

## REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

### **To Chaminade University of Honolulu (CUH)**

Visit Dates: March 5-8, 2019

#### Team Roster

Judith Maxwell Greig, President, Notre Dame de Namur University; Team Chair

Melea Fields, AVP of Accreditation Affairs/ALO at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology;

Assistant Chair

Cynthia Carter, Associate Provost Institutional Effectiveness and Degree Completion (retired) at Fresno

Pacific University; Team Member

Harry Fong, Associate Vice President of Finance (retired) at Santa Clara University; Team Member

Rodney Reynolds, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and institutional Research at California Lutheran University; Team Member

Tamela Hawley, Vice President, WSCUC; Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC).

The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

## Table of Contents

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT.....	3
Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History .....	3
Description of Team’s Review Process.....	5
Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence .....	6
SECTION II – COMPLIANCE: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.....	7
Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.....	7
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions.....	9
Standard 3: Deploying and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability .....	14
Standard 4: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions.....	19
Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees .....	22
Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation .....	24
Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation .....	24
Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence .....	25
Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment.....	25
Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes – N/A.....	26
Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement .....	26
SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE (such as Substantive Change) .....	27
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW .....	27
APPENDICES .....	29
Federal Compliance Forms.....	30
1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM .....	30
2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM .....	31
3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM .....	32
4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM.....	33
Distance Education Review - CUH Review .....	33

## SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

### ***Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History***

Chaminade College was founded in 1955—four years before Hawai‘i became a state. In 1883, the Marianist community (Society of Mary, Catholic order of brothers and priests) established an academy for boys, the Saint Louis School that continues to thrive today, sharing space with Chaminade on the Kaimukī campus. Chaminade became a four-year college in 1957, and then added graduate programs in the 1970s. In 1977, Chaminade College was formally renamed Chaminade University of Honolulu (CUH). Today, CUH serves nearly 2,400 undergraduate, graduate, and online students. CUH has five academic divisions; 23 undergraduate and six graduate majors; two undergraduate and four graduate certificates, and a number of not-for-credit professional development programs and seminars. It works to offer programs to members of the military on bases island-wide, and has an array of degree programs online. In addition, CUH is home to more than 30 student clubs and organizations along with ten NCAA Division II athletic teams.

CUH is the only Catholic university in both the Pacific and Hawaii. It is one of only three Marianist higher education institutions in the nation. The university is on the island of O‘ahu, having a 65-acre campus close to Waikīkī and Honolulu. CUH’s campus has several landmark Spanish mission-inspired buildings along with a number of newer, state-of-the-art structures, including the 30,000-square-foot Sullivan Family Library. The library has study areas, a 40-station computer lab, and more than 70,000 print books and 240 print journals.

The CUH mission states;

*Chaminade University offers its students an education in a collaborative learning environment that prepares them for life, service and successful careers. Guided by its Catholic, Marianist and liberal arts educational traditions, Chaminade encourages the development of moral character, personal competencies, and a commitment to build a just and peaceful society. The University offers both the civic and church communities of the Pacific region its academic and intellectual resources in the pursuit of common aims.*

Their Statement of Core Commitments reads:

*From our Mission flow the following Core Commitments which both amplify and specify the Mission. We understand our Core Commitments as guiding both the service we offer and the formation of our educational community:*

#### *Commitments to Service*

- *To offer quality academic programs, both those leading to a degree and those focused on continuing education, in a manner responsive to the needs of our students and communities;*
- *To graduate students who are recognized for their liberal arts learning, preparation for professional careers, facility in the use of information and communication technologies, interest in life-long learning, appreciation of diversity, sense of ethical responsibility, and commitment to leadership through service to affect positively individual lives and the common good;*
- *To be a community that looks beyond itself and engages in public service, that enriches the life of the wider community;*
- *To exhibit a strong social consciousness that expressly permeates all curricula;*
- *To engage in partnerships with the Hawaii community, our Pacific Island neighbors, the church and those with whom we share Marianist sponsorship;*
- *To explore critically the intersections of faith and culture and, consistent with our identity, engage our students in this dialogue and participate in the processes of public learning and policy formulation and the building of a more just and peaceful society.*

#### *Commitments to the Character of Our Educational Community*

- *To be a unified educational community where members are committed to our common mission and their self-development;*
- *To be a faculty and staff with a primary focus on student learning and the development of the whole person;*
- *To hold an extensive view of hospitality, meaning cordiality to the ideas and talents of others; to listen with an open mind that enhances our integrity and reasserts our humanity;*
- *To nurture a culture which honors and promotes open inquiry, reflection, critical dialogue with peers on and beyond the campus and the dissemination of our scholarship;*
- *To be a scholarly community which explores and encourages connections between disciplines and provides the various experiences necessary to make those connections. This implies intense, dedicated collaboration among colleagues and students;*
- *To foster an excellent multi-cultural learning environment drawing on our unique Pacific Island location;*
- *To conduct ourselves with personal integrity, perhaps the most powerful educational tool we possess; to serve as mentors and role models; the way in which we interact with students enables them to work with others in a like manner;*

- *To be a community which stays the course through the difficult periods. Patience, self-discipline and sacrifice are necessary to build a strong community. We look within ourselves for solutions and the resolve to work through difficulties.*

As part of the students-first commitment, CUH offers an on-campus student-to-faculty ratio of 11-to-1, student support services, including individualized academic advising, and a focus on *Ohana*.

CUH has been continuously accredited since WSCUC began in 1962, and was most recently affirmed in 2010. In the July 9, 2010 letter to CUH WSCUC noted that the university had made “significant progress” in its recommendations and scheduled an interim report. The 2014 interim addressed five areas: 1) progress in instituting a formal program review process for all academic programs; 2) enrollments; 3) financial status; 4) assessment of learning, particularly in general education and 5) implementation of the nursing program. The interim report was received and CUH has remained in good standing with WSCUC. The current institutional report continues to address improvements and challenges across these areas. To assist the team CUH provided a matrix that briefly summarized the recommendations since the 2010 action letter, which was an easy visual of the following four areas: assessment/program review, student success, financial stability, and enrollment management.

### ***Description of Team’s Review Process***

The team reviewed CUH’s Self-Study and the supplementary materials prior to the off-site review. From these materials, the team developed lines of inquiry that were conveyed during the conference call with the CUH leadership team on December 6, 2018 and via email to the team on December 14, 2018. In addition, the team requested additional documentation from CUH including the new strategic plan, enrollment and financial data, benchmark and assessment data and processes; most materials were received prior to the on-site review at the Honolulu campus on March 5-8. During the on-site review, members of the team met with students, faculty, key administrative staff, and several members of the governing board. Additionally, calls were placed between the university auditors and the team’s finance expert, as well as the Chancellor with the Team Chair. The team was also given the opportunity to see the facilities and samples of student work.

