

## **REPORT OF THE WASC SPECIAL VISIT TEAM**

**To: Brigham Young University - Hawaii**

**Date of visit:**

March 29 - 30, 2012

**Team Roster:**

Arthur G. Holder – Chair

Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Graduate Theological Union

Melanie Booth – Assistant Chair

Dean of Learning and Assessment, Marylhurst University

Kristine L. Chase – Member

Professor of Economics and Graduate Business

Saint Mary's College of California

Lisa A. Kramer – Member

Director of Assessment and Evaluation

Golden Gate University

Richard Winn – WASC Staff Liaison

Vice President, WASC

The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. 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 WASC website.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SECTION</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT</b>	3
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	3
B. The Institution's Special Visit Report: Quality of the Report and Supporting Evidence	5
C. Description of the Team's Review Process	6
<b>SECTION II: EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS</b>	7
A. Issue: Financial Priorities	7
B. Issue: Assessment of Student Learning	14
C. Issue: Faculty Scholarship	18
<b>SECTION III: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	22
<b>APPENDIX – Credit Hour Worksheet</b>	25

## **SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

### **A. Description of the Institution and Visit**

Brigham Young University-Hawaii (BYU-Hawaii) is a small comprehensive university located in Laie, Hawaii. Owned and operated by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (LDS Church), BYU-Hawaii was founded in 1955 as a two-year school known as Church College of Hawaii. It became a four-year school in 1961 and received its present name in 1974.

BYU-Hawaii is part of a three-campus system governed by a Board of Trustees who are general officers of the LDS Church; the other institutions are BYU-Idaho and BYU-Provo. The university's mission is "to integrate both spiritual and secular learning, and to prepare students with character and integrity who can provide leadership in their families, their communities, their chosen fields, and in building the kingdom of God." The student body at BYU-Hawaii comprises 2,784 undergraduates from 78 different countries, with 49.5% coming from the Asia-Pacific area (including Hawaii), which is the university's primary mission area. Many students (42.6%) are international, with 37.8% coming from the university's international Asia-Pacific target area. In fall 2011 there were 124 full-time and 126 part-time faculty. IPEDS data from 2010-11 showed an overall student/faculty ratio of 16.8.

Since the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) in 2008, the university's academic departments have been reorganized into four colleges of approximately equal size (Business, Computing and Government; Human Development; Language, Culture and Arts; Math and Sciences) offering a total of 25 different majors leading to the degrees of BA, BS, BFA (Fine Arts) and BSW (Social Work). In October 2009 the

WASC Commission approved proposals for two new degree programs: an Associate of Arts and Science, and an Associate of Science in Business Management. The school's 2011-12 catalog also describes a new Bachelor of University Studies degree that was reported to WASC in 2009 but was not mentioned in the institution's Special Visit Report.

BYU-Hawaii has been accredited by WASC as a four-year institution since 1961. The last accreditation cycle concluded in June 2008 with the Commission's action to reaffirm accreditation, schedule a Capacity and Preparatory Review for spring 2017 and an Educational Effectiveness Review for fall 2018, and require a Special Visit in spring 2012 regarding three issues:

- 1) Financial Priorities: Ensuring that the institution's newly articulated imperatives (to increase the overall quality of education, and increase total number of students without additional church funding) have not compromised educational effectiveness in terms of their impact on class size, faculty recruitment, faculty research, use of online instruction, and continued support for assessment activities.
- 2) Assessment of Student Learning: Continued work on assessment, including complete implementation of appropriate student learning outcomes, program review for all departments, assessment of general education competencies, and use of assessment data to improve learning.
- 3) Faculty Scholarship: Continued development of the definition of faculty standards for various forms of scholarship such as those identified by Ernest Boyer

(discovery, integration, engagement, teaching), and the implications of those clarified standards for faculty retention, development, and promotion.

