

REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM

ACCREDITATION REVIEW

The University of Hawai'i Maui College

April 2 – 4, 2014

Team Roster

Paul Gaston, Trustees Professor, Kent State University
(Team Chair)

Geoffrey Chase, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, San Diego State University
(Assistant Chair)

Mary Boyce, Interim Provost, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science

Willard Lewallen, Superintendent & President, Hartnell Community College District

Maureen Maloney, Vice President, WSCUC
(WSCUC Institutional Liaison)

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 WASC Senior College and University Commission 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.

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

I.	Overview and Context	3
	A. Description of the Institution and the Reaccreditation Process.....	3
	B. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor.....	4
	C. Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission actions and Reviews.....	5
II.	Evaluation of Progress.....	7
	A. Retention and Student Success.....	7
	B. Program Review and Assessment.....	14
	C. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement.....	16
	D. Ensuring Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness in the Future.....	19
III.	Evaluation of Electronic Exhibit Portfolio	21
IV.	Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations from the Team Review	22
V.	Appendices.....	26
	A. Off-Site Programs and Distance Education.....	26
	B. UHMC Accreditation Visit Interview and Meeting Descriptions.....	32
	C. Credit Hour Program Length.....	37
	D. Student Complaints Review – Team Report.....	39
	E. Marketing and Recruitment Review – Team Report.....	42

I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and the Reaccreditation Process

University of Hawai‘i Maui College (UHMC) is part of the University of Hawai‘i (UH) system, a post-secondary education system, and is one of the system’s seven community colleges and one of the system’s four baccalaureate degree-granting institutions. UHMC is the only postsecondary institution in the three islands of Maui, Moloka‘i, and Lāna‘i Lāna‘i that comprise Maui County and it has the responsibility of providing an affordable, quality education to the citizens of the county and the state.

UHMC is the only public, open-admission institution among those located in California and Hawai‘i that grants certificates, two-year degrees, and bachelor of applied science degrees (3). Furthermore, UHMC University Center brokers baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate degree programs in partnership with University of Hawai‘i Mānoa, University of Hawai‘i Hilo, University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu, and Oregon State University.

The role the campus plays as a two-year institution offering select baccalaureate degrees with accreditation granted through the WASC Senior College and University Commission places the College in a unique situation that poses challenges different from those facing most institutions undergoing the accreditation process. Based on county-wide community needs assessments and focus groups conducted in 2001, Maui Community College (Maui CC) began its transition into a four-year degree granting institution. The list of selected actions included in Appendix B outlines the accreditation history beginning with the first baccalaureate in Applied Business and Information Technology (ABIT).

As noted, UHMC also has centers on Lāna‘i and Moloka‘i, and in Lahaina and Hana on Maui. Students at these centers interact with faculty in face-to-face, interactive

videoconferencing and online modalities, synchronous and asynchronous. Students at UHMC also have the opportunity to take part in online classes offered by other campuses in the University of Hawai'i System. Additional evaluative information regarding UHMC's online and distance efforts are included in Appendix A.

UHMC's record of continuous institutional accreditation through the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) provides a strong track record in terms of its previous plans and accomplishments in the area of accreditation as noted in Appendix A (CFR 1.9). Now, as the only public community college in the WSCUC region that has shifted from the ACCJC to WSCUC, the University of Hawai'i Maui College (UHMC) is one of the pilot institutions under the new WSCUC reaccreditation process. Because the College agreed to pilot the new institutional review process, they addressed the Standards of the 2008 Handbook. This accreditation history reflects more broadly the College's commitment to seek to address the unique socio-economic, political and geographic needs of Maui County (CFR 4.3).

As one of the pilot institutions at the beginning of the shift at WSCUC from an earlier accreditation process to a new one, UHMC addressed standards in the 2008 Handbook of Accreditation but did so following the format of the Review and the Accreditation Visit described in the 2013 Handbook. As the team constructed its report, it did so by reading and evaluating the essays prepared by UHMC, but did not restrict observations and suggestions to them since they were written more than a year before the Accreditation Visit. This report, then, is a response to the initial themes of those essays but also includes observation and evaluation

B. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

From the start, the team benefited from the thoroughly researched, carefully written, and thoughtfully designed documentation provided by the College. That documentation supported a substantive discussion at the heart of the off site review in May 2013 and helped lay the

groundwork for the team's visit a year later in April 2014. In the months following the Offsite Review, the College considered the questions and concerns that had been raised by the WSCUC team at that time and developed an extensive response. Both the initial documentation and this response provided a firm platform for the campus visit (CFR 1.9).

