The committee is tasked with coordinating and monitoring assessment activities and developing assessment policy. It provides oversight and guidance to the Assessment Office. [3.11] In response to concerns among some faculty about academic freedom, access to assessment results, and use of assessment results by the administration, the Mānoa Assessment Committee drafted a “Statement on Program Assessment” in Spring 2010 to help build a unified understanding of program assessment on campus. [1.4] To increase student involvement, Committee members have met with student government bodies (Associated Students of University of Hawai‘i and the Graduate Student Organization) to discuss assessment practices and gain the student perspective. [2.1, 2.7, 2.8, 3.8]

All of this activity has begun to lead to real change in general education at Mānoa. The Assessment Office collaborates with faculty groups to conduct general education assessment. Student learning outcomes for all general education areas were established in 2007. Formal assessment of student learning began in 2008. [2.3, 2.6]

Mānoa’s General Education program requirements have distinctive multicultural and Hawaiian components: Foundations in Global and Multicultural Perspectives (FG) and the Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues (H) focus. To obtain general education designations, courses go through a rigorous review process to ensure that each course meets the appropriate hallmarks and is in alignment with general education curricular goals. Faculty board members also take the initiative to contact instructors and departments whose proposals fall short in some way, resulting either in modification/clarification to produce a successful proposal, or in a withdrawal if it becomes clear that the course is not suited for the requested designation. [2.4] One result of the Board’s quality control efforts was the designation of the first “course-based” H focus offering, Hawaiian Studies 107 (Hawai‘i: Center of the Pacific). Almost 2,000 students were able to fulfill their H focus requirement with this course in AY2009. [2.5, 2.10, 2.12]

Assessment of the Global and Multicultural Perspectives and Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific focus requirements began in 2007, when student learning outcomes for both requirements were drafted. Although students in H focus classes currently complete a questionnaire at the end of the semester, the results give only a partial picture of whether or not outcomes are being met. In Fall 2010, the Assessment Office started a longitudinal assessment project that evaluates how well students are meeting the Global and Multicultural Perspectives outcomes and the Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific outcomes.
Foundations Written Communication (FW) Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are posted on the Assessment Office website. Results thus far include: 74% of students met or exceeded expectations on SLO #1 (compose a text to achieve a specific purpose and respond adeptly to an identifiable audience); 54% of students met or exceeded expectations on SLO #3 (compose a text that makes use of source materials that is relevant and credible and that is integrated in accordance with an appropriate style guide). The English Department assessment team presented the results of SLO #1 at a departmental colloquium. Attendees participated in a brainstorming activity which resulted in a document of potential activities/assignments to address SLO #1. [2.6]

In Spring 2010, the Assessment Office and the General Education Office pilot tested the use of the Association of American Colleges and Universities Written Communication rubric and investigated the minimum standard of student writing quality needed for Writing Intensive (WI) focus SLO #1 and SLO #2 to be met. Two faculty study groups scored student writing using the rubric and completed an online survey. Results indicated that the VALUE rubric on Written Communication indicates how well students are meeting SLO #1 and SLO #2. The Assessment Office, General Education Office, and the Writing Intensive Board are discussing how to conduct a large-scale assessment of WI.

The ethical reasoning rubric for the Contemporary Ethical Issues (E) focus was pilot tested in Spring 2009 and student work was collected in Spring 2010. Student work will be scored in Fall 2010. New leadership and an additional .25 FTE in the General Education Office beginning in Fall 2010 will create additional momentum for this effort; we are replacing the retiring faculty member who jointly directed the General Education Office and the Mānoa Writing Program in a full-time capacity with two faculty, a 0.75 FTE General Education Office Director and a 0.50 FTE Mānoa Writing Program Director. [3.1, 3.11]

A major focus of effort in the near future will be the Foundations’ Symbolic Reasoning (FS) component of general education. Student failure and withdraw rates in some FS courses at Mānoa are high (for example, 15-42% of students between 2003-2007 received D-, F, or W on their first attempt in 100-level FS courses; 26-59% of those students received D-, F, or W on their second attempt). The General Education Committee of the Mānoa Faculty Senate formed a working group that drafted recommendations for improving the FS requirement and courses; the recommendations will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate in Fall 2010. [2.4] But one recommendation in the draft report—to add additional courses from other schools and colleges—is already being acted on, with exciting conversations going on in the School of Hawaiian Knowledge and the College of Social Sciences about new courses proposals that would meet the hallmarks for this component of general education but might be more accessible for those students not aiming at math-intensive fields or majors. [4.3, 4.4, 4.7]

Next Steps

Important next steps include strengthening the assessment of general education. In Fall 2010, the Mānoa Assessment Office launched a six-year longitudinal cohort study of 250 first-time college freshmen to assess general education, identify factors that contribute to student learning, and explore the perceptions about the Mānoa Experience and Hawaiian Place of Learning. The study: 1) assesses student achievement in written and oral communication, ethical reasoning, symbolic reasoning, global understanding, and Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific issues; 2) identifies factors that help and/or hinder student learning in these areas; and 3) explores student perception of the Mānoa Experience and UHM as a Hawaiian Place of Learning.

Strengthening the Honors Program and initiating a comprehensive approach to undergraduate research are only the first two in a series of high-impact programs in undergraduate education that we intend to launch in the coming years. [2.9] Our aim is to transform the Mānoa Experience through a variety of initiatives which deepen student engagement and involvement.
Campus Renewal to Support the Mānoa Experience
Essay 3: Constructing an Approach to Campus Master Planning and Facilities Management that Fosters Community Engagement and Student Learning

Long before “sustainability” was a recognized movement, Native Hawaiians exemplified sustainable living through their wise management of natural resources. Isolated from the rest of the world, their relationship with the ecosystem was entirely self-contained and sustained over generations. To the extent that Mānoa realizes a sustainable means of operating, it is incorporating many of the principles held and implemented by Native Hawaiians, imparting a “Hawaiian Sense of Place” to the campus. [1.5, 4.1]

Our Institutional Proposal identifies a focus on sustainability and renewability as a major Mānoa value, reflective of our Hawaiian cultural history. The development and implementation of a campus master plan and improving facilities management were two initiatives outlined in the Institutional Proposal to achieve campus renewal. By focusing on improving the quality of learning spaces and embedding sustainability in capital improvement planning and projects, the campus master plan establishes an infrastructure support for the Hawaiian place of learning envisioned in our strategic plan. Improvements in facilities management with priorities aligned to campus needs contribute to the development of a physical environment that fosters community engagement and student learning. This essay reports on progress achieved in these two initiatives. [3.6, 4.2]

Campus Master Planning

On March 17, 2010, Mānoa obtained approval of its Plan Review Use Permit, by way of formal Resolution of the City Council of the City and County of Honolulu. Mānoa is now poised to fully implement our Long Range Development Plan (2007 Update) (LRDP), which includes buildings and projects that are in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and those expected to be developed within the next five to ten years. The LRDP effectively serves as Mānoa’s Campus Master Plan, and, as reported in our CPR Report, was developed through a lengthy process that included a series of workshops and input from the various community stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, and the neighboring communities as represented by neighborhood boards and other community groups. [4.1]

Significant among the improvements brought about within Mānoa’s campus master planning initiatives, is the formation of two Committees: the Design Advisory Panel and the Campus Facilities Planning Board. The Design Advisory Panel (DAP) is made up of a blue-ribbon list of professionals within the design and development industry. It provides input and advice to the design teams for various campus improvement projects and to the Campus Facilities Planning Board. It is comprised of six members, each one prominent in his/her field or profession: an architect, former president of AIA Honolulu (American Institute of Architects), a retired and renowned landscape architect, the Executive Director of the Historic Hawai‘i Foundation, a renowned commercial real estate developer with over 40 years’ experience, the Dean of the School of Architecture, and the Director of the Center for Smart Building and Community Design at the School of Architecture.

The Campus Facilities Planning Board (CFPB) is responsible for reviewing and approving all major policies and decisions affecting the physical environment on campus. Membership of the CFPB is comprised of all four Vice Chancellors, the Director of Facilities, the Dean of the School of Architecture, Dean of the College of Engineering, two at-large faculty members and one student member, along with the two Co-Chairs, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Services and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Financial and Physical Management. [4.1, 4.3]

This organizational structure ensures a broad spectrum of views and input from critical areas on campus, creating an environment of checks and balances to ensure optimal use of campus space, with a goal of achieving excellence in campus planning. Whereas prior to the CFPB’s formation,
individual projects might have been approved and funded at times at the expense of some other campus function, any proposal now must meet with the collective approval of all major functions within the Mānoa campus and must fall in line with the collective priorities established by the CFPB.

An example of the campus planning decision-making under the new DAP/CFPB model involves the decision to postpone requesting funds for the construction of a new, 160,000 square feet, $90 million classroom building. When presented with plans for the new classroom building, the Design Advisory Panel raised critical questions about the building’s appropriateness in its design approach and its lack of a Hawaiian sense of place, how it would integrate with the campus at the ground level, how it would relate to the pedestrian environment we aim to create, and questioning its high energy consumption as planned. The DAP recommended rejection of the project as designed, recommending instead that the project be re-programmed and redesigned with a new Basis of Design, addressing the concerns raised above. The Campus Facilities Planning Board heeded the DAP’s recommendation and as a result, the project has been halted and sent back to the drawing boards—an action that would have been unlikely prior to the multi-faceted and kaleidoscopic scrutiny of the DAP and the CFPB. [3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4]

Additionally, at its July 2010 meeting, the CFPB embarked on an innovative approach toward prioritizing and leveraging UHM’s precious capital dollars, by adopting an “Enterprise Zone” concept in campus planning. Combining similar buildings into groups of adjacent, compatible facilities, the campus has been subdivided into smaller units such as the “Campus Center Zone” or the “Research Sciences Enterprise Zone.”