### **B. The Institution's Special Visit Report: Quality of the Report and Supporting Evidence**

The Special Visit Report submitted by BYU-Hawaii was appropriately organized in relation to the three concerns expressed by the WASC Commission. The report itself was primarily presented in narrative format, describing actions taken since the EER visit and reporting on conclusions drawn from assessment activities and the institution's self-analysis. Supporting documentation was presented in twelve appendices and six tables, supplemented by an extensive array of materials made available to the team on the school's website (and for the most part readily accessible to the general public).

The team was informed that the principal authors of the report were the Associate Academic Vice President with responsibility for Institutional Effectiveness (who is also the Accreditation Liaison Officer), the Director of University Assessment and Testing, and the chair of the Faculty Advisory Council. Other administrative and academic leaders contributed information for the report, which was reviewed by the President's Council, Academic Council, Faculty Advisory Council, and Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Steering Committee.

Nearly a third of the report was devoted to an account of the current administration's initiatives to improve the quality of teaching and learning, decrease costs, and increase the number of students served. The team found this background information helpful in understanding the very significant changes that BYU-Hawaii has made in the last four years. At the same time, the team noted that some of the changes are

still quite recent, and others are not yet complete. For example, between 2008 and 2010, total FTE enrollment grew from 2,269 to 2,740 (an increase of 21%). The university plans to add more than 2,000 additional students over the course of the next several years. As a result, the school's evaluation of the effects of those changes is at this stage necessarily preliminary.

### **C. Description of the Team's Review Process**

The team received the Special Visit Report on February 7, 2012 and discussed it on a conference call on February 21, 2012. While on campus for the Special Visit on March 29-30, the team met with the President (by videoconference), Academic Vice President, Vice Presidents for Administration and Construction and Facilities Management, President's Council, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee, Academic Council, University Assessment Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee, General Education Committee, and small groups of representative faculty and students. The team was also able to examine some additional documentation made available by the institution such as the Master Plan for facilities development and a ten-year projection of enrollment, personnel, and budget figures. The team appreciated the professionalism and attention to detail that was evident throughout the school's preparation for the visit, and the generous hospitality extended to them during their time on the university campus.

## **SECTION II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS**

### **A. Financial Priorities**

In its June 2008 Action Letter, the Commission identified financial priorities as an area of concern. At that time, BYU-Hawaii had just been reminded by the LDS Church that the benefaction from the Church should be reduced to 70% of operating costs from a level of over 80%. At the time of the EER visit, BYU-Hawaii was considering a number of specific strategies to reduce operating costs and the need for support from the LDS church. These strategies included increasing student-faculty ratios and class sizes, using more online delivery of courses, and reducing support for faculty research. The Commission observed the following: “it is unclear how the institution will balance these financial priorities without compromising its historically strong educational experience for underserved and financially limited students (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 3.5). The institution will need to demonstrate that it can, in fact, strike an effective balance between these potentially competing priorities.” In response, the Special Visit Report specifically detailed, as listed below, some of the various strategies now being used to reduce LDS church costs per student.

- A new Master Plan includes the goal of doubling the size of BYU-Hawaii over the next ten years. The principle driving the plan is that a larger institution can achieve economies of scale in several areas, as well as broaden its mission outreach.
- The academic calendar has been compressed from two semesters and two summer terms to three semesters (fall, winter, summer). Most students are required to

complete their education within nine semesters, and the University is able to use its facilities and staff more efficiently.

- A "culture of stewardship" has been developed, evidenced by an academic and administrative reorganization as well as institution-wide budget reductions and a temporary hiring freeze (now expired) for non-faculty employees, among other specific initiatives.
- Tuition has been raised over 20% since 2007-08 (not including an adjustment for health insurance now being packaged with tuition).
- Online courses have grown exponentially from the last visit and now comprise 10% of all credit hours taken by both on-campus and distance students.
- Faculty contracts have been redesigned so that the increase in courses taught each academic year is covered by overloads paid at a lower per course rate. This arrangement (required for faculty not in continuing status and optional for those who are) enables faculty to augment their annual income and the University to reduce costs.