The team was impressed with the organization of the visit to the UHMC campus in Kahului. There was ample time to meet with many members of the campus community including faculty, staff, students and members of the UH Board of Regents and the UH System Office. Additionally, the campus had made arrangements for the team to meet with employers and to interact with community members. Team members were also able to interact through video connections with participants at the centers on Lānaʻi, Molokaʻi, and in Lahaina and Hana on Maui. All of these meetings were useful and helpful. Participants spoke honestly and candidly as they described the progress, opportunities, and challenges facing UHMC. The campus had also prepared documents for review and provided additional information as it was requested (CFR 1.9).

It was clear from these meetings that UHMC had taken the review seriously, and that the process for them has been an important undertaking. Further, the meetings the team conducted and the individuals with whom the team met helped to flesh out more fully the picture of the College that was afforded during the Offsite Review. Most importantly, the visit provided the team with clear evidence of UHMC's progress in regards to the Standards for accreditation set by WSCUC.

C. Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission actions and Reviews

The most recent review was an Institutional Review letter in May 2010. The expectations outlined in that review include:

1. The need to develop rubrics for the BASET capstone course and to aggregate the findings from those rubrics as well as an increased focus on the addition and implementation of cyclical program reviews. As noted elsewhere in this report, the team acknowledges that UHMC has worked hard to establish program reviews, however the Visiting Team has concerns about the sustainability of the process for program reviews that has been established (see pages 15-16 in this report). Additionally, the College has provided rubrics for the capstone course as noted.
2. Establish guidelines for baccalaureate faculty evaluation for retention, tenure and promotion. This recommendation, also noted in the response to a substantive change action (2011) has led to the adoption of “Guidelines and Procedures for Applied Research Projects Undertaken by Maui College Baccalaureate Program Faculty Members,” which is included on page 69 in the appendix to the Institutional Report.
3. Ongoing discussion and attention within the College, the UH system and WSCUC about UHMC’s expectation to comply with system-wide community college and 4-year college policies. These discussions are underway. The 2010 Interim Report review panel indicated that the dual reporting structure was important for UHMC to meet community college and four-year college expectations. Henceforth, however, while the UHMC chancellor may on occasion meet with the UH President and chancellors of four-year degree institutions regarding areas of common interest or concern, the UHMC Chancellor will no longer have a dual reporting line that includes the UH President.

It will be difficult to predict the consequences of the change in reporting. The change could marginalize UHMC and exacerbate the issue of its identity within the UH system. This issue warrants continued attention going forward.

The College has also responded to the last substantive change action, initiated at the request by the College to add the Bachelor's Degree in Sustainable Science Management (July 2011), in which the review panel recommended that:

1. UHMC or UH provide a teach-out policy for the program. The College has complied and provides evidence in the appendix of its institutional report of the policy, which meets WSCUC standards;
2. UHMC should continue to build a culture for the baccalaureate by ensuring that there are sufficient faculty and that PhD faculty are supported to do their research. As noted above, the College has met this recommendation; and
3. UHMC should provide sample Curriculum Vita (CVs) of faculty teaching required courses beyond the major, especially in cases where there are few new faculty assigned directly to this program. The CV's of the faculty teaching these courses are provided in the appendix to the institutional report.

II EVALUATION OF PROGRESS

A. Retention and Student Success

UHMC describes student success as the achievement of a student's "true educational goal" whether it is a certificate, degree, or participating in a lifelong learning program.

Additionally, the College embraces its challenge as an open door institution: to determine the true educational goal of each student and provide the necessary instructional and support tools to assist in meeting these educational goals (CFR 2.13). Deeply connected to the community it

serves, UHMC began this particular journey at least as far back as the comprehensive visit in 2005 when it pursued accreditation for its first baccalaureate program (ABIT). Having developed programs to meet the educational needs of the community by expanding its identity from that of a community college to a college that offers associate and baccalaureate degrees, UHMC through the 2013 institutional report directly addresses the challenge of supporting student success (CFRs 2.12, 2.13).

UHMC recognizes a variety of measures when it speaks of student success: certificate completion, employment, overall retention, retention disaggregated by student population, and associate and baccalaureate degrees conferred. The materials reviewed for this report include Essay 3 of the institutional report (2013), the Retention, Graduation, Time-to-Degree Narrative (2012), the Retention and Graduation Committee Report included with the Institutional Reaccreditation Report (2013), and the UHMC Response to the WSCUC Offsite Review Lines of Inquiry (February 2014). So as to confirm information provided through these reports, the team met with multiple groups during its campus visit in April 2014. A list of these meetings and some of the individuals involved are noted in Appendix B.