The Enterprise Zone concept calls for combining various sources of funds–federally-funded research dollars, state-funded general obligation CIP bonds, state-funded Capital Renewal and Deferred Maintenance (CRDM) dollars, along with private donations and other sources of funding–into groups of projects that collectively will have a much greater impact on the campus than the individual projects would normally provide. Additionally, in the “Enterprise Zone” model, improvements to landscaped and hardscaped areas between buildings become incorporated into the design, providing for upgrades to the “non-building footprint” areas such as the interconnecting walkways, outdoor seating areas, and landscaped areas which might otherwise be overlooked or neglected.

Examples of the first “Enterprise Zones” to be designed include the Research Sciences Enterprise Zone, consisting of Edmonson, Snyder, and Webster Halls. Funding for those projects is slated to come from Research and Training Revolving Fund (Research), CIP (State General Obligation Bonds for Capital Improvement Projects), and CRDM (State funds for Deferred Maintenance) funds.

Another example is the Classroom Center Zone, with planned renovations to Kuykendall and Sakamaki Halls as well as the Sustainability Courtyard. Funding for this project that includes classroom and faculty office space is slated to come from CRDM (State funds for Deferred Maintenance) and CIP (State General Obligation Bonds for Capital Improvement Projects) funds, as well as from the U.S. Department of Energy and from the State Department of Business Economic Development and Tourism. Design for these projects will take into consideration the integration of the whole zone, resulting in a tangible improvement to that entire area of the campus, rather than diluting the construction dollars among sporadic buildings spread throughout campus.

In support of the LRDP, the Landscape Advisory Committee continues to meet monthly as it has done for the past several years, to provide valuable input on one of the campus’ primary assets: lush tropical landscaping which boasts, among other things, an unparalleled collection of over 560 different species of tropical and semi-tropical trees, as well as Heritage Landscape Areas identified in the Campus Heritage Report, a historic preservation resources inventory funded by the Getty Foundation that was completed in 2008. Landscaping at Mānoa has, over the past 100 years,
intentionally incorporated botanical diversity as a learning/teaching opportunity, evidenced by educational signage in landscaping that create a “living museum” and a database of plants and trees found on campus. The Campus Heritage Report allows the decisions around campus planning to be informed for the first time by what historically valuable and/or significant assets we have on campus, both in the way of buildings as well as in historical landscapes and botanical collections.

One of the four major themes in the Long Range Development Plan calls for Mānoa to become a leader in environmental sustainability. In Summer of 2009, the Mālama Honua website, dedicated exclusively to sustainability on campus, went live. Mānoa continually creates opportunities for community engagement around issues of campus and environmental sustainability by encouraging student, faculty, and staff participation in community organizations including the Old Town Mo‘ili‘ili Business Association, Mānoa Neighborhood Board, McCully-Mo‘ili‘ili Neighborhood Board, and Saint Louis Heights Neighborhood Board. Mānoa also regularly invites representatives of different groups to participate in discussions. [4.1]

In Fall of 2009, we launched the Mānoa Sustainability Corps as a campus-wide forum for students, staff, and faculty to engage in an on-going dialogue and sharing of data, projects, and ideas related to sustainability. Through regular monthly meetings (and electronic media in between), members share their own research, projects, and programs with one another. At each meeting, a campus group presents its own projects and has an opportunity to propose new efforts and ideas, which are then submitted to the Campus Facilities Planning Board for approval and eventual implementation. Representatives from City and State agencies regularly participate in the meetings and present opportunities for student engagement with City and State programs and projects, both on a compensated and on a volunteer basis.

Working toward a goal of enhancing sustainability awareness on campus, Mānoa held a workshop on Fostering Sustainable Behavior presented by Dr. Doug McKenzie-Mohr in March 2010, attended by some 150 students, faculty, staff, and members of the community. The workshop was followed by an evening presentation attended by over 150 people as well. Additionally, Mānoa is co-sponsoring the World Congress on Zero Emissions Initiatives which launched “The Blue Economy” in September 2010 at the Hawai‘i Convention Center in Honolulu to focus on design of an economic system driven by innovations, generating jobs and building social capital.

The Office of Financial and Physical Management (OFPM) now serves as the central organizing platform for all planning and sustainability efforts on campus. Under the auspices of the OFPM, graduate students from the School of Architecture were involved in preparing Mānoa Building Design and Performance Standards that promote building design and performance appropriate to the climate and physical environment and ensure that construction of new buildings as well as renovation of existing buildings reflect the unique environment of Hawai‘i and Mānoa Valley in which the campus rests. The Standards promote the use of natural ventilation, reduced energy, water and other resource consumption beyond merely meeting LEED Silver requirements.

Mānoa was among the first of 662 university signatories to the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (ACUPCC). The School of Travel Industry Management, the UH Economic Research Organization and the Sea Grant Center for Sustainable Coastal Tourism worked with undergraduate and graduate students to compile a green house gas inventory for the campus. Mānoa filed this inventory, titled Report on Green House Gas Emissions, with the ACUPCC, with the goal of monitoring, tracking, and reducing green house gas emissions for the campus. Mānoa has also filed and published a Climate Action Plan with the ACUPCC, and partnered with various organizations including student groups, the City and County of Honolulu, UH Sea Grant, and Sustain Hawai‘i, in bringing in speakers to address making Mānoa a more sustainable campus.
The Office of the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Financial and Physical Management has partnered with the University of Hawai‘i Economic Research Organization Energy and Greenhouse Gas Solutions team to support Mānoa’s Energy and Green House Gas Benchmarking, Monitoring, and Analysis Project (BeMAP). Mānoa is the first university in the country to sign on as a Founding Reporter of The Climate Registry, a non-profit organization established to measure and publicly report greenhouse gas emissions in a common, accurate, and transparent manner consistent across industry sectors. Mānoa will also report on the energy footprint of all buildings using the Environmental Protection Agency’s Energy Star Portfolio Manager. Tracking energy and greenhouse gas emissions supports the campus master plan goal of achieving a 50% reduction of campus energy use by 2015, based on a 2003 benchmark. Furthermore, BeMAP, which promotes student involvement, targets the creation of a central depository, making data readily accessible for programs beyond The Climate Registry and Energy Star, e.g., ACCUPCC and campus master planning. [1.8]

An important means of measuring the impact of the above-mentioned Campus Master Planning and Facilities Management on community engagement and student learning is the degree to which students understand, appreciate, and utilize the improvements that have been planned, executed, and maintained by the Office of Facilities and Grounds. In the Summer of 2009, the Office of the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Financial and Physical Management engaged faculty and students from the School of Architecture and the Center for Smart Building and Community Design to embark on a campus planning endeavor unprecedented at Mānoa. Graduate students under the guidance of the Center’s director prepared and delivered a proposal to study and document the entire 305 acre Mānoa campus utilizing the latest in BIM (Building Information Model) technology. More than 20 students are creating a BIM model of the campus. The model consists of two- and three-dimensional images of all campus buildings, geo-referenced into a GIS (Geographic Information System). Drawings are embedded with a wide range of numerical databases. The BIM creates a 3D model of the campus with an Internet-based interface, providing real time information on operations, occupancies, costs and energy usage of all campus facilities. This new facilities management tool allows a unique learning experience for our students, whose direct participation and engagement in the campus master planning process builds valuable professional skills while providing real-life, applicable, and useful service to Mānoa. [2.8, 4.3]

The BIM project will provide a field survey of all assignable and non-assignable space both at the Mānoa campus and at off-campus university research facilities. Over the course of Spring 2010-Fall 2011, more than two dozen students will inventory nearly five million square feet of Mānoa buildings, verifying floor plans against actual construction, and cataloging their use. From a campus planning perspective, the completed student-created BIM and SSIP/AiM model will enable Mānoa stakeholders and decision-makers to more accurately: 1) assess efficiency and use of space on campus (e.g., which departments/personnel use which space, which spaces are used for instruction, research, offices, laboratories, support space, etc.); 2) determine Mānoa’s indirect cost ratio for the purposes of federal reporting on research grants and other grants; 3) analyze buildings with a goal toward maximizing energy efficiency (e.g., thermal/solar data for optimal design of exterior shading devices, air conditioning loads and opportunities for natural ventilation); and 4) program maintenance, repairs, and renovations to the existing buildings in a predictable manner. [4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4]

Among the first applied uses of the BIM model for the campus has been the inventory and assessment of all general-use classrooms and of all departmental classrooms, resulting in a proposed policy to improve scheduling efficiency by deleting the category of Departmental (or department-controlled) Classrooms in favor of a model that provides departments with priority over classrooms they historically controlled, but allows other departments to use those facilities when they are not otherwise in use. This simple policy change could have a major implication in
eliminating the need to build new classrooms while allowing the potential increase in enrollment at essentially zero cost to the University simply by more efficient use of the existing classroom spaces.

While the previous examples suggest the breadth of Mānoa’s efforts to establish, nurture, and maintain a sense of community through our physical environment, both our Institutional Proposal and Long Range Development Plan recognize that physical spaces enable community, and so Mānoa is investing in several new community spaces. One completed example is the Sustainability Courtyard. This area of campus, once home to old trucks and rusting equipment, has been transformed into a serene, landscaped courtyard with vegetarian food vendors and recycled tables and benches. As reported in the CPR Report, the courtyard has created a central gathering place for students to meet, chat, and enjoy a meal together.