Addressing Commission concerns that the above strategies might negatively impact the mission of the institution and quality of the educational experience, BYU-Hawaii provides in the Special Visit Report various types of evidence that it not only is successfully pursuing its mission using the above strategies, but is also expanding it. Applications to BYU-Hawaii have risen significantly, cumulative GPAs have not been impacted by the compressed calendar, and there is some evidence that the marketability of BYU-Hawaii degrees continues to improve (a particularly important goal for the international students). Financial aid has increased in dollar terms, keeping up with the



increased enrollment. The online courses have made access to a BYU-Hawaii degree easier for international students and the Report provides assessment results showing that the online English courses have not negatively impacted the English language competency of international students.

During the visit, the team focused on obtaining additional evidence that BYU-Hawaii was continuing to achieve both its financial and mission-based priorities. The team reviewed the last two years' audited financial statements as well as data exhibits provided with the report, which revealed student/faculty ratios, class size, faculty composition (full-time and part-time), and student learning. Overall, the team's impression is that BYU-Hawaii is an institution that is financially healthy, but is undergoing a significant transition in its financial profile that has created some challenges (CFR 3.5). As BYU-Hawaii notes in the Report, this is a situation not unlike that experienced by many institutions during the recent financial crisis. The team recommends that as BYU-Hawaii continues to implement its plan for enrollment growth, it pay careful attention to the effect on the institution's culture of stewardship, intimate sense of community, and ability to meet the emerging needs of its students, staff, faculty, and facilities.

BYU-Hawaii's Special Visit Report acknowledges that the changes have not come without stress on the faculty, staff, and students. As noted below, the team found that some of the strategies to reduce expenses have had serious, though perhaps unintended, consequences. Of particular concern to the team was the impact of compressing the academic calendar. Reflecting good practice, BYU-Hawaii conducted careful surveys of faculty and students about the new calendar (CFRs 4.6, 4.7). Survey

responses from students were mixed at best, and faculty expressed significant concern over their ability to present academic material effectively. In response, BYU-Hawaii has again revised the calendar, with the new version to start in winter 2012. However, the basic compressed structure remains, and it clearly has had significant impact on the ability for the BYU-Hawaii student population to successfully complete the existing curriculum. A key reason for this impact is that, in order to induce students to finish their studies expeditiously and make room for new students to benefit from the educational mission, BYU-Hawaii now requires students to finish their degrees within nine semesters (including at least one summer semester) over four years (three years for those on the IWORK financial aid program). Students can petition for an exception to be allowed an additional semester to complete their studies, in which case they are still eligible for campus housing and financial aid. Though many students may be able to comply with the above restrictions, this is particularly difficult for international students who make up approximately 50% of the student population. Those students who participate in the IWORK program are obligated to work 19 hours/week during terms, and 40 hours/week between terms.

The team recommends that BYU-Hawaii re-evaluate the 9 semesters in residence academic model to ensure that the compressed and accelerated learning format is actually serving the student population. Currently, the rigidity of the structure significantly constrains students' options, potentially negatively impacts student learning and preparedness, and appears to be contradictory to the BYU-Hawaii Framework for Student Learning. Furthermore, the team recommends that BYU-Hawaii ensure that both prospective and current students are better informed through advising processes about the

need for careful academic planning in addition to the rationale for curricular requirements. The combined effect of the compressed calendar, the need for students to work substantial hours, a lack of communication and support for careful degree planning, and students' varying levels of preparation prior to entry has resulted in a considerable number of students who have been unable to successfully finish their declared major programs.

In order to provide a way for such students to graduate with a degree, BYU-Hawaii has created a "Bachelor of University Studies" degree. This degree is not based on a traditional academic program, but on the completion of 120 credit hours, with only a loosely defined structure requiring 12 credits in each of two or more "clusters" (which are not defined) or minors. As the team heard it described by a senior academic administrator, the degree was designed as an "exit strategy" for students who are challenged by the new calendar and completion restrictions. As of the visit, this degree is now the second most-awarded degree at BYU-Hawaii, comprising 9% of degrees awarded in the 2010-11 academic year.