### ***Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence***

The Self-Study Report was organized into thematic essays. The report included five essays, an introductory chapter and a chapter on reflections and future plans. The report included supporting documents in an appendix. The report included all required components, and provided a foundation prior to the visit. The team viewed the report as an accurate reflection of the challenges faced by CUH and showed the commitment of CUH to provide a high-level of quality to its students. Report content reflected CUH's growing academic and administrative capacities and their ongoing institutional commitment to mission, vision, and values. The *Ohana* sense of community and service in light of their place, the Marianist mission, and their niche as a Native Hawaiian-Serving institution were infused throughout the report and associated evidence. There was a clear institutional focus on improvement and the need to be innovative in the challenging higher education environment.

The Self-Study would have benefitted from the inclusion of explicit references to the CFRs linked to specific narratives. Since CFR notations were organized exclusively and inconsistently by headings, it was not clear which CFRs were addressed by large amounts of varied narrative content under each heading. Annotating CFRs by paragraph would further assist the institution by confirming alignment with accreditation's guiding principles.

The report itself, while comprehensive in scope, included multiple references to data, reports, and processes without citing or documenting evidence, making analysis difficult. Overall, report quality reflected what appeared to be administrative and academic decision-making, which relied upon collaborative narratives but often in the absence of detailed evidentiary data. Some supporting evidence requested by the team was not provided either after the OSR or in the team room. The institution did provide a poster session on Day 2 of the onsite visit, which provided some of the supporting evidence. However, the team's analysis was delayed because the needed evidence was seen for the first time at the poster session.

To prepare for the Self-Study, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) organized meetings with CUH stakeholders, which included the faculty, students, academic departments, student support services, members of the governing board, relevant committees, such as the strategic planning committee, faculty committees, and program review committees, as well as campus administrators.

## **SECTION II – COMPLIANCE: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

### ***Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives***

CUH demonstrates a strong understanding of its own place and purpose. (CFR 1.1) The team noted the strong sense of its own mission, its Marianist heritage, and its niche as a Native Hawaiian Serving institution. The mission statement is readily available on the CUH website, and the service and justice orientation of Ohana was a theme of the report. During the campus visit, the team found that stakeholders were very familiar with the mission statement and are particularly mission driven in their focus on Marianist characteristics and service to Native Hawaiian students. As found in the mission statement, CUH is committed to advancing the well-being of its communities and demonstrates its commitment to the public good in several different ways.

The university has demonstrated commitment to student success and has continued to work, since the last accreditation visit in 2010, to improve student outcomes and the quality of program reviews and other assessments. The achievement of several programmatic accreditations and the establishment of the Center for Teaching and Learning demonstrate deep commitment to achieving its educational objectives (CFR 1.2). CUH has a clearly defined set of objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. These learning objectives are reflected in CUH's educational programs and in their approach to assessment.

The faculty handbook for CUH notes that the university subscribes to the 1940 "Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom" of the AAUP and has an established grievance procedure should any violation be perceived (CFR 1.3). The team did not hear concern from faculty regarding academic freedom issues during the visit.

CUH has a very diverse student body, with no ethnic group more than approximately a third of the students. As noted earlier, CUH is highly attuned to its location and its status as a Native Hawaiian Serving Institution (CFR 1.4). Its Statement of Core Commitments includes the claim, "To foster an excellent multi-cultural learning environment drawing on our unique Pacific Island location." This claim is evidenced in a wide variety of programs with arts and culture organizations, internships in local companies, scholarships for Native Hawaiian students, and research projects addressing local issues. In recent years, significant attention has been paid to ensuring equitable educational outcomes, and marked progress in retention and graduation rates has been made with Native Hawaiian students,

Pacific Island students, first generation students, and Pell eligible students. Faculty and staff reflect the student body much more than on many campuses.

The Articles of Incorporation designate the Members of the Corporation for the university as the members of the Provincial Council (seven in total, including the provincial) of the Marianist Province of the United States, the president of the university, and the chair of the board of regents of the university. The provincial serves as both chancellor of the university and as chair of the members of the corporation. The members of the corporation have the reserve powers typical of many Catholic colleges and make appropriate level decisions, such as approving the members of the board of regents, approving the appointment of the president, and overseeing the Marianist character of the university. The board of regents and management retain appropriate responsibilities for the direction and operations of the university (CFR 1.5).

The university maintains the required information on its website not only to ensure compliance with federal requirements but also to faithfully represent its programs and outcomes to prospective students and the public (CFR 1.6). The student handbook includes clear reporting processes for Title IX and other harassing behavior and appeal processes. The catalog includes clear processes for academic grievances. The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators was completed.

The team applauds the openness and transparency CUH has demonstrated in the review process. The institutional report was forthcoming and honest regarding the issues facing the university and the progress made to date. Commission personnel are informed timely of changes for the institution, such as the recent downgrading of CUH's Moody's bond rating. The institution has audits of its finances performed on an annual basis by qualified independent auditors (CFRs 1.7 & 1.8). The Dean of Students maintains a record of student complaints, which the institution appears to address timely.

CUH appears to be an institution that understands its strengths and its challenges and has plans for improvement. The president has been at CUH for just over one year; during that time a new strategic plan was completed. The five priorities include; students first, faculty and staff development, innovation and responsiveness, mission and values-based campus climate, and financial fitness for sustainability. While the team commends the completeness and direction of the plan, questions remain about the ability of the campus to sustain the many priorities enumerated without the infusion of significant financial and human resources. The university leadership and the team also noted that additional work is required in order to ensure sufficient specificity for implementation.

Similar to traditional campus based programs, missional values are described as being integrated into distance faculty role modeling as well as course content. Typically, those values are



assessed in reflective assignments, wherein both campus based and online learning students may be asked to write about how they see disciplinary content applied in light of Marianist values.

Distance education programming is reportedly funded under the same budgetary lines as the traditional programs with the exception of five counselors who are dedicated to serving students at the remote bases and in fully online programs. There are no discrete line items either reported or identified for distance education expenses, complicating the team's efforts to determine whether adequate resources were allocated for these purposes and to compare resource allocation across learning modalities.

### ***Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions***

#### ***Teaching and Learning***

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) as well as other academic groups, offer professional development events at convenient times to encourage faculty participation. Although a variety of training opportunities are available to all instructors, adjunct participation is low despite creative attempts to solicit their participation, such as offering Sunday morning events. It is not clear whether adjunct faculty have been surveyed to determine what factors, such as day of the week, time of day, meal availability, networking opportunities with full time faculty or deans, or specific content areas would further motivate their involvement. In addition, online pedagogy is not required of faculty teaching online courses and there is no tracking system for the purpose of determining which faculty members have been certified in online teaching expertise. The optional nature of CTL trainings, even for CUH policy initiatives, has resulted in low implementation, which ultimately affects student learning improvements.

Deans are responsible for the academic quality of all courses in their disciplinary programs. A systematic quality review and accountability plan for faculty, course, syllabi, and content has not yet been implemented, although a new syllabus template has been developed with plans for routine syllabi audits. The new syllabus template offers the opportunity to chronicle compliance regarding details for instructional and homework hours, outcome linkages, and academic rigor expected for each course. Assessment practices vary widely within online courses and between programs. The team found cases where assessment was not being carried out, with no office taking responsibility to track whether the function was occurring or not. Assessment occurs primarily during each five-year program review. The contents of annual reports housed in the university portal vary across programs, from discipline specific data reporting to anecdotal reflections on program delivery. It is assumed among faculty groups that content experts are responsible to determine rigor but an institutional approach to assessing rigor had

not yet been identified and there was some campus confusion about the term ‘rigor’ as contrasted to ‘disciplinary content’.