The Sustainability Courtyard and other physical spaces at Mānoa designed to facilitate community interaction are widely used. Over a four-day period in April 2010, headcounts were taken of the Sustainability Courtyard, the upgraded Hawai‘i Institute of Geophysics Courtyard, Shidler College of Business courtyard, and Saunders courtyard—improvements reported in our CPR Report. All areas showed active use; users who participated in a sample survey reported frequent use of the areas and universal agreement that more community spaces were needed. The College Collaboration Center (CCC), created by the College of Education to serve as a meeting and working space for students, is used regularly by students (264 in July 2009 and 223 in November 2009). An April 2010 survey of CCC users showed that 93% of the users were graduate or undergraduate students and that the space was used predominantly for studying and group work. Ninety percent of the users agreed or strongly agreed that the space met their needs and 91% felt that similar spaces were needed on campus. Repurposed spaces in the Hamilton Library, also noted in the CPR Report, show encouraging usage. The eight study rooms were used by approximately 7,600 users during the 2009-2010 academic year. The two practice presentation rooms which opened in February 2010 showed increasing usage: eight users in March, 26 in April, and 48 in May. [3.5, 3.6, 4.5]

Expanding on the success of the Sustainability Courtyard, an additional initiative currently underway involves implementation of major theme #3 in our Long Range Development Plan (Outdoor Places of Living and Learning) through the creation and/or enhancement of campus gathering spaces. The concept focuses on designing, acquiring, and installing additional seating areas, benches, picnic tables, lighting, and other outdoor furniture in key areas around campus, with a goal toward creating places for students and faculty to meet, study, chat, or to simply linger on campus. The first concrete example includes the landscape/hardscape entrance into the newly-completed C-MORE Hale, where seating areas were created with the intent of establishing informal “outdoor classrooms” under the shade of scented eucalyptus trees. Next areas of implementation will focus on Hamilton Plaza/Paradise Palms, the Sinclair Library entrance, and Kuykendall plaza. We anticipate the purchase and installation of some 100 new picnic tables, benches, and other street furniture for this effort. Additional areas will include the ground floor/courtyard at Saunders Hall, Webster Hall, and other areas.

The Office of Financial and Physical Management has also engaged a graphic design consultant to work on the creation of a campus signage master plan. Designs are underway, aiming at a unified, cohesive, clear image to enhance our campus wayfinding, street signs, building signs, banners, room signs, emergency, and temporary signs.

**Improved Facilities Management**

Reflecting Mānoa’s focus on sustainability and renewability, the Mānoa Office of Facilities and Grounds (OFG) purposefully redefined its organizational mission in 2008 to better incorporate its core activities with the community it serves. One of the four stated goals of the new mission statement is to “[Serve] Hawai‘i’s goals to develop needed intellectual resources through the
effective involvement of our campus facilities and environment as active teaching spaces and laboratories.

To assess the impact of its services, the OFG utilizes a portfolio of assessment tools to measure both its internal effectiveness and the efficacy of its operations on community engagement and student learning institutional outcomes. In addition to measuring and reporting to the community conventional operational metrics such as use of energy, water, and recycling programs and their results, we participate in the annual Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) Facilities Performance Indicator (APPA FPI) survey which is a detailed report of facilities conditions and operational performance. These data are collected on a nation-wide basis from 392 public and private institutions of higher learning and contain over 100 metrics that compare individual institutions to defined benchmarks. The data are subsequently summarized into an Executive Presentation and reported on the OFG website for general dissemination.

Energy savings continue to be important particularly in light of Mānoa’s financial situation. In 2008, Mānoa’s Office of Facilities and Grounds developed an energy strategy for 2008-2015. The plan projected a 47% reduction of energy usage between 2006 and 2014. As reported in the March 2010 University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Energy Status Report, electrical usage for the campus in 2010 declined by over 9% from the previous year. This was the fourth straight year of decline since 2006; the cumulative decline from 112,850,873 kWh in 2006 to 96,550,873 kWh in 2010 totaled 14%. The cumulative savings since the campus peak usage of 121,350,873 kWh in 2004 are estimated at $9 million. The CPR Report documented the launching of Mānoa Green Days during which air conditioning to selected buildings is turned off during weekends, holidays, and certain non-instructional days to conserve electricity. In addition, a program of capital investments in HVAC mechanical upgrades and energy retrofits has resulted in significant energy savings. Seventy-five percent of all energy savings are the result of HVAC upgrades and retrofits; the additional savings are created through projects such as Mānoa Green Days conservation efforts. [1.8, 3.5]

To measure its operational effectiveness OFG utilizes the Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS), a new on-line tool (eFacilities AiM) that provides real-time reporting on the status of pending repair and alteration work orders. The information generated by the CMMS allows users to track requested work and OFG Operations and Maintenance staff to monitor workforce productivity. In addition to the CMMS system, the OFG Buildings and Grounds Management group is implementing an additional work quality and performance quality measurement system to evaluate janitorial and landscape work quality and productivity. The APPA janitorial and landscaping performance monitoring system was installed in August 2010. Integral to the new CMMS deployment is an on-line customer survey program connected to the requested work order. This will allow the collection of customer satisfaction information on either an individual work order basis or a sample work order basis. This information will be reported to both individual customers and the community at large via the OFG website. This feature is not expected to be available until the end of the year. [1.8, 3.5]

Creating a sustainable campus has been embraced by Mānoa’s students. For example, the Mānoa Energy Performance Assessment project (MEPA) organized students into teams that gather and analyze lighting and energy usage data on campus. To date, student teams have documented and assessed over 800,000 square feet of existing classroom, office, laboratory space, and support space, making recommendations to the Facilities Office for optimizing energy usage and minimizing consumption. The work performed by the MEPA Project has been incorporated into upcoming Capital Renewal and Deferred Maintenance projects. A list of MEPA projects can be found on the MEPA web site. MEPA demonstrates how the core value of sustainability can generate student engagement with the campus.
The OFG has continued to develop learning opportunities with students and faculty. The OFG employs over 20 graduate and undergraduate students in various positions from Storekeepers (warehouse) to Operations Analysts providing real-world experience. As part of its own research program, OFG has developed a series of virtual “Research Clusters” in partnership with various departments (the Physics Department, College of Engineering, School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology’s Sea Grant Center for Smart Building and Community Design, and Economics Department). These projects include wireless building monitoring, user interfaces for smart buildings, photovoltaic power, campus water resource and storm drainage management, and carbon footprint reduction reporting. [1.8]

Next Steps

UHM’s investment in major infrastructure improvements over the past several years has resulted in substantial energy savings. Investing in projects such as updating the campus chilled water loop system and replacing old, inefficient chillers with highly efficient state-of-the-art magnetic bearing systems has brought about significant reduction in energy consumption. Roofs have been replaced on nearly 30 buildings, providing much-needed, long-overdue basic repairs to the physical plant. Next steps include a focus on renovations to our classrooms, with special attention to creating optimal learning environments for our students. For example, Kuykendall Hall has been slated, together with the New York Times Building, and the NASA AMES building in California, for major renovations in partnership with the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratories (LBNL) under the U.S. Department of Energy’s Commercial Building Partnership pilot program. Kuykendall Hall Retro-Commissioning project has the distinction of being one of only three pilot projects in the country selected by LBNL to focus on minimizing energy use in existing buildings while maximizing user comfort. This project will aim to return Kuykendall Hall to a naturally-ventilated classroom building, as originally designed for our island’s uniquely benign climate, while addressing the issues of noise, humidity and wind-driven rain that caused it to be hermetically sealed and air conditioned, at a severe annual energy cost. At nearly 80,000 square feet, Kuykendall Hall remains one of UHM’s most widely-used classroom buildings. [1.8, 4.2, 4.3]

The OFG is planning to commit 20–30% of its biennium CIP allocation towards building scale energy retrofits for the next several funding cycles. These projects mainly consist of the replacement of aging inefficient HVAC systems with modern high-performance HVAC systems. To compliment these “in-building” projects, OFG has also commenced to integrate Building Integrated Photovoltaic (BIPV) with suitable re-roofing projects. Presently, there are approximately 500 kilowatts of PV capacity in development. OFG is in the process of conducting a detailed Facility Condition Assessment of 50 of its designated “core” buildings to better assess the condition of HVAC systems in each building and to develop on-going operations and maintenance programs and specific business plans for upgrades and replacement projects to improve building environments. [1.8]

A 2011-2012 comprehensive update of the LRDP has been budgeted, and funding for specific elements of the LRDP was approved: Campus Drainage Master Planning ($350,000); Campus Drainage/Flood Mitigation Design and Construction ($3.2 million); and West Campus (College of Education) Master Planning ($500,000). Additional funding for campus master planning was included as the top priority for CIP funding in the 2011-2013 Fiscal Biennium. This comprehensive update will add to the LRDP by aligning academic goals with facility capabilities, communicating and exploring choices with the stakeholder community; and developing plans to achieve a sustainable learning environment that integrates with the host culture, i.e., supporting the creation of a truly Hawaiian sense of place. Subsections of the LRDP that have already been completed will be incorporated as appendices. [4.1, 4.2]

The Master Plan will take into account existing infrastructure and further expand on the principles and themes laid out in the LRDP. For example, taking the theme of a “Globally Connected Hawaiian
Place of Learning, Leadership and Service” and turning it into reality requires that the campus community first come to agreement on exactly what constitutes a “Hawaiian Place.” The Mānoa Experience Workgroup, described in Essay 1, has been established for exactly that purpose. It is anticipated that these discussions will lead to suggestions for physical, environmental, and cultural improvements to the campus.