As UHMC evaluated disaggregated retention and graduation data (CFR 2.10), it observed that fluctuating retention rates between 2008 and 2010 were, in part, a reflection of economic volatility, declines in employment, and rapid enrollment growth at UHMC. In the period examined for this institutional review process, enrollment at UHMC grew from a headcount of 2981 in fall 2007 to 4527 in fall 2011. An area of concern cited in the report by the WSCUC Retention and Graduation Committee (2012) is the need to identify which students are truly degree seeking. Graduation rates may be artificially lowered by including students who are not seeking degrees with those who are truly degree-seeking. Substantial enrollment growth and lack

of clarity regarding the percentage of students who are degree-seeking make it difficult to interpret the data. With the limitations of the data observed, the following data points are noted here:

- Among students seeking associate degrees, females are retained at 60 percent and males are retained at 51 percent.
- Templates completed for WSCUC indicate that associate degree students are graduating in two years at 2 percent, in three years at 8 percent, and in four years at 14 percent (2013, p. 43). Reporting both full-and-part-time students together generates a lower graduation rate than one sees for IPEDS when looking at graduation rates of full-time students: 11 percent at 3 years (150% time).
- The six-year graduation rate of students in baccalaureate programs is 42 percent; however, the population in these programs is too small to support meaningful evaluation. These new programs should be closely monitored.
- Nonresident alien students have the highest two and three-year retention rate (75%), and the highest three-year graduation rate (50%). The Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander group has the lowest retention rate, with 45 percent of students enrolling the next semester and 7 percent persisting to graduation.
- About two-thirds of the UHMC students are part-time students. On average, these students require about 5 years to complete an associate degree and 4 years to complete the upper-division baccalaureate curriculum.

UHMC has been actively engaged in numerous student success projects including the national Achieving the Dream initiative, which in Hawai'i targets success rates of Native Hawaiian students, and the statewide Hawai'i Graduation Initiative, focused on graduation rates. Additionally, many student success initiatives are being implemented at UHMC and address

experiences of students in different groups (CFR 2.13). (These initiatives will be addressed further in this report.)

As part of these efforts, UHMC has identified several peer institutions for comparison based on size, differentiation of degree levels, and faculty to student ratios. The University of Hawai'i, Hilo is similar in size, with a rural, island location, and similar ethnic and racial student populations, and is the most useful peer comparator at the baccalaureate level. When comparing retention and graduation rates between these two institutions, UHMC reports 42 percent 6-year graduation rates to UH Hilo's 36 percent and 40 percent male graduation rate to UH Hilo's 34 percent. However, the UHMC graduation rate of Native Hawaiians is lower than UH Hilo's, at 27 percent to Hilo's 35 percent.

UHMC has also identified seven community colleges as peer institutions for examining graduation rates at the associate degree level. Two of the selected colleges are also educating Native Hawaiian students: Windward Community College and Honolulu Community College (HCC). UHMC reports graduation data that is comparable with these colleges; however, it reports a lower transfer rate (19 percent in comparison with the 25 percent of the other two colleges)—perhaps understandable in light of its relative isolation. (Both Windward and HCC offer access by land to several baccalaureate institutions.) As transfer is tracked by matriculation to a four-year institution, it may be worth noting that at the time the institution submitted the Retention and Graduation report and the Institutional Reaccreditation report, UHMC “transfer” data did not report associate degree students that “transfer” and are admitted into baccalaureate degrees offered at UHMC (CFR 2.10).

Although WSCUC templates do not require data on certificate completion, the team was pleased to note that certificate completion rates are encouraging. Certificates providing job skills are completed at very high rates: UHMC reports that the certificate in Practical Nursing was

completed at 97 percent by the 2007 cohort and at 83 percent by the 2008 cohort. The certificate in Dental Assisting was completed at 91 percent in 2008 and at 75 percent in the 2009 cohort.

A closer look at degree-related student success suggests the predictable significance of academic preparation. UHMC reports that in 2012, 59 percent of students taking the COMPASS test placed at developmental writing level and 86 percent placed below college level math. The negative effects of inadequate preparation may be exacerbated by issues of course availability and advising: it appears that students are not always advised directly into the necessary development courses. Obviously, when students do not take the developmental courses that they need within the first few semesters, their time to degree can be further protracted.

On the other hand, it appears that effective academic advising has contributed to student success (CFR 2.12). Seeking to assure that all students understand degree requirements and to provide them with timely, useful, and regular information and advising, UHMC reports success in encouraging students to declare a major promptly so that they may access advising within that major (CFR 2.12). On the other hand, the institution has discovered that this practice can inflate the number of majors in programs, in that all students declared in a program may not be seeking degrees there. UHMC must continue working to offer students the benefits of affiliation with an academic program while seeking more reliable data.