With the exception of programs under other external accreditors, learning outcome data are collected exclusively in each program’s capstone course. The outcomes are program level and mastery is determined by cross-disciplinary faculty review of student portfolios. Linking course-level outcomes to program-level outcomes consistently across disciplines may be the next step for Chaminade. The university may wish to consider how its exemplar programs could offer strategies to improve comprehensive, foundational, and detailed outcomes assessment for other programs.

CUH’s current online syllabus template is variably applied across courses. The template does not require mention of faculty availability/office hours, nor does it require that faculty indicate how many instructional hour are required for the course. It is not clear where the university assesses instructional hour compliance or appropriate levels of academic rigor for online courses (CFR 2.1). There was mention during the site visit of instructional hour consolidation in at least one program, wherein students’ homework hours were completed during scheduled instructional (classroom) hours in order to minimize student workload. The team recommends that the university establish clear processes for periodic review of the application of the institutional credit hour policy, especially with respect to online courses, to ensure that credit hour assignments are accurate and reliable

#### *Curriculum and Delivery.*

Quality, content, and outcomes comparisons between distance and campus delivery of the same programs were not available to the visiting team. Disaggregated data on core competencies was requested by team members but not provided either prior to or during the site visit, although campus representatives affirmed that content was the same regardless of learning modality. In the absence of disaggregated learning outcomes data, it was not possible to assess congruence between modalities.

An abbreviated orientation is made available to but not required of distance education students, offering an overview of institutional mission and values as well as available student services. However, dedicated counselors maintain close contact with military base campus students who are taking distance or blended courses and with traditional campus students enrolled in online programs. These counselors provide personalized outreach and triage functions, develop close personal relationships with students, and redirect students toward available university resources as needed. In addition, CUH’s early alert system, previously applied exclusively to traditional campus students, is slated for implementation among online and blended course enrollees in the near future (CFR 2.2).

#### *Retention and Graduation.*

The retention and graduation rates data page on the university's website provides overview data but does not disaggregate by online vs. on-site programs. The documents submitted suggest that efforts are underway to construct assessment systems for this purpose, although the nature of those plans was not clear. See related content in Component 5.

General education ("Core") curriculum information is included in the undergraduate catalog and has been undergoing revision over the past couple of years with completion in sight, though the final product is not yet available. The focus is on the sequence of required courses without explanations about associated learning outcomes. (CFR 2.2a).

Across programs, there are multiple examples of vague or immeasurable learning outcomes. (CFR2.2b). Representative outcomes examples such as 'consider', 'learn about', 'increase appreciation', and 'accept responsibility' make means of assessment unclear. Likewise, scoring rubrics do not link elements of assignments to course student learning outcomes (CSLOs) or program student learning outcomes (PSLOs).

The online syllabus template and sample syllabi submitted for review reveal that the links between PSLOs and institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs) as well as scoring rubrics are most often absent. Students are not given instructions about how many hours are expected for homework or participation in discussion threads. Discussion thread performance, quality expectations, and scoring practices are generally not provided on syllabi. In many cases, CSLOs are not measurable, leading to questions about valid data collection and the ability to improve curriculum by following data analysis threads.

It is unclear how required instructional hours are tracked as they are often not mentioned in the syllabus template or recorded in many sample syllabi which were submitted for review (CFR 2.3). Undergraduate credit hours are defined in the catalog's 'Registration and Records' section as: *The standard for one credit hour is nine hours per week, consisting of three hours of lecture and two hours of study or three hours of laboratory*. While CUH's educational programs appear generally appropriate in content, standards of performance, and rigor (CFR 2.1), data was not available to support compliance with institutionally defined credit hours because instructional hours and homework hours are not recorded on syllabi or other documents reviewed by this team. An institutional definition for rigor, likewise, could not be identified but was described during the visit as related to disciplinary content.

Three degree programs that the team reviewed, Nursing, Business, and Forensics, function under external accreditation bodies and described robust assessment practices which include collecting

student learning data based on measurable outcomes, disaggregating the results by demographic groups, generating remedial actions as indicated by the results, and obtaining budgetary funding to support those actions. Other disciplines set program outcomes, which varied widely in quality and measurability. Most programs did not have the capacity to disaggregate results by students' demographics or their learning modality since outcomes data was not linked to the student information system with identifying demographics.

In many programs, it was unclear whether course outcomes existed, were reflected in assignment rubrics, were measurable, or were linked to program outcomes. Even when course outcomes were listed, there was no evidence trail back to representative assignments, a scenario where discovery of the need for targeted curriculum modifications would be difficult. A remedy includes linking CSLOs to program outcomes and also identifying those CSLOs in well-crafted assignment scoring rubrics. Additionally, since outcomes data was collected in various program spreadsheets, which are housed in Deans' offices, the results are not linked via a student information system to demographics for disaggregated analysis. Neither are the results easily accessible for administrative analysis. Upon inquiry, the team learned that only deans had reviewed program specific learning outcome results. This would not be true, however, when each program submits a five-year program review, which undergoes review and approval by the associate provost and provost.

Student learning assessment was limited to capstone (summative) assessment of program outcomes. Academic quality would be better served by the addition of interim or formative assessment, to facilitate identifying which course offerings in the curriculum sequence might need attention in cases where learning falls below mastery standards (CFR 2.5).

PSLOs are summatively assessed in cross-disciplinary portfolio scoring sessions, where faculty calibrate their scoring techniques (CFR 2.6). While this strategy facilitates collaboration and efficiency, it also calls into question the institutional agreement that rigor is defined by disciplinary content with faculty scoring summative capstones outside of their disciplinary expertise. This may need to be clarified as Chaminade reviews its assessment process.

During the site visit, Program Directors offered a poster session with informative disciplinary overviews, including a curriculum map linking their major courses to their program learning outcomes. There were a few noteworthy examples of programs where course learning outcomes were linked to program learning outcomes as well (CFR 2.7).

#### *Scholarship and Creative Activity*

Scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation for both students and

faculty are all valued and supported (CFR 2.8). Faculty dossiers include representative evidence in each domain as outlined in their contracts.

Faculty evaluation links scholarship, teaching, student learning, and service, with an emphasis on teaching. Distance learning faculty are not required to earn related in-service hours each year, but are invited to the center for teaching and learning's offerings. The center maintains a roster of professional development events and the attendees. Faculty are responsible for maintaining a personalized list of trainings and presentations as well. (CFR 2.9).

#### *Student Learning and Success*

Campus climate is regularly assessed using the nationally normed NSSE instrument, with institutional wide review of the results (CFR 2.10). CUH does not assess students' online learning capacities prior to enrollment, although students are provided with materials listing the necessary technology resources. However, dedicated counselors are available to walk them through online course navigation as needed and several support resources are available, including 24/7 online learning system support and a business-hours campus based help-desk.