As an element of the overall campus LRDP, OFG is preparing a Campus Energy Plan to outline additional future steps to improve campus sustainability. This initiative is focused on evaluating new technologies such as “Smart Grid” technologies, energy storage and water conservation, and reuse technologies to decrease the campus’ reliance on natural resources. [1.8]

Creating a “Livable Urban Campus” as detailed in the second LRDP theme requires development of facilities that help activate and enliven the campus beyond the school day. In addition to the development of Frear Hall in 2008 and recent completion of the renovations to the Hale Aloha Residence Halls in Summer 2010, a significant additional step in that direction is being taken with the groundbreaking of the new Campus Center Expansion discussed in Essay 4. Likewise turning the campus into “Outdoor Places of Living and Learning” will require the master planning of walkways, pedestrian paths, bikeways, shaded seating areas and other improvements—many of which are already under way, with the planning of Hamilton Plaza near Hamilton Library and the Legacy Path running in the mauka-makai (mountain-to-ocean) direction for example.

UHM has taken major steps toward achieving its goal of becoming a Leader in Environmental Sustainability, as called for in the fourth and final LRDP theme. In partnership with Time Warner Oceanic Cablevision, UHM is developing content for the Green Channel based on environmental and sustainability research being conducted on campus. With a reach of over 240,000 homes in Hawai‘i, this interactive teaching initiative will be broadcast both on cable television and online simultaneously allowing existing and prospective students to participate in and to learn about environmental research from the comfort of their own home.
Mānoa’s unique housing environment has a direct impact on the overall satisfaction of all members of the campus community. Hawai‘i is a beautiful place to live and learn. The cultural richness of the surrounding community is unparalleled by any university in the United States. However as a result of living in the third most expensive housing market of any American city, the housing and space challenges we face as a community are similarly unique and compelling. For the past several years, Mānoa has embraced the challenge of providing adequate and affordable housing options for students and faculty, at the same time engaging in an unprecedented effort to renovate and expand many of the important spaces in which student-faculty interaction and community engagement with a reimagined Hawaiian place of learning can coexist.

Mānoa’s Institutional Proposal identifies three initiatives to fulfill the objective of expanding and renovating student and faculty housing and improving areas of student interaction: 1) renovating student housing and building or locating more student and faculty housing; 2) building a one-stop center for student services; and 3) expanding the Campus Center. This essay reports on progress on these initiatives.

Expand and Renovate Student Housing

By 2012, Student Housing will have averaged one completed construction project annually for each of the previous five years. With the addition of Frear Hall and the renovation of the Hale Aloha complex and Johnson Hall, 53% of bed spaces available on campus will be in facilities that have been significantly renovated or built within the last three years. The additional proposed Gateway project will increase the impacted bed space number to close to 60% (approximately 85% of residence hall beds).

Initial data collected from a new Student Housing Assessment survey, completed in Fall 2009, show that there is already positive impact from the renovation projects. Students living on-campus report a substantial increase in satisfaction from 47% in 2006 to 71% in 2009. Freshmen topped all classes. Their satisfaction with residential life rose from 46% to 85% from 2006 to 2009. (Student Affairs Performance Indicators, December 2009) Overall, 93% of housing students would recommend (to some degree) living on campus to a new student. Freshman and sophomore students (the main residents of Frear Hall and Hale Aloha towers) show higher recommendation rates of 96% and 95% respectively. Student Housing has seen almost 11% increase in renewal requests between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 with bed spaces remaining constant. In 2008-2009 there were 1,700 renewal applications while in 2009-2010 the number was 1,886. Additionally, the percentage of students who accepted their housing contracts increased from 67% in 2008-2009 to 86% in 2009-2010. [4.6, 4.8]

In marked contrast to prior years, student housing is now being used in recruitment (tours, neighbor island visits, parent and family newsletters, department website, etc.). Based on the questions posed by prospective students and family members, we know there is a great deal of interest in facilities improvements. Student Housing will continue to find proactive ways to provide new students with the message that Mānoa student housing facilities are improving and will survey students yearly to gauge areas of success and areas of service that need improvement. [1.7, 1.8, 4.4]

It is important to improve the attractiveness of on-campus housing since we know that living on campus is positively connected with other student success and engagement factors. According to 2009 NSSE results (Comparison of Freshmen Living On-Campus and Commuters at Mānoa), in general, freshmen living on-campus at Mānoa are significantly more engaged in certain campus
Not only are students who live on-campus more engaged in certain activities than commuters, they demonstrate steady or increased engagement from 2007 to 2009 (Comparison of 2007 and 2009 Freshmen Living On-Campus). For example, engagement in art exhibits, plays, music, and dance performances as well as exercises and participation in fitness activities increased by 3% from 2007 to 2009. Participation in learning communities increased from 39% to 43%. Talking about career plans with a faculty member or advisor increased from 19% to 29%. Students perceived that institutional emphasis on attending campus events and activities rose from 57% to 63%. Student Affairs will continue to monitor these and other indicators. Once the 2010 NSSE data are available, these comparisons will be updated.

In addition to new construction and renovation projects, Student Housing has taken steps to completely revamp our Residential Life model which now offers more student interactions and focuses more on educational development, adding staff to foster more community in the first year-centric communities and full-time live-in staff to foster better staff and stronger communities. Residential Life has developed a functional, student-led community leadership model and is developing community councils for each building/community and a campus-wide student-led Residential Hall Association. Programming models have changed to be more student and community development focused and tailored to the students in the individual halls. Additionally, late night programming options have increased and in Fall 2010, a late night food option coupled with programmatic goals was added as well.

Student Housing Services partners with academic departments to establish Residential Learning Programs (RLP): communities that foster a greater connection between the in-class learning experience and the out-of-class experience. Since Student Housing has increased its focus on these communities, the concept and the popularity have grown. In 2007-2008, there was one residential learning program; that number has increased to 13 for 2010-2011. Additionally, Student Housing has seen an increase in requests from students asking to be placed in these communities and in students renewing back into the communities. Initially, when proposed in Spring 2008, interest from returning students was almost non-existent. Current renewal data for 2009-2010 shows that 100 students who are returning to the residence halls want to be a part of 2010-2011 residential learning communities. [2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 3.6, 4.6]

The RLPs are assessed through monthly stakeholder meetings and individual programs learning outcomes are assessed yearly to determine ways to improve and refine programs. The 2009 Student Housing assessment provides some insight into the impact of the changes (percentages displayed are those students who responded yes):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1st Yr.</th>
<th>2nd Yr.</th>
<th>Avg. All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The environment in my residence hall is conducive to my academic success</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>70.31%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in an on-campus residential facility has enhanced my ability to meet other people</td>
<td>84.41%</td>
<td>79.54%</td>
<td>77.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in an on-campus residential facility has enhanced my ability to live cooperatively</td>
<td>81.75%</td>
<td>77.52%</td>
<td>75.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data indicate programmatic changes are improving the effectiveness of residential housing program and creating new opportunities for student interaction. Because of the many programmatic changes, data and assessment will be ongoing and the assessment will continue to shape and improve the housing program. [2.11, 2.13, 4.1, 4.4, 4.8]

**Faculty Housing**

Before the current national financial crisis, Honolulu was the fifth most expensive housing market in the country (after Manhattan, Brooklyn, San Francisco, and Los Angeles); now, it is the third, as the price drops in California means that real estate in Honolulu is more expensive than either San Francisco or Los Angeles. Given the expense of the Honolulu housing market, the availability of faculty housing plays a key role in the retention and recruitment of faculty. In 2002, Mānoa made the decision to grant all lease extension requests in faculty housing, which consciously or unconsciously, emphasized the retention of existing faculty over the recruitment of new faculty. As a result, many residents of faculty housing have been there longer than the official three-year maximum term for Kauʻiokahaloa Nui and Kauʻiokahalao Iki and the one-year maximum term for Waʻahila. As of May 21, 2010, 103 of the 171 units (60%) at Kauʻiokahaloa Nui and Kauʻiokahalao Iki were occupied by tenants beyond the three-year maximum term; and 49 of the 66 units (74%) at Waʻahila were occupied by tenants beyond the one-year maximum term. The rent charged for all three faculty housing properties is well below market (55-65% of current market rates).

However, current rental rates do not meet the Faculty Housing Program’s long-term financial obligations. Because Faculty Housing must be self-sustaining to meet UH bond covenant regulations, rents will need to be increased across time. Analysis is currently underway to determine what the rents need to be in order to keep the Faculty Housing Program financially viable. Further complicating the issue, the Hawai‘i State Legislature removed $2M from the University’s Housing Assistance Revolving Fund (HARF) in fiscal year 2010. Therefore, the University must find a rent structure that serves two somewhat conflicting purposes—making the program self-sustaining while keeping the rents attractive enough to maintain the units at maximum occupancy.