The team believes that the University Studies degree, though not officially presented as part of the current financial strategy, is an ill-conceived attempt to deal with some of that strategy's unintended negative effects on student success rates. When the team asked senior administrators and faculty leaders about the process by which the new degree was developed, the response was that it had been proposed and quickly implemented by academic administration without extensive faculty consultation (CFR 2.4). Based on the minimal half-page description of the program in the university's catalog and interviews with academic administrators and faculty during the visit, the team

is very concerned that this degree program is not clearly defined in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits (CFR 2.2), does not require students to engage in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study (CFR 2.2a), and does not require significant study in depth in a given area of knowledge (guideline for CFR 2.2a). Since this new degree is not associated with any particular department or supervising academic unit and does not comprise a coherent set of course requirements, it would be virtually impossible to develop assessable outcomes for this degree (CFR 2.3).

In addition, during the visit, students and faculty expressed deep concern about the academic integrity and rigor of this degree, which they described as a kind of “consolation prize” for students whose advisors judged them incapable of completing the requirements of a departmental major, or who could not afford to finance an additional semester if needed to complete their programs, or who did not receive adequate advisement concerning the careful selection of courses necessary for them to complete their intended major within the nine semester limit. Nearly all of the faculty and students interviewed by the team expressed a fear that the Bachelor of University Studies was a “worthless degree” that would not be appreciated by potential employers and that would over time devalue the reputation of the entire school.

Based on the above information, the team strongly recommends that if the Bachelor of University Studies is to be continued, BYU-Hawaii should demonstrate that the implementation of this degree program provides for:

- 1) Clear definition of the expected level of student achievement and requires engagement in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study (CFR 2.2);
- 2) Clearly stated student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment at the program level (CFR 2.3);
- 3) A plan for systematic program review including analyses of the achievement of the program's stated student learning outcomes, program retention and completion, and evidence that graduates are being effectively prepared for future employment or further study (CFR 2.7);
- 4) A designated core of faculty who exercise oversight over the design, delivery, review, and improvement of this degree program (CFR 2.4).

The team identified two additional concerns that will require ongoing assessment by both the institution and by future WASC teams. The first is the sustainability of the "culture of stewardship." Many of the cost reduction initiatives have increased stresses on both faculty and students. New full-time faculty are required to carry the augmented load, and the impact of this increased teaching expectation will not be seen until these faculty come up for review for continuing faculty status and eventual promotion. While BYU-Hawaii notes that current faculty continue to participate in professional development, those same faculty have, on average, a lower teaching load (CFRs 3.3, 3.4). Further, as mentioned earlier, international students continue to be required to work 19 hours a week in the IWORK program.

The third concern for future assessment is the new Master Plan, which proposes increasing enrollment to 5,000 as well as a very significant expansion of the physical

plant. Though the Special Visit Report notes the importance of this new direction, and the University has developed a matrix showing the basic forecasts for key operational benchmarks over the next ten years, there is still little in the way of specific plans for how BYU-Hawaii is going to accommodate such rapid growth. The details of the plan, in terms of student support, staffing, facilities, financial goals, etc. should already be in place, given the University's trajectory at the moment (CFRs 4.2, 4.3).

Just as importantly, BYU-Hawaii needs carefully to consider the potential impact on campus culture of a doubling in size of the student body. Throughout the visit, the team was impressed by faculty and student comments that emphasized the value of close personal interactions between faculty and students. A question for the institution is whether this culture can be maintained with a much larger population and physical environment.

## **B. Assessment of Student Learning**

In its Commission Action Letter dated June 30, 2008, the Commission requested that BYU--Hawaii consider the following with respect to its assessment and program review work:

- 1) Sustain work in assessing critical thinking and writing skills within the GE curriculum and extend the work to cover other core competencies;
- 2) Renew efforts to deploy assessment at a uniformly high level across all departments and units (with the Commission noting that some initiatives may have experienced a loss of focus and momentum since 2006);
- 3) Ensure key assessment findings are integrated into program or unit reviews;

- 4) Develop a systematic process for incorporating results from program reviews into departmental planning and into strategic planning structures as appropriate; and
- 5) Strive to ensure assessable learning outcomes are included in course syllabi.