#### *Program Review*

Program reviews are posted to CUH's portal. A recent submission included a 12-page report with 121 pages of appendices, including extensive course evaluation data. Remedial actions were not offered for notably low scoring courses, nor were affirmatives offered for the more typical high performing courses. In order to improve student learning, CUH could benefit from highlighting academic successes as role models to encourage programs and courses in need of refinement. Faculty and administrators acknowledged that program review outcomes and recommendations were intended to generate resource allocation, and attributed the absence of budgetary resources to the university's current financial status. Planning processes for program review recommendations, however, are generated and routinely tracked by the Dean in conjunction with the Associate Provost.

Core competency assessment was included in the most recent (Feb 2019) program review. Retention, persistence, and graduation data were not included in the two most current program reviews accessible via the CUH portal. An earlier program review included extensive survey data as well as rubric results for the summative assignment, comparing population groups, a notable example of disaggregated learning outcomes data. Courses in distance education courses are delivered in a lock-step delivery sequence, which maximizes students' timely progress toward graduation. With the exception of the nursing and business programs, it is not clear to what extent course delivery has been supported as well (CFR 2.10).

Co-curricular programs are in a nascent stage of data collection and analysis. A February 2019 PowerPoint presentation includes a newly developed schedule for co-curricular program review submission spanning 2019-2023, intending to make use of CAS Standards. There was great interest among co-curricular directors toward expanding their understandings and applications of data informed decision-making (CFR 2.11).

The CTL webpage does not mention training nor support for online students, although faculty in these courses and programs are invited to CTL offerings. The learning management system provides 24/7 support for students with questions or in need of support and dedicated counselors provide additional guidance, encouragement, and support (CFR 2.12).

In previous years, campus students received services from a dedicated student service team and distance-learning students likewise had their own student service staff. More recently, those services have been consolidated under the traditional campus staff. However, one counselor is assigned to each military base and one to exclusively online students. These counselors triage student needs and provide personal contact. Since distance education programs fall under the same leadership as traditional campus programs, budgetary resources are shared rather than discrete. Costs are not yet projected for future needs and tend to be allocated on more of a must-have basis with approval offered through administrative advocacy (CFR 2.13).

CUH's transfer policy is easily searchable and accessible online, containing detailed information about minimum grades, maximum units, institutional accreditation, maximum timeframe, and other relevant qualifications. Interested parties are referred to support offices and given their contact information (CFR 2.14)

### ***Standard 3: Deploying and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability***

#### ***Financial Resources***

CUH's institutional report, Essay E, recognizes the importance of aligning sustainable revenue streams and financial viability to the educational effectiveness of the institution. The report provides evidence of increased financial stability by presenting financial ratios through fiscal year (FY) 2017 compared to FY 2009. While this is a correct conclusion, a review of the worksheet supporting the calculations shows the ratios do vary from year-to-year as financial results have fluctuated. The team's calculation of FY 2018 ratios, when a slight operating deficit was incurred, reflected less favorable ratios. Overall, however, the institution appears to have managed its finances well, adjusting to the operating

environment with cost controls as necessary. Other positive indicators of financial stability are steadily increasing net assets, increased Federal grants and lowering of the age of plant assets. Unqualified annual financial audits were presented for the last three fiscal years (CFRs 3.4, 3.5)

The university has experienced decreasing net tuition revenue since FY 2015. From FY 2015 to 2018, total gross tuition had risen only 3% despite tuition rate increases while financial aid has risen 22%. Declining enrollment in its traditional undergraduate day program has been identified as the primary cause of this decline. The tuition discount rate has risen to 41.4% for the current 2019 fiscal year increasing steadily from a rate of 37.9% in 2015.

Bond rating agencies, Moody's and Standard and Poor's, reaffirmed their prior bond ratings for CUH in May 2018; however, Moody's changed their outlook to negative due to the enrollment challenges. A January 2019, Moody's report downgraded the university's rating by one level to Ba3, citing the continued decline in enrollment for the current academic year. While Moody's is concerned by the recent enrollment declines, it states that CUH has proven strong fiscal management in the past and optimism for the future because of recent leadership changes notably in enrollment management.

Cash flow has been managed well over the years. As a formality, the Board of Regents authorized borrowing of up to \$2 million from the \$6 million line of credit should the need arise. Management has not had to utilize the line of credit in many years and does not anticipate the need to in the near future.

#### *Financial Planning and Budgeting*

CUH has been forthright and honest in the evaluation of its financial situation. The institutional report describes several vulnerabilities that could affect its already precarious finances. Of significant concern is its declining enrollment, which will be addressed under enrollment management. Another key financial strategy is to address costs across the university. The administration has initiated a new budgeting approach, which attempts to link academic programs and program review to budget development. This self-described "smart budgeting" was first used in the development of the fiscal 2019 budget when departments engaged in a bottoms-up budgeting process resulting in savings that could be redirected towards other more strategic activities. The report provided an example of resource reallocation when an additional faculty position was approved following a program review.

Cost savings through data driven analysis are the goal of the smart budgeting, which will provide much of the funding to develop and launch new programs. Several changes have been made to some administrative functions. Similar functions, such as enrollment groups for the traditional academic programs and online programs, were consolidated into one enrollment management department.

Budgeting was moved to the finance department from the president's office. A separate marketing function in enrollment management was combined with the university wide communications and marketing group helping to unify a common message about the university. These organizational changes were welcomed by the staff as they greatly improved efficiency, eliminated redundancy, saved resources and increased transparency. While these are progressive achievements, continued shortfalls in enrollment could make it more difficult to cut costs further without seriously affecting some operations or new initiatives.

The university's five-year budget forecast projects a 10% total growth in online undergraduate and graduate enrollment while undergraduate day enrollment will increase 2%. Salaries and benefits are forecasted to increase 3% annually and other expenses 1.5% annually. Net surplus is projected to be around \$589,000 in FY 2024, up from a break-even budget in FY 2019. The long-range forecast will be continuously reviewed and updated as new data and information becomes available, such as the enrollment shortfall this academic year.

Several positive comments were made by groups across the university that praised the new budgeting process as being more engaging, collaborative and transparent. This was a welcome change from the top down closed budget process of the past. The team commends the institution on its progress to attain financial stability with transparency and honesty regarding fiscal challenges, enrollment and institutional vulnerabilities. Also commendable are its success to obtain Federal grants and the establishment of a more collaborative approach to the budget process. While much progress has been made, the team recommends continued improvement of the new budget process for the best use of limited resources and that it continues to monitor financial stability as conditions change.

#### *Enrollment Management*

The university identifies declining enrollments and net tuition as its most important financial vulnerability. Its over-dependency on traditional undergraduate and graduate academic programs is of major concern especially with more recently experienced enrollment declines. This becomes even more challenging because of recent news that the State of Hawaii is considering free community college and Masters of Education tuition for in-state residents. The university determines that it must stabilize its undergraduate day enrollment at 1,200 students based on current resourcing and capacity levels. To address this enrollment concern, the institution is enhancing recruiting efforts in its traditional native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander markets and beyond its boundaries including the mainland. Increased recruitment efforts have been initiated to the other islands and parts of the mainland where concentrations of Hawaiians have relocated such as California, Nevada and Texas.