We also need to decide how important recruitment is as an aim for faculty housing. The 2008 Faculty Housing Feasibility Study conducted by Helber, Hastert & Fee/Eva Klein & Associates that was reported in our CPR Report indicated that as many as 954 faculty would need to be recruited to replace estimated departures through 2013 and that there might therefore be a shortage of up to 450 units in faculty housing as a result of the departures. Thanks to the economic crisis, the large number of retirements and subsequent faculty searches expected at the time of the Institutional Proposal has not yet been realized. Although this has reduced the short term pressure to expand faculty housing, we nonetheless expect to begin hiring in the near future, at which time the number of high-priority applications is expected to exceed the typical availability of housing. It would therefore be helpful to increase the turnover in faculty housing, with the idea that some faculty may now be in a position to move out and purchase a home. [4.3, 4.6]

To address the low turnover rate in faculty housing, changes to Board of Regents policies were drafted in the summer of 2008. These changes would implement an income cap for tenants in faculty housing, which would create outward movement of many longer-term, higher-income tenants and make more units available for incoming high-priority faculty. The income cap could be adjusted to maintain vacancy rates at optimum levels. These changes await approval by University System administration; if approved, they must also be presented to the Board of Regents for approval before implementation.

This complex situation should help explain why we have not made rapid or broad progress on new faculty housing. One recent initiative which will have a small but definite effect on retention is the Mortgage Assistance Program announced in 2009. It has a maximum capacity of fifteen recipients.
at any given time. In its pilot year the program received twenty-two applications from which fifteen of the highest priority applicants were chosen to participate. Due to the liquidity crisis, our hopes of expanding the program have not yet been realized but we expect that the program can build a successful track record of repayment and therefore build a case for a further expansion.

Although we have not been in a position to expand our number of faculty rental units, there have been efforts to move in this direction. The study done by Helber, Hastert and Fee analyzed three properties identified in Mānoa’s Long Range Development Plan. The University has explored several opportunities to purchase existing buildings in and around the Mānoa campus during the past two years. While the rental revenue required to support these properties does not allow us to provide below-market rates of the kind a faculty housing program needs, we are continuing to explore options as they arise.

**Centralized Academic Support Services**

Our Institutional Proposal envisioned enhancing students’ experiences in obtaining support services through the creation of centralized student services areas. The Student Success Center, located in Sinclair Library, is one major center providing support services to students. The effectiveness of the Student Success Center (SSC) has been described in Essay 2. Benchmarks in the transformation of the SSC space include the following: during 2007, creation of eight private and semi-private meeting rooms that students can reserve for group study; the SSC Commons area; the Heritage Reading Room; the Student Success Center web page; and wireless access for the entire Library structure. During 2008, installation of upgrades to the Audio Visual Center that includes state-of-the-art media carrels; a camera security system to provide a safer environment for students; and 24/7 operations during the academic year. During 2009, the creation of the Harry C. and Nee Chang Wong Computer Lab and Media Studio; installation of a major upgrade to the Study Lounge as well as new entry and lanai lighting and electrical outlets.

As reported in our CPR Report, in 2007, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, the Arts and Sciences Advising Office, the Mānoa Advising Center, and Pre-Health/Pre-Law Advising Center were moved to the Queen Lili‘uokalani Center (QLC) for Students Services to create a one-stop center for services, joining Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Career Development and Student Employment, and Service Learning. In 2010, space was provided in QLC for Native Hawaiian Student Services. This space, together with spaces already provided in Kamakakōkokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies, provide Native Hawaiian students opportunities to gather, access various services, attend workshops, study, socialize, and rest. Each location has served upwards of 200 students per month, conducted over 240 hours of tutoring support per month, and sponsored between six to ten workshops and community huaka‘i (field trips) per semester over the last year and a half. According to preliminary student feedback, the students report that in addition to accessing valuable services like tutoring and academic counseling, the spaces enable community with their peers. [2.11, 2.13]

**Expand the Campus Center**

Campus Center renovations were described in detail in our CPR report and are on schedule for completion by 2012. Student involvement and participation in decision-making has been a constant in the Campus Center expansion. The Campus Center Board took steps to ensure full participation by stakeholders (chartered student organizations who represented their constituents, Mānoa administration, programs affected by the project which included student union vendors, and student life staff) in the design phases of the project. Members of the Campus Center Board continue to participate in major project initiatives, review and approve expenses for major renovation and equipment repair and replacement, and review service and business proposals for the student union. The management and implementation of the Campus Center Renovation project has been successful and effective in large part because of the collective power of student organization and participation. [2.13, 4.1]
Manoa’s CPR report identified several goals and priorities relating to the Campus Center Renovation and we are making rapid, on-time progress toward meeting them: 1) improving common areas as gathering spaces, 2) upgrading technology, 3) creating openness to existing buildings while improving energy efficiency, 4) creating flow and fusion between services and buildings, and 5) improving traffic flow. A progress report on these goals is provided in Exhibit 2.

Once all construction/renovation is completed for Phase IIB, the construction of a new student recreation center, the effectiveness of improvements to common areas and gathering spaces will be measured by assessing visitor and user numbers. Recent data indicates that overall student satisfaction with co-curricular activities experienced a steady upward trend from 78% in 2002, 82% in 2006, and 86% in 2009 (Student Performance Indicators, December 2009, p. 94). This increase in student satisfaction is mirrored in an upward trend in the use of Campus Center facilities and services. Activities ranged from ticket sales, student organizations, and student government to intramural sports, leisure activities, and leadership development. The use of facilities rose from a low of 25% in 2002 to 51% in 2006 and a high of 59% in 2009. The satisfaction and use survey will be replicated in 2012 to capture the effects of new renovations and buildings. [4.4, 4.8]

In addition, in 2010 the Campus Center Board implemented the comprehensive ACUI/EBI College Union Student Center Assessment survey. Students are now regularly surveyed to assess their use and knowledge of the student union services and facilities, allowing Manoa to create a baseline measure for evaluating the impact of new building and renovated facilities. The ACUI/EBI also provides us with comparison data with similar universities. Ultimately, we will be able to determine the effect of improved technology, impact of expansion and placement of student organizations throughout the Campus Center, whether services are more accessible and any increase in the level of partnering among student groups. The effects of altered foot traffic patterns will be assessed via staff observations and with digital counters installed in various locations.

Numerous energy saving efforts, designed into the Campus Center renovation, include changing all lighting to CFLs, replacing tenting with low UV and heat transfers, rewiring the Campus Center lights to timers for day and night time use, installing sub metering, replacing the air-conditioning thermostats and replacing old air handler units with VAV systems have begun to pay off. Manoa saw a return of $11,000 in rebates from Hawaiian Electric Company, a decrease in energy consumption, and fewer complaints about the air-conditioning not working.

We made significant progress toward meeting long-term goals by completing Phase I of the Campus Center Renovation Project in 2008 and anticipate student engagement and activity will increase significantly as Phase II is completed in 2012. We will assess increased demand for spaces by student organizations and departments that serve students and measure student attendance at noon and late night offerings. We anticipate that service points will increase as the campus community is drawn to these new and renovated spaces and will compare data relating to customer counts. [4.1, 4.2]

Next Steps

Phase II of the Campus Center renovation began in May 2010 with the renovation of Hemenway Hall auditorium to provide working space for the Board of Publications programs, services, and staff. The next part of Phase II, the construction of recreation facilities, is scheduled to begin in October 2010 and be completed by 2012. The planned Recreation Center will allow for unrestricted access to recreation facilities such as a gym, fitness center, showers, lockers, multi-purpose rooms, and an indoor running track. Expansion of recreation programs is being developed in anticipation of the new facility. A tiered student management approach to delivering recreational services ranging from direct customer contact to management of activities and other students will be implemented. [2.11, 2.13]
Student Housing Services will be embarking on a master planning process to determine the next course of action for significant facilities improvements. Renovation or replacement options, additional bed space capacity, type of facilities constructed and facility location will be analyzed. Although planners will be hired for this project, a wide range of stakeholders will also be consulted. Student Housing Services will bring students, faculty, administrators, and facilities staff together to discuss the needs of students using housing facilities. The goal of the new facilities program is to emphasize student, academic, and community development while creating a Hawaiian sense of place as well as a sense of home for students. Although at times the focus of these developmental needs may not be in line with individual student desires (such as private rooms), we must ensure that each building/structure aids students in educational attainment and furthers the overall mission of bringing students together on campus. [4.1, 4.2, 4.3]

We believe that for a faculty housing program to be effective, whether its goal is retention or recruitment, we need a cost structure that provides below-market rates, at least 10-15% below market. However, we see no way at the present time to achieve that cost structure in new or newly purchased facilities—even if built on precious university land—without a revenue stream in addition to rental rates. Our long-range planning effort is beginning to consider the possibility of mixed-use facilities (commercial and residential) on some university land, and if we move in this direction, the commercial development could become the needed revenue source to enable the construction of new faculty housing. However, this is new ground for the University of Hawai'i so will take some planning.

We are looking at a number of other possible options and may have more to report at the time of the EER visit. Faculty housing is a crucial issue for the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration, Finance and Operations and the University as a whole.
Reform Campus Governance to Promote Communication and Student Success
Essay 5: Forging Meaningful and Long-Term Relationships Among Stakeholders

Stakeholder-institution partnerships are key components in Mānoa’s efforts to promote communication and student success and increase stakeholder investment in our campus. As a state institution and the only major research university in the state, it is imperative that stakeholders, including government decision-makers, appreciate the value added to the State by hosting and supporting a thriving research-extensive university. Mānoa has placed considerable emphasis on ensuring that stakeholders fully appreciate that their investment in Mānoa generates tangible returns. This essay reports the results of efforts to reform campus governance in ways that increase individual and collective investment of on- and off-campus stakeholders in planning for our future. [4.1, 4.6, 4.8]

Mānoa educates a large and growing population of diverse, talented students (20,337 in Fall 2010), generates an impressive volume of research and training grants, and strengthens the State’s economy by creating $5.34 in expenditures for every state dollar invested in Mānoa. During the recession that began in 2001, the State made severe cuts to higher education budgets that had not been fully restored when the current downturn began, and because Mānoa absorbed the largest share of the biennium 2010-2011 reductions ($66 million of the $100 million reduction), our fiscal challenges will remain significant as the state economy recovers. (See Appendix D.)