A review of the Special Visit Report, an examination of annual assessment and program review reports and syllabi, and discussions with the Assessment Committee, the General Education Committee, and faculty and staff during the Special Visit suggest progress has been made in all areas noted by the Commission. Notably, the "BYU-Hawaii Framework for Student Learning" developed since the EER visit in 2008 is not only a good presentation of some fundamentals of learning theory in higher education, but the process of its development also appears to have been a consultative process involving many different constituencies across the institution.

Per the Program Review Schedule posted on the university website, and the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (Appendix A of the Special Visit Report), it appears that subsequent to the visit in 2008, academic programs have consistently planned on, and followed through with, conducting annual assessments and program reviews (CFRs 2.3, 2.7).

The Special Visit Report states that in 2008, one-third of programs had completed an annual learning assessment (called an "annual assessment plan"), and that in 2010, nearly two-thirds of academic programs had completed assessments with findings and actions. Annual assessment reports found at the assessment website support the claim that participation in annual assessment is continuing to expand, that programs are engaged,

that appropriate assessment methods are being used, and that assessment is leading to the identification of opportunities for improving student learning. A review of a sample of annual assessment reports posted at the website and conversations with faculty suggest this is true. Not only do programs consider annual assessment findings in their program reviews, some programs openly acknowledge when assessment methodology failed to yield the desired insight and indicate how future assessment work will be improved. Furthermore, an examination of a sample of recently completed program review reports suggests programs are doing a better job of integrating assessment findings into program review.

There is evidence that co-curricular programs and administrative services are involved in assessment as well (CFR 2.11), in part because these units recognize that their work contributes to student learning and in part because so many students work in these areas. It is admirable that the university sees students' work at the university as learning opportunities that should be assessed. The University Assessment Committee provides education and support to university programs undertaking assessment and meets regularly to share ideas with one another. It is comprised of representatives from each College along with representation from student services and administrative services, helping to ensure that the culture of assessment is developed across the university and not only in academic departments. These are good practices and are in accord with the Commission's recommendation.

The university's program review guidelines were revised in April 2009. Per the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, eleven academic programs conducted program reviews in 2009-2012. This suggests the institution has progressed in its



implementation of a university-wide program review processes. The Special Visit Report states that student learning has become more central to the program review process and that departments include annual and multi-year assessment plans with their self-study report. Discussions with staff and faculty indicate all academic programs understand they must undergo review, and the Program Review Schedule is posted publicly. The new program review guidelines indicate that changes to the program that will require additional resources will be considered in the budget planning process. The Special Visit Report states that assessment and program review results “are part of the university annual stewardship and budget review processes.” Conversations with faculty and senior administrators suggest programs are engaging in program review self-studies in accord with the new guidance and stated expectations. A review of a sample of self-studies completed in recent years (e.g., completed by the Department of Religious Education, International Cultural Studies and Accounting), and conversations with faculty and staff suggest program reviews are leading to findings with planning and budget implications (CFR 4.6).

A review of a sample of course syllabi shows that some syllabi have excellent course-level student learning outcomes and other syllabi do not have any student learning outcomes (CFR 2.3). In some instances, program-level (not course-level) learning outcomes are listed on syllabi. The university should continue working toward ensuring all syllabi contain measurable student learning outcomes for each class, and that course-level outcomes align with program-level outcomes. Faculty who do not yet articulate learning outcomes in their syllabi should be encouraged to do so.

Conversations with the General Education Committee indicated that recent

program review efforts resulted in a decision to completely revise the GE program. The General Education Committee is considering new GE requirements quite thoughtfully and inclusively, and continues to assess students' critical thinking skills as it defines the new requirements. Thus while the university has not fulfilled the Commission's recommendation exactly as stated, the work that is being done to design a new GE degree program is commendable (CFRs 2.2a, 2.3).