A revised marketing and branding approach is being implemented emphasizing its reputation as a good value that meets the needs of potential students. It also focuses on the uniqueness and high touch approach of a CUH educational experience. An updated university web site was recently launched and plans to be continuously revised to stay relevant in today's fast changing environment.

It also plans to diversify its revenue by developing new academic programs, enhance its online offerings and further develop non-degree certificates, professional development, summer institutes and professional continuing educational programs which are priorities in the new strategic plan. The Department of Innovation and Strategy has opened opportunities for faculty to bring forth ideas for new academic programs. The team commends the institutional focus on improvement and the need to be innovative in the challenging higher educational environment. Faculty are encouraged to develop new programs that are responsive to community needs. The provost developed an infographic to help faculty understand institutional decision-making processes for new programs.

#### *Faculty and staff*

A student to faculty ratio of 11:1 is indicative of generous instruction levels serving the students. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) was started in 2015 providing faculty development opportunities including training in teaching techniques, workshops and a place for faculty to share best practices. Since its establishment, over 80% of faculty have used the services of the CTL, which is now housed in a permanent facility. Staff levels have fluctuated over the more recent years as open positions are being evaluated and only filled strategically. Staff development is in its formative stages currently and starting to be tracked. Both faculty and staff have published policy manuals that are well written and comprehensive (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3). While it is challenging to have an ideal number of faculty and staff given limited resources, the team recommends the institution ensure they are sufficient in numbers needed to uphold academic excellence, support the success of students, and achieve the mission, strategic plan and direction of the institution, especially when approaching reallocation of resources. (CFR 3.1)

#### *Organizational Structure*

The organization of CUH follows a typical structure with the president as its Chief Executive Officer (CEO) with vice presidents and provost reporting to the position. Additionally, the dean of students and senior director of communications and marketing report to the president. Several of these positions have either been created or reshuffled since the new president arrived to achieve a more efficient and productive organization. (CFR 3.6, 3.8)

The team found the Governance and Administration document to be thorough and extensive. It describes the various committees across the institution including the Hui Haku- senior leadership council made up of the president and a broad representation of senior leaders at the vice president level, deans and some directors. The Hui Haku group is relatively new, replacing the Presidents Leadership Council previously in place. Faculty participate in decision making through the Faculty Senate. Roles of the board, executives and Faculty Senate are clearly articulated in the Governance and Administration document found on the web site. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.10).

The president reports to the Board of Regents, which serves as the governing body, meeting at least three times annually. Under the prior administration, the board had not been as actively engaged in the governance of the university especially in the academic areas. Currently, the board has become more active and engaged in several aspects of its role as a governing board. The board is diligent in its oversight of financial matters, capital investment, and its appointment and annual evaluation of the president's performance. The team recommends the Board of Regents strengthen the exercise of its responsibility in providing oversight and accountability of the academic enterprise, sharpened by periodic evaluation of its own effectiveness. (CFR 3.9)

#### *Facilities, Information and Technology*

The university is situated in central Honolulu on a beautiful, hilly campus with views of the ocean and Diamondhead. Its facilities are in very good condition with minimal deferred maintenance because of efforts to maintain the campus buildings. These efforts were, to a large extent, funded by Title III grants and strategic use of debt in more recent years.

Library resources were excellent with more focus on electronic materials in recent years. Technology resources were adequate with plans for continuous improvement as resources become available. (CFR 3.5)

#### *Strategic Plan Financing*

The newly adopted strategic plan recognizes that traditional education and administrative processes in higher education do not meet the needs of today's student learners. This realistic and accurate assessment is the basis of the new strategic plan, which has identified five priorities. The first four priorities address the educational and student programs, faculty and staff development, innovating for change and strengthening its mission and values.

The last priority, financial fitness, makes recommendations that echo the other priorities while re-emphasizing that business as usual will not achieve its strategic goals. The institution cannot rely solely on undergraduate tuition in the future. New innovative educational programs, online programs,

certificate and continuing education are needed; however, traditional degree program enrollment must be stabilized with increased recruitment efforts. Efficiency in departmental operations is also recommended calling for better business processes resulting in cost savings. Increased engagement with alumni and efforts in fund raising are other financial recommendations.

While the goals in the financial section do have linkages with the rest of the strategic priorities, the cost of each priority and related goals have not been estimated in order to better forecast total resources needed to accomplish the plan's goals. As the institution continues and deepens the implementation of strategic plan, the team recommends that it provides adequate resources and clear linkage to the new budgeting process.

#### ***Standard 4: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions***

##### ***Quality Assurance Processes***

Qualitative and quantitative data are regularly collected by CUH from various sources, however, there are few examples of how that data is tracked over time so that benchmarking, analysis, interpretation, and subsequent decisions about funding and implementation can occur. For example, NSSE data provides national benchmarking qualitative data and is processed among various constituencies. Recommendations for budgetary consideration are included in such processing but the evidence of consequent resource allocation has not been available (CFR 4.1).

Budgetary resources now appear to be allocated based on collaborative conversations between program directors, deans, and administration. Because detailed learning outcomes rubrics are not utilized and processed through the university's learning management system, the institution is at a disadvantage with regard to assessing discrete skills and therefore unable to aggregate or disaggregate detailed student performance results. One positive exception to disaggregation involves comparisons between AEOP (adult evening and online programs) and DUG (day undergraduates). Generally, learning deficits cannot be identified at a detailed level sufficient to indicate the needs for curriculum revisions and remediation. Current student performance assessment, in other words, performance assessments do not result in actionable next steps because of them being conceived too vague and broad. In most cases, learning outcomes cannot be disaggregated demographically due to the nature of the collection process, which varies by program. Collected data is housed in deans' offices in various formats such as excel spreadsheets, SPSS charts, and narrative reports. That data is not routinely reviewed by other administrative or academic personnel.

Institutional research (IR) produces and distributes a data-fact book, regular retention and graduation reports, and student performance reviews. Other data, such as national surveys, are also distributed for committee review and campus-wide discussions. The extent to which actionable responses to data are developed, resourced, and tracked is unclear. In their institutional report, CUH acknowledged “...gaps in understanding and awareness of uses of data...” and many constituents did not know how to access assessment data resources (CFR 4.2).

An example of how collected data led to institutional change involved generating campus-wide meetings to review NSSE results. The expectation is that those conversations will lead to increased awareness of students’ needs and generate change among faculty and staff. Other action plans were not available. Subsequent NSSE administration is considered to be the follow-up process to determine change effectiveness. Confounding variables and the possibility of no follow through were not addressed in this scenario. In a more effective example, CUH discovered that privileged students were more likely to receive quality internship opportunities, jeopardizing the mission related to inclusion. That data generated a successful grant application to increase underserved students’ internship access.