The current fiscal situation makes achieving the goals identified in the Institutional Proposal for forging meaningful and long-term relationships among stakeholders—instilling long-range planning and fostering broad stakeholder participation in governance—even more critical than envisioned in 2006.

Institute Long-Range Planning
The Mānoa campus has remained resolute in meeting commitments outlined in Defining Our Destiny, 2002-2010 and institutionalizing renewed long-range planning that incorporates input from our broad stakeholder base of faculty, staff, and students. Efforts over the past several years have focused on assuring adequate communication and meaningful stakeholder participation in both long- and short-term campus planning processes. [3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.8]

Over Summer 2009, members of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Prioritization and the Budget Workgroup met separately to discuss ways Mānoa could maintain its focus on academic priorities and, at the same time, utilize resources more effectively. As with the WASC accreditation process, the prioritization process had its own website to keep all stakeholders informed. Prioritization Committee and Budget Workgroup member contact information was made public to facilitate comments and suggestions from the entire Mānoa community. From the start, the process was designed as a tool to assist Mānoa in identifying and investing in intermediate- and long-range priorities. Applicable links, survey results, rankings, and recommendations received at various phases of the prioritization process were posted on a central webpage for easy reference. E-mail updates at each phase of the process ensured that all stakeholders understood the implementation timeline and encouraged feedback throughout the process. [1.8, 3.5, 3.8, 4.2]

As the severity of budget cuts worsened, it became apparent that Prioritization Committee and Budget Workgroup considerations should inform each other’s recommendations. The resulting Budget Prioritization Workgroup (BPW) combined Budget and Prioritization Committee members and was charged with developing medium and long-term recommendations for meeting budget restrictions for fiscal year 2011 and beyond. The Budget Prioritization Workgroup recommendations was forwarded to the Budget Workgroup. The Budget Workgroup reviewed the recommendations, prepared cost impacts, and forwarded the recommendations to the Chancellor. This process has concluded, and Mānoa is currently using BPW/BW recommendations to guide programmatic and
budgetary decision-making while we develop an updated strategic plan. In addition to the energy savings initiatives reported in Essay 3, recent examples of decisions following from BPW/BW recommendations include the closing of Duplicating Services (because it was unable to operate as a self-sustaining recharge center), the relocation of the non-credit programs of Outreach College to a downtown location for greater visibility and to better serve the local community, and the reorganizations of the Industrial Relations Center and the Environmental Health and Safety Office to increase administrative efficiencies. [4.1]

A joint administration-Faculty Senate working group began meeting in Summer 2010 to develop a strategy for reviewing and updating *Defining Our Destiny, 2002-2010*. The workgroup developed an online survey that uses state-of-the-art planning technology. Survey data were collected from stakeholders in early September 2010 and focus groups met in October to discuss and evaluate scenarios developed using survey responses. This planning strategy is based on the highly successful stakeholder engagement model Mānoa used in developing the Institutional Proposal but has relied more heavily on web-based technology. Stakeholder participation has been vigorous and writing teams began drafting the updated strategic plan in November; we expect to complete the process and present a draft 2011-2015 strategic plan to stakeholders for final review in December 2010. Regular updates and draft plans were posted on the 2010 Strategic Plan web site. [1.1, 3.11, 4.1]

**Committee on Enrollment Planning**

As the flagship and land-grant institution of the University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa stands in a pivotal position vis-à-vis the educational attainment of the whole state, and we believe our enrollments must grow to improve the educational attainment of the entire community. In August 2009, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Students held a retreat with participation from the Senate Executive Committee, deans or associate deans from every college or school, and other interested parties, to develop a set of high-level enrollment goals for the campus. The overarching goal is to increase enrollment by 1,500 students over the next three to four years.

A new Committee on Enrollment Planning (CEP) led by the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs and for Students is developing initiatives, monitoring progress, and coordinating enrollment activities on the campus. In order to meet the overarching goal, four sub-goals were articulated: 1) keep more of Hawai‘i’s high school graduates in-state, attending Mānoa; 2) address the differential rates of educational attainment across Hawai‘i’s population; 3) increase mobility between the two and four-year sectors; and 4) improve retention and graduation rates at Mānoa. CEP working groups are addressing each of the four sub-goals and proposing action steps for meeting them. The Committee prioritizes each suggestion and identifies the office or individual responsible for implementation. An updated action item inventory is maintained and posted on the enrollment planning website. [3.8, 4.2, 4.3]

Additional enrollment management efforts are ongoing in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Given the budget cuts and the reductions in course offerings, there is more pressure on academic units to offer high-demand courses. In response to the problem of students unable to register for certain required courses, the VCAA has been working with deans, associate deans, and department chairs to increase data-driven course scheduling. Together with institutional research staff, they have presented workshops demonstrating STAR functions/capabilities to encourage responsiveness to student needs in course scheduling. In some cases, students were directed away from over-capacity sections to alternative courses that would meet their academic requirements. In other cases, additional resources were provided to open additional sections to meet student demand. [2.12, 2.13, 3.7, 4.5]
Fostering Broad Stakeholder Participation in Governance

From the drafting of the Institutional Proposal to the present, Mānoa’s accreditation process has involved stakeholders. Town hall meetings and electronic communication with students, staff, and faculty provided opportunities for input to the Institutional Proposal, the Capacity and Preparatory Review Report and this Educational Effectiveness Report. Formal contributions from stakeholders have continued through the various committees drafting the WASC documents. We have now largely institutionalized stakeholder involvement in planning based on strategies initially developed to prepare our Institutional Proposal. [4.1, 4.8]

The Chancellor and/or her representatives meet regularly with the Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i and the Faculty Senate and weekly with the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) as a means for the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors to stay in touch with the concerns and interests of these campus constituencies. The Chancellor’s “Update to Alumni” messages reach an audience of more than 55,000 alumni, and the UH Alumni Association website has been modified to invite alumni to participate more actively in university events. [3.10]

As reported in Essay 1, Mānoa is expanding the use of media to communicate success in enrollment, research funding, and student satisfaction, to the community-at-large. Campus officials issue an average of three press releases per workday, all of which are archived. The Mānoa Campus Talk blog is updated at least three times a week and is featured on the UH Mānoa home page, and fed to the Mānoa Facebook account. Mānoa enjoys the highest media profile of all UH System campuses, a claim substantiated by Meltwater News which tracks media mentions of the campus in local, national and international media. Mānoa also subscribes to EurekAlert, a service of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science, which is monitored by media seeking news relating to scientific research. [1.7]

Next Steps

As reported in Essay 1, the various electronic modes (email updates, the Mānoa Campus Talk blog, and the Mānoa Facebook) of communicating with Mānoa faculty, staff, students, and alumni have proven their effectiveness. The Mānoa Advancement Team will continue to use these means and other new social networking systems as they emerge to keep stakeholders apprised of Mānoa events and issues.

The update of Mānoa’s strategic plan has drawn members from all Mānoa stakeholder groups into a conversation that will set the direction for the Mānoa campus into the next decade. It will provide a road map that will guide decision making as we consider curriculum changes, improvements in student services and student life, future research goals, and ways to strengthen the ties between Mānoa and the community that it serves.
This essay reports on progress made in achieving the objective of fostering student success through enhanced student and faculty engagement. According to our Institutional Proposal, this objective seeks to change Mānoa’s assessment and evaluation culture by providing faculty and students with opportunities for increased engagement and with infrastructure support for the evolving assessment and evaluation expectations. Two initiatives are identified for this objective: 1) promoting student learning improvement through improved faculty development in assessment and approaches to teaching, and 2) improving student and faculty retention. Our working hypothesis for the first initiative is that there is a strong relationship between faculty development and improved achievement of student learning outcomes. Research has shown that the relationship is actually quite complicated and, indeed, it is difficult to identify faculty development factors that directly impact student success. Nevertheless, it makes good sense that faculty development helps educators stay abreast of the knowledge, skills, and understandings that form the foundation of student learning, as well as the pedagogical processes that ensure student success. Our program assessment process is an information feedback system that guides individual learners, educators, programs, and schools in improving the effectiveness of their programs. Key to successful, sustainable program assessment is faculty engagement and leadership support. [3.2, 3.4, 4.1]

This essay reviews current faculty development programs for strengthening faculty expertise in program assessment and approaches to teaching available to faculty and staff on the Mānoa campus and discusses the results of our student, faculty, and staff retention efforts. Mānoa’s retention and graduation data are analyzed to assess student success.