Although the WSCUC Retention and Graduation Committee evaluated UHMC as “initial” on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Templates and Narrative in 2013, the comprehensive materials provided for this institutional review demonstrate that UHMC now has in place the WSCUC templates, comparisons with peer institutions, and initial analyses of disaggregated data. They show further that UHMC has established plans and goals to improve retention and graduation rates (CFR 2.10). These include:

- Better define and track degree-seeking students;

- Raise program admission requirements—programs with admission requirements are reporting graduation rates as high as 98%;
- Achieve a 44% 150% time to graduation rate of baccalaureate students by 2018;
- Achieve a male baccalaureate graduation rate of 44% by 2018;
- Achieve a Native Hawaiian baccalaureate graduation rate of 40% by 2018.

The team noted that UHMC has many initiatives underway to improve retention and graduation rates, and specific and numerous initiatives to address the needs of part-time students, under-prepared students, at-risk students, males, and Native Hawaiian students. Additionally, there are initiatives to better link education with employment opportunities, and to improve time-to-degree rates. Some of the initiatives are funded with specific federal and state grants, while others are incorporated into the duties of UHMC administrators and faculty. It is clear that much is underway. However, it is less clear which initiatives are making a significant difference. Going forward, it will be especially important for UHMC to examine disaggregated data in relation to these initiatives so as to ensure that effective programs can be sustained, as noted below.

There is a sense at UHMC that every reasonable avenue towards increased student success must be explored—a commendable spirit but one that makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of specific initiatives and capture evaluative data to inform decision-making. Some students may be engaged by one initiative while others engaged by numerous campus initiatives. For example, one student, a female Native Hawaiian, might be engaged in an initiative to enhance the success of Native Hawaiian students. Another student, a male Native Hawaiian student, eligible for support as a student placing into developmental writing or math, support for enhancing success of male students, and programming targeting Native Hawaiian students, might participate in one program or several—or in none. More systematic alignment of student need

and qualification with the array of available programs clearly would be desirable, and, in turn, disaggregating the data regarding participation in these programs would be necessary to evaluate their effectiveness—in isolation or in combination. In short, it is essential that the institution develop ways to track the engagement of students in various initiatives and programs so as to evaluate which initiatives are contributing most effectively to student success. Given limited institutional operating funds and reliance on grant funding for some support programs, it is essential that UHMC have information about effectiveness to inform difficult strategic decisions.

The concern about institutional resources not keeping pace with enrollment growth emerged clearly through the institutional report and the team heard this voiced by many members of the College during the Accreditation Visit. Effectively supporting Native Hawaiian students, male students, and under-prepared students requires substantial resources, just as enrollment growth increases demand for additional support capacity. In addition to the targeted initiatives aimed at enhancing success of specific student populations, UHMC has organizational mechanisms in place to increase student success. These include:

- Scholarships crafted to incentivize and reward student achievement;
- Collective work at levels of programs, departments, and the Academic Senate in the curriculum process, program review, and contract renewal;
- Faculty and staff professional development is funded by grants and other funds.

There was not evaluative material included in the accreditation documents addressing the effectiveness of these mechanisms to increase student success; however, there was significant discussion of assessment and annual program review. (Assessment and program review are addressed in the following section of this WSCUC team report.)

In addition to examining student success in terms of retention and graduation rates, the WSCUC Visiting Team pursued a focus on student learning, one related closely to the subject of

the institution's other essay, that concerning program review and assessment—see below. One line of inquiry concerned the relation of retention and graduation data to student success as measured by the accomplishment of student learning outcomes, while another considered the connection between retention and graduation rates and the quality of degrees.

In its response to the Offsite Review, UHMC described discussions with this focus in departments, program meetings, and Academic Senate meetings. Additionally, the College was able to document a campus culture increasingly focused on accountability and campus-wide assessment (2014, p. 17). Several good examples, including the redesign of the developmental math course sequence and the evidence that students are moving forward with increased success, appeared, but the extent to which information on student learning is informing the institution's understanding of student success remained unclear.

Second, while it appears that there might be a far stronger link between completion data on the one hand and the rigor of its expectations concerning degrees on the other, UHMC's application of the Degree Qualifications Profile is clarifying and deepens its understanding of such expectations. As a result, revised, refined student learning outcomes reflect a developing awareness of academic standards appropriate to associate and to baccalaureate degree levels. Given that selective admission standards appear to be a factor in the success of students at the baccalaureate level, clearer statements of learning outcomes may guide the reconsideration of selective admissions standards for other programs. But the materials provided for this review suggest that much work remains in this regard.