Overall, the institution has made good progress in building a culture of learning assessment and using findings for student learning and program improvement. BYU-Hawaii should continue to focus on advancing its learning assessment and program review processes, including the incorporation of clear and measurable learning outcomes in course syllabi.

### **C. Faculty Scholarship**

In its report on the EER visit in 2008, the EER visiting team expressed concern that the ability of the BYU-Hawaii faculty to pursue scholarly research would be threatened by the university's implementation of its plans for increasing annual teaching loads for most faculty from 30 hours to 36 hours under the terms of an "augmented contract," by revising the academic calendar in order to provide for a full summer semester, and by increasing the student/faculty ratio. The WASC Commission expressed the same concern in 2008 and further noted that "the institution needs to be clear how it is defining faculty scholarship in its academic policies, and how it is using such definitions in its decisions about faculty development and promotion."

The institution's 2012 Special Visit Report states that BYU-Hawaii "has made a clear decision to put more focus on teaching and student learning, and less on traditional

academic research.” During the team’s campus visit, the President described this shift not as a new departure but as a return to the original mission of this campus within the BYU system, in which BYU-Provo is designated as the research university while the Idaho and Hawaii campuses are to be teaching institutions dedicated exclusively to undergraduate education. While BYU-Hawaii has continued to pursue its plan to put more emphasis on teaching and less on research and publication, it has taken some important steps to mitigate or prevent some potentially negative effects of that shift:

- 1) A new “BYU-Hawaii Faculty and Administration Communication Plan” provides opportunities for faculty to meet with administrators on a regular basis, with time for question and answer sessions.
- 2) A new “Faculty Professional Development Policy” invites faculty to apply for an annual 3-credit hour course release, a second 3-credit hour course release every third year, and a paid professional development leave of one, two, or three semesters every six years.
- 3) A newly revised document entitled “Continuing Faculty Status and Rank Expectations for Faculty Members” clearly states standards for teaching, scholarship and creative work (with reference to Boyer’s four modes of scholarship), and service to the institution. The same document provides a detailed step-by-step description of the processes of applying for Continuing Faculty Status (comparable to tenure) and for advancement in rank.

The visiting team commends BYU-Hawaii for these efforts to clarify expectations for faculty and enhance trust through communication and transparency.

The team's conversations with faculty indicated that there is widespread support for BYU-Hawaii's emphasis on teaching, but mixed reactions to the recent policy changes that the administration has adopted on the basis of that emphasis. Some faculty – especially those who have come from other institutions where there was no support for research at all – expressed appreciation for the opportunity to apply for course releases and professional development leaves. Other faculty reported that increased teaching loads are making it difficult for them to keep up with current developments in their fields to the extent necessary for them to be effective teachers. Some faculty who are on the augmented contract (either because it is required of faculty who have not attained continuing faculty status, or because faculty need the additional income to support their families) noted that the only time available for them to pursue research and publication is late at night or during the five week summer vacation period. Some of those faculty were not aware of the new policies providing for course releases and professional development leaves, while others noted that in their cases the policies would not be effective because there were no other departmental faculty or adjuncts with the requisite competence who could take over the teaching of required courses for which they are responsible.

Both faculty and administrators alike acknowledged to the team that the real test of the clarified expectations for full-time faculty will come when those revised policies are used to evaluate current and future faculty as they become eligible for continuing faculty status and advancement in rank. The team recommends that BYU-Hawaii continue its efforts to publicize and explain the new policies regarding faculty development and criteria for continuing faculty status and rank advancement, and begin

now to develop means of evaluating the effectiveness of those policies in the coming years (CFRs 2.8, 2.9).