Across the campus, multiple offices were noted to be creating and distributing original surveys without the benefit of IR’s survey construction expertise or their tracking service to prevent survey fatigue. The resulting data’s validity would be well served by requiring IR support, approval, analysis, and tracking.

#### *Institutional Learning and Improvement*

CUH is commended for its intention to focus on four specific high impact practices (HIP): service learning, first year seminar, undergraduate research, and common intellectual experiences. Each practice bears strong outcomes research to ensure that students will be well served as they seek to achieve their academic goals (CFR 4.3). HIP implementation offers fertile ground for disaggregated assessment to determine the scope of effectiveness and provide opportunities for further improving program delivery to serve discrete student groups.

Currently, academic improvements appear to be based primarily upon collective decision-making but there is no evidence to indicate that they benefit from long-term data trends, which are analyzed to subsequently inform resource allocation decisions. CUH engages in a large variety of surveys, which function well to capture qualitative trends. More granular quantitative data derived from disaggregated student populations and discrete student learning outcomes assessed at formative and summative milestones appear to be scarce, handicapping curricular improvements, which would otherwise serve student success. Exceptions to this scarcity appear in robust assessment strategies

employed by externally accredited programs such as nursing, business, and forensic sciences (CFR 4.3).

The CUH program review process is reported as integrated within the senate's work to ensure faculty ownership and accountability. However, the senate does not retain responsibility for implementation and tracking program review recommendations. The provost and deans track requested resources, which are considered during institutional budgeting. There is no evidence that recommendations aligned with specific strategic plan entries are prioritized for resource allocation. In fact, CUH's institutional report confirmed that there is no explicit link between assessment report recommendations and the budgeting process itself (CFR 4.4).

Institutional recognition of the need to support a deeper commitment to assessment is commended, including relevant administrative leadership and support, as well as the creation of the Center for Teaching and Learning and new positions. The institution is also acknowledged for the level of administrative participation in academic program review. In particular, the provost's program review feedback is significant in that it affirms assessment efforts. Additionally, program reviews migrate during their approval process through several institutional academic bodies, the deans, and the provost. Further, the agreed upon recommendations arising from program review are tracked by regular conversations with Deans and the Associate Provost (CFR 4.5)

Beginning in 2018-19, CUH's divisions or schools will submit a summary of assessment activities, as noted in the institutional report. While that continuous attention to assessment will serve the institution well, all assessment requires functional links to subsequent actions, tracking, and resource allocation (CFR 4.5).

It was reported that academic deans are responsible for assessing rigor in both traditional campus programs as well as online programs during program reviews and annual assessments. Each content discipline is responsible for its own definition of rigor, although those definitions are not codified and appear to focus primarily on academic content rather than standards, levels of challenge, or cognitive complexity. A standardized syllabus template was recently developed and is intended for implementation beginning in April 2019. Currently, syllabus quality varies widely and makes understanding course requirements, credit hours, instructor expectations, and assessment practices difficult.

Sustained institutional effort recently led to finalizing and publishing CUH's robust strategic plan, which is broad in scope and highly relevant to current higher education's climate. However, it has been difficult to determine how the plan is or will be funded, implemented, and monitored (CFR 4.6).

CUH has benefitted from grant support across academic and administrative units, some of which are close to ending, with the expectation that the university will continue supporting their initiatives. The status of those transitions is under discussion. A grant writer is available to facilitate proposal development and has reliably provided those services over many years.

CUH's fidelity to mission is a strong integrative element running throughout administrative and academic decision-making. It remains sensitive to constituents' cultural, historical, and ecological concerns. There is also a need for additional attention to higher education's focus on student learning, assessment practices, best practices in classroom and online course delivery, and resource allocation and project implementation. Recent attention to expanding enrollment management and the diversification of income streams reflects the institution's awareness of marketing and enrollment's strategic roles in higher education, even as hurdles with approvals and buy-in continue to be addressed (CFR 4.7). Several current initiatives indicate that CUH anticipates a more robust approach to data informed decision-making in the near future.

### ***Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees***

While CUH is to be applauded for its clear commitment to its students, the team worked to explore and understand how a CUH graduate differs qualitatively from another institution, in essence what makes a CUH graduate unique among its peer institutions and what are the distinctive experiences and learning outcomes a CUH student receives. The team focused on the meaning, quality, and integrity of a degree (MQID) from CUH (WSCUC Handbook, p. 30). The team looked at CUH's approach to the core competencies and how they fit with the mission, learning outcomes, and campus culture described in the WSCUC Handbook, p. 29.

#### ***Meaning***

The meaning of a CUH degree revolves around the five Marianist Characteristics:

- Educate for formation in faith
- Provide an integral quality education
- Educate in family spirit
- Educate for service, justice and peace
- Educate for adaptation and change

When asked, students, faculty, and staff all said the same, that what makes a CUH degree unique are these values that are infused throughout the curriculum and the CUH culture. A CUH degree embraces the Catholic faith in the Marianist tradition and values and strives to ensure a rigorous education that serves its island community, while working towards achieving the mission of the university.

### *Quality*

While processes are in place to assess the academic programs and curricula for quality, the quality of a CUH degree is strongly reflected in how CUH degrees contribute to the community and through their reported student success rates. The self-study indicated that quality is assured by the integrity and rigor of the processes that CUH has in place to assess the excellence of students and by both internal and external reviews through the formal program review. Evidence of quality can be seen in the many activities and awards CUH students receive. The list is long so the following only highlights a few from each academic division:

1. Natural Sciences and Math has a reported 87.5% of students with graduate degrees being in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) career employment. Additionally, 14 students have won national research awards in venues such as the Society for Advancing Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS), Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS) and The Endocrine Society since 2010.
2. Nursing students have received the 2019 National Student Nurses Association (NSNA) Stellar School Chapter Recognition, the 2018 and 2019 Health Occupations Students of America (HOSA) Future for Health Professionals, the 2016 Isabel Hampton Leadership Award from NSNA. Additionally, they have recognitions and presentations with selected interdisciplinary mentorships and at conferences, as well as community service and cultural immersion activities. CUH currently boasts a 100% NCLEX pass rate.
3. The School of Business and Communication, business students (business administration, accounting and MBA) exceed the national the national average for the last five years with the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Additionally, the BA in Accounting typically reports 100% placement of graduates at graduation as well as various faculty and student awards.
4. Humanities and Fine Arts houses the only accredited program (Environmental and Interior Design) in the state of Hawaii with the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA). Students have won recent awards with the American Institute of Architects, Hawaii Chapter, as well as, participated in many research and conference presentations.

### *Integrity*

The integrity of a degree from CUH lies in consistency of delivery, serving the island community, ensuring the degrees are serving the intended purpose, and having assessment processes in place to reflect on the needs of the student through outcomes, data, and improvements. The team encourages

CUH to continue to explore how the meaning, quality, and integrity of a degree at CUH effectively transforms and prepares its students.

***Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation***

By assessing program learning outcomes in students' capstone course portfolio submissions, CUH determines the degree to which mastery levels have been obtained. The institutional report noted how the standard for at least one mastery level was dropped to correspond with student performance rather than further exploring strategies to improve student learning. Campus representatives confirmed that CUH has not yet developed an evidence based assessment culture. For example, rather than utilize the institution's robust learning management system, outcomes data are recorded in spread sheets or explanatory narratives housed in each dean's office and are not reviewed by administrative leaders. As addressed in detail in Standard 2 above the team recommends the institution's faculty take collective responsibility for academic quality and assessment linking student work to measurable course and program learning outcomes (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, & 2.7). Additionally, it is recommended that CUH begin to broaden the implementation of benchmark and disaggregate data to better understand and identify unique student needs (CFRs 2.10 & 4.1).

***Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation***

Student learning data is difficult to discern due to the variability in learning outcomes development, links between course, program and institutional learning outcomes, and paucity of disaggregated demographic learning outcomes results. Freshman cohort retention rates for 2018 are posted on the university's disclosure pages at 79%, the highest rating over the past 5 years, up from a low of approximately 74% during that period. Persistence rates vary between second (81%), third (72%), fourth (72%), fifth (70%), and sixth (86%) year cohorts. Graduation rates, also listed in the university's website, show disaggregation by gender (6% point differences), race/ethnicity (28% point differences when correcting for small 'n's), and financial aid status (6 percentage point differences). Questions remain about the basis of rising retention and persistence, ranging from improved student services to compromised academic quality in some cases. Differential analysis of the measures between programs, comparing externally accredited programs to others, may help answer those questions, since external accreditors generally mandate mastery levels and analysis of disaggregated data.



***Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence***

CUH is implementing an ever-improving, robust 5-year program review plan, integrating faculty reflections on student learning and incorporating data elements such as retention, completion, and enrollment. Analysis and actions related to student learning data is necessarily limited by many of the current outcomes collection practices, the absence of formative data, and missing links between assignments, courses, and programs in some programs.

***Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment***

As previously mentioned, CUH has been very open and realistic about its financial challenges over the more recent years. The institution has worked hard to achieve financial stability over the past decade, but realizes its future depends on making the necessary changes to stabilize its traditional enrollments while developing new educational programs and other revenue streams to provide the financial resources necessary to support the educational and student experience. The university also realizes the source of its undergraduate students is a shrinking demographic and it must revise its messaging and outreach beyond this core group.

Its financial viability is not only dependent on enrollment, but also on cost control. New programs will need resources for development and start up before they become net resource positive. With the continuing upward pressure to provide more services and financial aid increases to meet enrollment targets, the institution could find itself in a more precarious situation, especially should enrollments fall short of targets. The senior administration is quite concerned about this and has built some contingency into the budget.

As with many small, private universities in the U.S., CUH is highly tuition dependent. It is proactively addressing the financial challenges it has experienced and will face in the future. Its new strategic plan speaks to these realities by laying out a roadmap to guide itself to more financial stability while maintaining its core mission and values. What remains to be seen is how rapidly these goals can be accomplished to provide the resources to achieve long-term financial sustainability.

***Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes – N/A***

***Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement***

CUH University of Honolulu is using the Marianist value of education for adaptation and change to address challenges facing the university itself. New presidential leadership is addressing the need for stronger visibility and engagement with the external community. The whole university, including the Board of Regents, recognizes the value and importance of this engagement and are doing their parts to respond and follow up as appropriate. The new strategic plan offers important direction and structure to CUH's plans for improvement; there is broad support for the directions addressed therein. Next steps include hard choices about prioritization to accomplish specific initiatives within the limited human and fiscal resources available.

The faculty and staff care deeply about the students and their progress; there is need to become more intentional and systematic in their approach to assessment. In many areas there are examples of outstanding pedagogical and assessment practices; these good examples need to be leveraged as models for other programs to adapt and apply as well. Another way of saying this is, clear authority needs to be exercised to ensure sufficient accountability at the individual faculty level to ensure there is accurate assessment based on measurable outcomes with obvious linkages to specific course assignments. The online program is undergoing substantial change; the team views the integration into regular university structures as an important first step. Academic leadership from faculty and deans to ensure strong pedagogical approaches are consistently used across online programs is essential.

The Board of Regents and administrative leadership have been vigilant about financial sustainability and the infrastructure requirements of a university; this attention must be maintained given the rapid changes occurring in higher education. The Board of Regents is encouraged to exercise the same kind of oversight for the academic enterprise as an important subset of its fiduciary responsibility. The team witnessed strong commitment across all stakeholders to the university, its mission, its students, and making the changes necessary to ensure its future. The trust and collaboration, based in the Marianist values, among stakeholders provides a strong foundation for future progress, as long as the desire for consensus and creativity does not impede the need for systemic progress and specific accountability.

### **SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE (such as Substantive Change)**

### **SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM**

#### **REVIEW**

##### ***Commendations***

The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and practices:

1. Commitment to and engagement in the reaffirmation process – well written report and investment as a community in moving the institution forward. The “voice” of the institution is clear.
2. Institutional focus on improvement and the need to be innovative in the challenging higher education environment. Faculty are encouraged to develop new programs that are responsive to community needs.
3. Ohana—strong sense of community and service in light of the university’s place, Marianist mission, and niche as a Native Hawaiian-Serving institution. Strong identification with the local business and cultural community, with outreach led by the new president. Institutional sense of trust and collaboration.
4. Recognition by administrative leadership for the need for support for pedagogy and assessment, including the creation of the Center for Teaching and Learning.
5. Positive impact on retention rates, specifically for Pell students, first generation students, and Native Hawaiian students.
6. Progress to attain financial stability with transparency and honesty regarding fiscal challenges, enrollment, and institutional vulnerabilities. Success with federal grants. Establishment of a new, more collaborative approach to the budget process.
7. Development and initiation of a new strategic plan, which unifies institutional vision and direction.

##### ***Recommendations***

The Team recommends that:

1. CUH continues and deepens the implementation of its strategic plan, with particular attention to the following areas:
  - a. Prioritization of initiatives, including analysis of the costs required to achieve each specific initiative;
  - b. Provision of adequate resources and clear linkage to new budget process;

- c. Ongoing monitoring based on clearly identified key performance indicators and periodic reflection and reevaluation of progress (CFRs 3.7 & 4.6).
- 2. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for academic quality and assessment, with appropriate accountability, supported by necessary institutional expertise and guidance. Assessments of student work require linkage to measurable course and program learning outcomes (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, & 2.7).
- 3. In order to further support the academic offerings, the institution is encouraged to improve the quality of the online learning by:
  - a. Prioritizing the integration of effective instructional design elements;
  - b. Establishing clear processes for periodic review of the application of the institutional credit hour policy, especially with respect to online courses, to ensure that credit hour assignments are accurate and reliable;
  - c. Ensuring consistent interaction between students, and between students and the faculty; and
  - d. Providing technology resources that are sufficient in scope and quality (CFR 2.1, 3.5, WSCUC Distance Education Policy, WSCUC Distance Education and Technology-Mediated Instruction Policy, and WSCUC Credit Hour Policy).
- 4. CUH moves from exemplars to broad implementation of benchmark data, disaggregating data by multiple student demographics to identify unique student needs, and generating data-informed decisions across academic and administrative units (CFRs 2.10 & 4.1).
- 5. CUH continues to improve upon the new budget process for the best use of limited resources and continues to monitor financial stability (CFR 3.4).
- 6. CUH ensures faculty and staff are sufficient in numbers needed to uphold academic excellence, support the success of students, and achieve the mission, strategic plan, and direction of the institution, especially when approaching reallocation of resources (CFR 3.1).
- 7. The Board of Regents strengthen the exercise of its responsibility to provide oversight and accountability of the academic enterprise, sharpened by periodic evaluation of its own effectiveness (CFR 3.9 and WSCUC Governing Board Policy).