**Enhance Student Learning/Assessment**

Mānoa’s Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), a unit of the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support (see Essay 2), provides programs for professional development and assessment of teaching and learning. Programs, services, and publications contribute to the development of attitudes, values, skills, and knowledge that are central to the complex processes of teaching and learning. These activities require both faculty participation and contribution, and in this sense, collectively function as an instructional program as much as a support program for faculty. [2.9, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4]

As outlined in our CPR Report, CTE provides opportunities for faculty development by sponsoring orientations for new faculty and department chairs, facilitating a formal faculty mentoring program, managing faculty and assessment enhancement, and by supporting the leadership of department chairs by providing programs relating to effective management decisions regarding faculty and student issues which impact teaching and learning. For example, in Fall 2010, the CTE in collaboration with the College of Social Sciences, the School of Pacific and Asian Studies, and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs offered a weekly series on “Teaching Matters: Fall 2010 Series for Faculty on High Impact Teaching and Learning Practices.” The series was led by Mānoa faculty and included topics such as effective and ineffective learning and teaching strategies, diversity/disability, research assignments/projects, small versus large classes, critical thinking assessment, and student active learning. Numbers of attendees at CTE activities from 2007-2010 are presented in three charts that follow growth in three specific program areas. [2.4, 2.9, 3.4]

CTE and the Faculty Mentoring Program have utilized YouTube as a platform for event videos since October 2008. These videos are available to anyone and may be viewed through links located on the OFDAS/CTE webpage. Usage data suggest the videos have become a valuable tool.
Assessment of program learning outcomes generates information that is used to improve program effectiveness. Program assessment generates information useful to students; it has proved to be a valuable tool in both sharing educational objectives with students and assisting them in charting their own progress. The combined efforts of OFDAS and the Assessment Office help faculty grow in ways that lead to enhanced learning and increased program effectiveness. As part of its mission, the Assessment Office provides a variety of services to faculty and departments including workshops and consultations. Data Exhibit 7.2 provides a list of the Assessment Office activities for 2009-2010. The activities of the Assessment Office were presented in Essay 2. [2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.4]

Another highly-effective form of faculty development is faculty-to-faculty interaction. As part of the assessment of general education, the Assessment Office facilitates faculty study groups for Oral Communication, Ethical Reasoning, and Writing Intensive assessment. The study groups were formed to pilot test rubrics and to provide an opportunity for faculty from across the campus to come together to intellectually engage in discourse regarding general education teaching and learning. These study groups have had an impact as illustrated in the following response from an Ethical Reasoning study group participant, “Our actual discussions of the scoring and how to define and teach ethics were especially helpful and gave me some good ideas on . . . class activities in the future.” As of Spring 2010, 33 faculty members have participated in study groups. Because of the positive responses to the study groups and because many participants indicated they would recommend the experience to colleagues, the Assessment Office will continue to facilitate faculty study groups. [3.2, 3.3, 3.4]

Faculty development is further supported through the sharing of best practices. “Assessment Shorts: Examples of Program Assessment in Action” were developed in response to feedback from faculty and staff who requested examples of how other programs on campus had developed effective assessment protocols. Since its unveiling in March 2010, 101 unique individuals have visited the site.

A weekly series of twelve training sessions entitled “Leadership Matters” for new chairs was offered in Fall 2010 by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The training sessions will provide the chairs with information to help manage their academic departments. Sessions will cover a range of topics including academic affairs, student affairs, research, personnel, fiscal, legal, and safety and security issues. [3.4]

**Improve Student and Faculty Retention**

**Student Retention**

The Institutional Proposal set the goal of increasing both student and faculty retention without saying much about how the goal of student retention was to be measured. It is important for each institution to set its own goals and measurement systems in this vital area, given the complexity of the landscape of higher education. The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa plays a role in the state of Hawai‘i that is virtually unique in American higher education and unparalleled among WASC institutions, in that it is the flagship and the land grant and the urban research university, playing for instance the combined roles of the University of Oregon, Oregon State, Portland State and Oregon Health Sciences University, in a context in which it is also the only comprehensive public four-year institution of any size. In this context, our official peers are not really our peers in the way they might be for our research aspirations and funding levels, as we have to maintain a commitment to broad access in the country’s most diverse state. [1.2, 2.10]

The University of Hawai‘i has therefore set goals for degree attainment rather than retention rates, judging that we need a bias towards access even at the flagship Mānoa campus, given that it awards 79% of the System’s baccalaureate degrees as well as virtually all of its graduate degrees.
In this, of course, it is in keeping with the emphases of the Obama administration, whose policy goals focus on improving degree attainment to the rates of other leading nations such as Canada, Japan, and Korea. The UH System goal is for the degree production of the entire system to go in a series of annual steps from 7,835 degrees in FY2008 to 10,507 in FY2015, and the system continues to meet those goals.

Mānoa continues to examine degrees awarded and graduation rates including disaggregation of gender, ethnicity, residency, transfer students and traditional freshmen. A detailed analysis of these data is included as Appendix B. The data included there show that Mānoa is doing its part in meeting the System goals of increasing degree production, as the number of degrees awarded continues to rise sharply. For example, in 2008-2009, Mānoa awarded 2,933 undergraduate degrees compared to 2004-2005 when 2,647 were awarded, a 10.8% growth in undergraduate degrees awarded. As we believe that the System goal of focusing on degree production is the right one, we are encouraged by these data.

However, looking at traditional one-year retention rates and at four-year and six-year graduation rates paints a less favorable picture. As the number of entrants rose between 1999 and 2005, from 1,422 to 1,880 full-time first-time freshmen, the corresponding retention percentages declined, from 78.6% for the 1999 cohort to a low of 75% for the 2003 cohort. Retention rates for first-time freshmen have subsequently improved to 78.5%. This occurred simultaneously with a 23% increase in cohort size between 1999 and 2008. Six-year graduation rates for first-time, full-time freshmen have declined from 55.6% to 48.6%, despite a 14.4% increase in degrees awarded (791 in 2005 to 905 in 2009).

The 2003 cohort had the lowest six-year graduation rate of 48.6% and displayed the lowest retention rate (75%). Our assumption is that higher retention rates directly lead to higher graduation rates. We therefore predict that graduation rates will rise for the next five years, but clearly we hope that the many improvements in the quality of the undergraduate experience described in this report will lead to a larger increase than the 3.5% increase in retention from 2003 to 2008. One promising data point is that four-year graduation rates have risen perceptibly across this entire period, moving from only 11.5% for 1999 first-time, full-time freshmen to 17% for the most recent cohort of 2005 entrants. This suggests that some of the internal barriers to students moving through the system are being addressed even if overall challenges to student success still remain.

It is increasingly important for Mānoa to examine data on transfer student cohorts when discussing retention and graduation rates. The increase in the cohort of full-time transfer students is dramatic, from 764 in Fall 1999 to 1,385 in Fall 2008 (with a high of 1,604 in Fall 2005), and much larger than the increase in the first-time, full-time freshman cohorts. We see the same inverse relationship between rates and absolute numbers among transfers as well as freshmen: the retention rates for the transfer cohorts dropped from 72.9% to 64.8% between 1999 and 2008, but the actual number of student retained from those cohorts increased from 557 to 897, a growth of 340 students or 61% for transfers. Four-year graduation rates remained almost level from 1999 (52.9%) to 2004 (52.2%), despite a large increase in actual graduates from 404 to 716. Despite a sharp rate decrease from the 2004 cohort to the 2005 cohort (six percentage points to 46.2%), there was still an increase in actual graduates (from 716 to 741). The number of transfer students graduating in four years increased 337 (or 83%) during the period from 1999 to 2005.

Also notable in the transfer cohort data are the lower one-year retention rates (69.8%) when compared to the first-time, full-time freshmen (FTFT) cohort (77.4%). Two-year graduation rates for transfer students (11.6%) also trail, but only slightly, the four-year graduation rates (14.7%) for the FTFT cohort. Transfer students have higher four year rates (47.8%) than FTFT four-year graduation rates, as expected because of earned credits upon entry. Alarmingly, the six-year graduation rates
for both cohorts are similar (55.2% - transfer, 54.8% - FTFT) as we should expect to see much higher completion rates for transfer students after six years at Mānoa. [2.10]

These rates and numbers are computed, of course, from the point of entry to Mānoa, not to the institution from which the students transferred. This means that this population—an ever-growing part of our student body—is moving towards baccalaureate degrees much more slowly than students who enter as freshmen. However, the area of community college transfer is an area in which we have been innovating lately, and our hope is that some of these innovations will begin to help address this ‘through-put’ problem which plagues so much of American higher education. The analyses contained in this report should help draw attention to the issue in ways that should stimulate further reflection and potentially further innovation. [2.14]

As the full study shows, there are some fascinating data points that demand further analysis and show how unique Hawai‘i’s population is—such as the fact that Caucasian students do substantially less well than minority students (who of course are the majority in Hawai‘i and at Mānoa) and the national norm. However, we believe that improving the retention and graduation rate is a means to the end of graduating more students, not an end in itself. We need to resist any steps to improve the graduation rate which might deny access to students and therefore reduce the number of graduates: the graduation rate that really matters is the entire society’s rate. [2.10, 4.5]

Retention and graduation data for Mānoa’s various student success programs were reported earlier in this report. The College Opportunities and Access to Excellence first-year programs are achieving first- and second-year retention results that exceed Mānoa’s average rates. Programs like ‘IKE AO PONO and the Native Hawaiian Science and Engineering Mentoring Program are graduating participants with little attrition. [1.5] The Graduation and Retention Subcommittee of the Committee on Enrollment Planning, which was described in Essay 5, is focusing its attention on efforts to improve Mānoa’s retention and graduation rates. Examples of recent initiatives include “Come Home to Mānoa” which is targeting students in good academic standing who left Mānoa as seniors. The students are being identified and will receive personalized invitations to return to complete their degree programs. Students who respond will be referred to the appropriate school/college advisors who will prepare an individual plan for graduation. [2.12] Within Mānoa, presentations to deans, faculty, and student support units will be made beginning in Fall 2010 to discuss why retention matters, and what they can be doing to improve retention. Additionally, the Mānoa Faculty Senate is leading the initiative to articulate all courses within the UH System so that courses with the same alpha and number are 100% articulated. This initiative may reduce the frustration that transfer students encounter with having to enroll in additional courses due to the imperfect articulation between Mānoa and community college courses. [2.14]

**Faculty Retention**

The larger goal of faculty recruitment and retention must be rethought within the context of our current budget constraints. Ideally, the goal should be to increase faculty size, lower student/faculty ratios, and encourage research to retain faculty with high salaries and a low teaching load. In reality, faculty size is no longer growing. The focus must shift to maintaining a high level of morale and job satisfaction even as we operate in an environment of declining resources. In essence, job satisfaction among faculty must improve to affect retention and recruitment. [3.1, 3.2]

In addition to reducing faculty mobility in ways that help ease the challenge of faculty retention, the financial crisis has also affected us in ways that exacerbate the challenge. As the University has lost funding from the State, with cuts to academic units largely at 10%, many units were forced to meet their cuts by leaving positions vacant and therefore at least temporarily shrinking the faculty.