## **SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Commendations**

The visiting team commends BYU-Hawaii on the following:

1. The General Education Committee is considering new GE requirements quite thoughtfully and inclusively, and continues to assess students' critical thinking skills as it defines the new requirements. The General Education Committee has followed up on a recent program review by developing a thoughtful and inclusive process for a possible redesign of the General Education program.
2. Faculty have a deep and abiding commitment to their students' academic success and their personal and professional development.
3. The institution as a whole has taken the recommendation to strategically address financial issues to heart, as evidenced in the major restructuring of the academic calendar and efforts to encourage students to complete their degrees in a timely fashion.
4. The diversity of BYU-Hawaii's student body and the strong international focus in the curriculum provide a rich and relevant environment for student learning.
5. In response to concerns expressed by the prior WASC visiting team and the 2008 Commission letter, the institution has developed new policies and revised existing policies in order to clarify expectations for faculty workload and the criteria for attaining continuing faculty status and advancement in rank.
6. The institution has made good progress in building a culture of learning assessment and using findings for student learning and program improvement.

7. The "BYU-Hawaii Framework for Student Learning" developed since the EER visit in 2008 is not only a good presentation of some fundamentals of learning theory in higher education, but the process of its development also appears to have been a consultative process involving many different constituencies across the institution.

## **Recommendations**

The visiting team recommends the following:

1. BYU-Hawaii should reconsider its decision to offer the Bachelor of University Studies. If the Bachelor of University Studies is to be continued, BYU-Hawaii should demonstrate that this degree program provides for a clear definition of the expected level of student achievement and requires engagement in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study (CFR 2.2); possesses clearly stated student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment at the program level (CFR 2.3); and will be subject to a carefully planned systematic program review including analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and evidence that graduates are being effectively prepared for future employment or further study (CFR 2.7). The institution should also ensure that a designated core of faculty exercise oversight over the design, delivery, review, and improvement of this degree program if it is to be continued (CFR 2.4).
2. BYU-Hawaii should re-evaluate the 9 semester / 3-year degree academic model to ensure that the compressed and accelerated learning environment is actually serving the student population. Currently, the rigidity of the structure significantly

constrains students' options, potentially negatively impacts student learning and preparedness, and appears to be contradictory to the BYU-Hawaii Framework for Student Learning.

3. BYU-Hawaii should ensure that both prospective and current students are better informed through advising processes about the need for careful academic planning in addition to the rationale for curricular requirements.
4. As BYU-Hawaii continues to implement its plan for enrollment growth, it should pay careful attention to the effect on the institution's culture of stewardship, intimate sense of community, and ability to meet the emerging needs of its students, staff, faculty, and facilities.
5. BYU-Hawaii should continue its efforts to publicize and explain the new policies regarding faculty development and criteria for continuing faculty status and rank advancement, and begin now to develop means of evaluating the effectiveness of those policies in the coming years.
6. BYU-Hawaii should continue to focus on advancing its learning assessment and program review processes, including the incorporation of clear and measurable learning outcomes in course syllabi.



## APPENDIX A

### CREDIT HOUR REVIEW

Institution: BYU-Hawaii  
 Type of Visit: Special Visit  
 Date: March 29 – 30, 2012

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?	YES
	Comments: <i>Responsive to the various forms of delivery provided.</i>	
Process(es)/ periodic review	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)?	YES
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	YES
	Comments: <i>Reviewed at time of new course approval and again during Program Review.</i>	
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?	YES
	Comments: <i>Institution schedules 60-minute class sessions for 14 weeks, resulting in more instructional time than 50-minutes for 15 weeks.</i>	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? <i>BOTH</i> How many syllabi were reviewed? <i>12</i> What degree level(s)? <i>BA</i> What discipline(s)? <i>Education, Sports Science, Math, English</i>	
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	YES
	Comments:	
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)	What kinds of courses? <i>Labs, Private Music Instruction, Student Teaching, Practicum, Studio (Art)</i> How many syllabi were reviewed? <i>12</i> What degree level(s)? <i>BA</i> What discipline(s)? <i>Art, Chemistry, Education, Music, Social Work, Biology</i>	
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	YES
	Comments:	