## **APPENDICES**

1. Federal Compliance Forms
  - a. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
  - b. Marketing and Recruitment Review
  - c. Student Complaints Review
  - d. Transfer Credit Review
2. Distance Education Review

## Federal Compliance Forms

### 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? Catalogs – Undergraduate p. 44 Graduate p. 26
	Comments: Explanation of credit hours and work/time expectations not typically described in syllabi
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uncertain.
	Comments: Deans are responsible for reviewing courses and application of policies. Details for systematic review of credit hour practices was not provided.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Little doubt here from schedule and syllabi that Chaminade abides by a strict class schedule.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for <b>online and hybrid courses</b> <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 15
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Mainly online.
	What degree level(s)? Undergraduate (10 courses); Graduate (5 Courses). Randomly selected from the list of available online courses.
	What discipline(s)? Representative of all programs
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Mostly YES. A few seemed to allow excessive student self-pacing.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4
	What kinds of courses? Labs and Internship courses
	What degree level(s)? Undergraduate
	What discipline(s)? Physics, Communication, Business
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Impressed that these courses are exacting on work and hours. Chaminade has strong lab and internship course requirements.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 10 Randomly selected
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Traditional Day Classes from Fall 2018 and Spring 2019
	What degree level(s)? Undergraduate
	What discipline(s)? Accounting; Business; Communication; Economics/Philosophy/Religion; English; Environmental Science; History; Physics; Psychology

	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: R. Reynolds  
Date: 3.8.19

## 2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Available on website
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Available through career center

Review Completed By: H. Fong  
Date: 3.8.19

### 3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where?            Harassment/Title IX Policy in Student Handbook, p. 15  <a href="https://studentaffairs.chaminade.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/28/2018-19-NEW-STUDENT-HANDBOOK.pdf">https://studentaffairs.chaminade.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/28/2018-19-NEW-STUDENT-HANDBOOK.pdf</a>            Academic Grievance Policy in Catalog, p. 56  <a href="https://registrar.chaminade.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2018-2019-Undergraduate-Catalog.pdf">https://registrar.chaminade.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2018-2019-Undergraduate-Catalog.pdf</a></p> <p>Comments:            Informal complaints, such as those about service in an office, are typically directed to the Dean of Students.</p> <p>Student Affairs has referral guide for how to handle a variety of issues, including complaints: <a href="https://studentaffairs.chaminade.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/28/CUH-Student-Referral-Guide-Div-of-Student-Affairs-1.7.19.pdf">https://studentaffairs.chaminade.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/28/CUH-Student-Referral-Guide-Div-of-Student-Affairs-1.7.19.pdf</a></p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:            Present complaint to faculty member or dean or VP HR, depending on nature of complaint.            Investigation as appropriate.            Resolution and/or appeal.            Documentation.</p> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:            Appear to follow procedure and close the loop as appropriate with students.</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO            If so, where? Office of Dean of Students</p> <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO            If so, please describe briefly:            Electronic database of student concerns and complaints</p> <p>Comments:            Institution is in process of consolidating a couple different sets of files that existed previously into the single electronic database.            Clear attention to having a records system that can be accessed as needed for patterns of concern.</p>

Review Completed By: J. Greig  
 Date: 3.7.19



#### **4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM**

Under federal regulations\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</b>
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where?
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:  The policy is easily searchable, comprehensive, understandable, and helpful.

Review Completed By: C. Carter  
Date: 3.8.19

#### ***Distance Education Review - CUH Review***

Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Courses Reviewed:

1. American Civil War Era
2. Capstone Criminal Justice
3. Ch. for the Concerned World
4. Comparative Gov't & Politics
5. Elementary Lang Arts Methods I
6. Elementary Math Methods II
7. Elementary Science Methods
8. Essentials of Eng. Composition
9. Ethical & Professional Issues
10. General Psychology
11. Introductory Algebra
12. Learning Environments
13. Non-For-Profit Organizations
14. Pre-Modern Pacific Islands
15. Western Academic Education

Materials examined:

Chaminade provided site visitors with access to a subset of online courses as noted in entry #1 above. Access included course schedules, weekly modules, syllabi and handouts, discussion threads, and select attendance material.

Related Interviews:

Student services representatives  
Distance learning advisors  
Deans  
Faculty  
Associate Provost and Provost

### Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	Institutional mission elements are integrated into course assignments and modeled by faculty.	Identify discrete measurable learning goals linked to mission elements. Collect and analyze outcomes data for those goals. Consider formative assessment options.
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Dedicated counselors establish communication with distance education students to ensure their access to university services. Campus events are not posted in an online calendar.	Consider opportunities for online students to enjoy campus activities, such as by virtual participation.
<i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	A small subset of courses benefit from full use of the learning platform infrastructure. In general pedagogical technology integration is lean across courses.	Improve faculty skills to employ effective online learning techniques through required professional development events. Establish authority and accountability trails.  Monitor (audit) online courses to identify and intervene when faculty to student and student to student interactions are missing or lean.

<i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	The learning platform provides 24/7 support and CUH offers additional support. Evidentiary data was not available.	Provide evidentiary data for the adequacy and effectiveness of advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support, and other services.
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	Full time and adjunct faculty teach online but online certification is not required and professional development is not mandated.	Establish and monitor minimum standards for faculty online expertise and professional development
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	Each discipline establishes program level outcomes and deans are responsible for quality. It is unclear who monitors course outcomes. Data is not disaggregated to compare between distance and campus delivery modalities.	Establish and monitor disaggregated learning outcome data to compare modalities as well as student demographic groups within and across modalities.
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	Retention and graduation data were not disaggregated between learning modalities.	Establish and monitor disaggregated graduation and retention data across learning modalities.
<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	Learning outcomes are assessed in summative capstone courses for both online and campus programs. Differences between modalities are not available.	Establish and monitor disaggregated learning outcomes to compare distance and campus based courses.
<i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport		

with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i> ?		
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	CUH relies primarily upon surveys such as the NSSE for qualitative feedback but has not tapped adult student feedback. Learning outcomes data does not disaggregate for distance learning.	Establish and monitor modality specific data collection to determine online learning effectiveness.  Consider population specific surveys such as the ASPS

Review Completed By: C. Carter & R. Reynolds  
Date: 3.12.19