Another result of the budget crisis has been a greater focus on tuition revenue than before, as tuition revenue is rapidly growing as a percentage of the University’s budget. In this context, the
short-term strategy of leaving faculty positions vacant is only sustainable for the short term. We need to reinvest in the faculty and build those programs where student demand is the greatest. Coming out of the Budget Prioritization Workgroup was an analysis of Mānoa’s budget according to a number of productivity and efficiency measures. One of the tasks in the next few years will be turning that data system into a way of allocating positions in order to invest in areas of enrollment growth where additional faculty are needed. This has already begun to happen at the college and school level, but there is a growing consensus that we need to replace the historical model of unit budgeting at Mānoa with some sort of revenue sharing model that will incent units to take student- and enrollment-friendly actions in the ways units have a direct incentive to increase their grant and contract income. A pilot project, investing $8 million in units providing student semester hours, was launched in Fall 2010, and by the time of the EER visit, some of these funds may be added to unit base budgets. [3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 4.4]

Mānoa must approach recruitment and retention efforts in new ways. We continue to place emphasis on research seed grants and travel support, assistance with intellectual property issues, tuition for dependents, and assistance with housing costs in an effort to improve overall job satisfaction. The Office of Technology Transfer and Economic Development offers an expanded array of services to Mānoa faculty (as well as staff and students) that help them identify, manage, protect, and commercialize intellectual property assets. The 2009-2015 Agreement between the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly and the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents (faculty contract) includes a provision for a new scholarship for dependents of faculty who attend any campus within the UH System. The impact of these efforts are, as yet, unclear and will be affected by the overall academic job market and ongoing changes in the local, national, and international economic situation. [2.8]

Staff Retention
Ratios of staff to faculty and staff to students at Mānoa are substantially lower than for peer institutions and other public doctoral research extensive universities. Some staff categories are identified as especially low, notably executive (formerly identified as executive/managerial), administrative, and skilled crafts categories. While Mānoa recognizes the need to fill these vacant support positions, many remain unfilled for financial reasons. Moreover, even in cases where funding may be made available and health and safety issues exist, filling State civil service positions has been hampered by the need for gubernatorial approval. Hence, retention of staff is a key issue at Mānoa.

Exit questionnaires completed by resigning staff indicate many leave Mānoa for a job with “more opportunities for advancement.” Since retaining staff reduces time and money spent recruiting, selecting, and training new staff, and high levels of staff retention leads to more efficient and stable programming and services, we have increased our efforts to promote job satisfaction and provide opportunities for advancement among this critical group of employees. Several professional development, incentive, and reward programs are in place including opportunities for part-time employment, flex-time, and job sharing; and professional development offered by the State, UH System and Mānoa campus and schools and colleges.

Each year, the State offers a series of professional development opportunities for civil service employees ranging from computer skills through customer service and supervisory leadership. Offered at no cost to employees, these short courses improve professional skills and also facilitate career advancement. [3.3, 3.4]

Mānoa operates in a delegated human resources environment such that each school or college is responsible for the overall management of the faculty and staff in their units. Individual schools and colleges offer staff development and training opportunities ranging from professional skills and certifications workshops to wellness seminars. For Administrative, Professional, and Technical
(APT) employees, special compensation adjustments, either in the form of a bonus or a permanent raise in pay grade, are utilized to reward and retain employees whose performance consistently exceeds expectations. Support staff throughout the state are recognized through Employee, Team or Manager of the Year Awards (State Team of the Year). The Mānoa campus also recognizes its staff with special award opportunities as well as the Willard Wilson Award for Distinguished Service to the University.

Mānoa Human Resources and the University EEO Offices also provide workshops and training related to a variety of administrative, human resources, equal employment, management/leadership and support topics. For example, in 2009-2010, eight workshops related to “CareGivers” supporting Mānoa community members who must address personal challenges in dealing with aging relatives, etc., were offered. Most workshops, other than specialized topics, are open to the entire Mānoa community. [3.4]

**Next Steps**

As the capacity of the Mānoa Institutional Research Office (MIRO) grows, continued monitoring and analysis of Mānoa’s student retention and graduation data will become a focus of MIRO efforts. MIRO will provide analyses of campus-wide retention and graduation data and will assist in assessing the effectiveness of our various student success initiatives by tracking the retention and graduation rates of their participants. [2.10, 2.11, 4.5, 4.6]

The Committee on Enrollment Planning (CEP) will continue to focus on ways to improve Mānoa’s retention and graduation rates. The CEP Retention and Graduation Subcommittee has already generated a list of 25 potential initiatives which are undergoing further analysis. Initiatives that merit action will be recommended to CEP for consideration and appropriate action.

On an annual basis, we will be updating the studies of retention and graduation rates and of instructional efficiency. In terms of the former, we hope to build a climate in which there is a broad awareness of the issues surrounding retention and graduation, so the entire campus embraces in a profound way the goals of increasing degree attainment, increasing retention, and reducing time to degree. This will also be complemented by more detailed assessments of curricular and co-curricular programs designed to improve student success. This will provide a much clearer sense of which programs are working and therefore where additional investment is warranted.

The contract ratified in 2009 by the faculty creates an incentive for faculty to retire by December 31, 2010. Although a large number of retirements will make the budgetary challenge of the next several years easier to meet, it will also undoubtedly create some temporary imbalances that will need to be addressed. The instructional efficiency data will be a major driver for determining where we allocate faculty resources in the years to come, and this will help us to ‘right size’ departments as student interest in fields waxes and wanes as well as help to incent departments to be more focused on student success initiatives as well as on offerings that genuinely help meet student needs.
Concluding Essay

We are confident that the efforts which led to the CPR and the EER will continue and be institutionalized in the culture of Mānoa for a number of reasons. First, we have created quality assurance efforts that are solidly part of the institutional fabric. Our recently redesigned program review process is well articulated with school-specific professional accreditation and provides a cost-effective and widely-accepted review of all campus programs on a regular basis. Assessment is now closely aligned with program review. Since the annual assessment reports form part of the complete program review, units understand that by completing their annual assessment, they are working towards the more comprehensive program review. [2.7]

Despite our challenging budgetary situation, we believe adequate institutional support has been committed to these activities, with the creation of the Assessment Office and the Mānoa Institutional Research Office since the submission of our Institutional Proposal. Both efforts are clearly contributing to our being a more data-driven environment. Particularly important here is the Instructional Efficiency measures, which collects data about the instructional role of each program on campus in an apples-to-apples format.

This use of information to inform decision making is part of becoming a learning organization. A key site of learning which is crucial to the continuation of our efforts in the re-accreditation process is the Committee on Enrollment Planning. For us to make progress on each of the four goals outlined in Essay 6, we need to tackle fundamental issues of institutional quality and effectiveness. The goals matter for the continuation of our accreditation efforts not in themselves but because progress towards them will require such a continuation of effort. We already have a rich menu of initiatives for meeting our goals, ranging from relatively simple ‘low hanging fruit’ to more complex and resource-dependent ideas. We are concentrating initially on those ideas with low cost and relatively rapid implementation, given the budget situation, but as resources become available from the enrollment growth that we anticipate as a result of this effort, we should be in a position to fund high-priority concepts that are not fundable now. [4.5]

We envision the Committee on Enrollment Planning, and its attendant work groups, as the nerve center of a continuous improvement project for all aspects of undergraduate education, focusing on our competitiveness for the State’s top students, on our mission of access and equity, on our increasingly symbiotic relationship to the rest of the System, and finally to our ability to educate and graduate the students who do come to Mānoa. We have a strong motivation to continue these efforts and for them to succeed—certainly fulfilling our educational mission is dependent on generating the tuition support provided by our students—and therefore we are confident that our myriad efforts will continue well beyond the EER visit.

Beyond these endeavors, how will we guarantee that momentum from the time of the Institutional Proposal to the Educational Effectiveness Review will be sustained? Because the central theme of the Institutional Proposal was the creation of a greater sense of community on campus, we have created a number of structures to sustain and enhance that sense of community. Virtually everything discussed in this report involves work that is cross-cutting and collaborative, and the collaboration is organized around key themes: how can we connect the Mānoa ‘ohana more tightly together around a core set of values? Can those values embody the Hawaiian values of aloha and kuleana (responsibility)? And can the community embodying those values commit to a climate of rigor and excellence comparable to the best research universities in the country? We believe that the answer to all of these questions is a resounding yes. We have become a more data-driven but also a more caring and committed community, and the many innovations and new programs described in this report will continue the process of transformation well beyond the present moment. We have many challenges ahead of us in a complex fiscal environment, but we also face the future with excitement and enthusiasm.