B. Program Review and Assessment

Throughout the review, including the Offsite Review and the Accreditation Visit, the College has demonstrated a sustained focus on student learning and they have worked toward aligning student completion rates with defined learning outcomes (CFR 2.2). All programs have

assessment practices in place and all programs address key questions, e.g.: (1) What can be done to improve student learning? (2) Where are the gaps or weaknesses in learning? (3) Is the “minimally proficient” student adequately meeting the minimum standards for a graduate in the field? (CFR 2.3) The team has seen evidence that the assessment processes put into place are making a difference, and that changes are being adopted as a result of what is learned through assessment. Additionally, all classes, regardless of modality, provide evidence of student learning and are evaluated in the same way (CFR 4.4).

As the College has added baccalaureate degrees, it has also sought to ensure that the outcomes for those degrees have integrity and represent baccalaureate level work. The team encourages the College to continue using the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) and to remain focused on appropriate learning outcomes at all levels of the curriculum: certificate, associate, and baccalaureate. The faculty with whom the team met during the Accreditation Visit evidenced a strong commitment to students and to student achievement. Given that very strong commitment, the team suggests that faculty continue to develop program level outcomes that are sufficiently rigorous (CFR 2.4, 2.6).

The Visiting Team also noted, however, that while assessment is being addressed seriously and with integrity, more work remains to be done in articulating the relationships among evaluation, assessment, program review, and resource allocation. The team also had concerns about the long-term sustainability of the annual assessment cycle that seems to have become an annual program review cycle. In an attempt to link assessment with resource allocation, the College has formed the Strategic Planning and Assessment Meeting (SPAM), which includes administrators and faculty from across the disciplines “to evaluate annual program reviews.” As the College works to meet its goals for student success and fiscal sustainability, the team believes it will be important to develop a clearer understanding of the

relationship between assessment and program review and to consider the advantages of completing assessment annually but, perhaps, undertaking program reviews on a more extended schedule of, say, every three to five years (CFR 2.7). There are two risks arising from the present system. One is that the frequency of the review will become monotonous and lead to a relaxation of scrutiny. The other is that annual reviews will become so burdensome that they create an insidious “assessment fatigue.”

While the College has also given some attention to alignment between assessment and resource allocation, the realization of that alignment is for the most part not clearly understood on campus. Nor did it become clear to the team exactly how this alignment is realized. (CFR 4.3) When the possibility of strategic reallocation was raised with the senior administration, the response was that positions have occasionally been reallocated from one program to another; there was no response that suggested systematic consideration of *financial* reallocation based on the assessment of program effectiveness and productivity and on the College’s long-term strategic priorities.

While the College recognizes the importance of the link between student success and resources, it is not clear how the College handles the allocation requests in terms of the information gained through assessment and program reviews. This lack of clarity also raises concerns about sustainability of a process that is intensive and still in the formative stages. (CFR 4.2)

C. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

UHMC is an institution committed to learning and improvement and this has been demonstrated through the institutional review process. It has engaged in broad and specific planning that involves multiple constituencies. In many ways this institutional report is a presentation of those plans, accomplishment to date, and efforts underway as the College

develops (CFR 4.2, 4.3). The materials examined in the review of Standard IV include Essay 4 of the institutional report (2013), the Retention, Graduation, Time-to-Degree Narrative (2012), and the UHMC Response to WSCUC Offsite Review Lines of Inquiry (February 2014).

Additionally, WSCUC reviewers met with many constituents, as already noted, during the campus visit in April 2014.

Standard IV focuses on evidence that the institution conducts “sustained, evidence-based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives.” The topics of review in Standard IV are commitment to learning and improvement, and strategic thinking and planning.

Planning and improvement at UHMC are informed to an extent by qualitative and quantitative data. Quality assurance processes implemented a few years ago are in place to review and approve curriculum, to track results, and to identify needs for improvement (CFR 4.4, 4.6). There is also a prioritization process informed by program review results that generates proposed funding priorities. Yet, as noted above, the link between such proposals and the creation of the institutional budget remains obscure to many—and was obscure to the Visiting Team. While unanticipated budget reductions arising from the recession beginning in 2008 clearly has constrained investment in new initiatives, the fact remains that priorities most highly recommended through the assessment process have not for the most part been funded, while others identified by the administration have been. Nor was the team able to determine that budgets are being built systematically to reflect information on program effectiveness—either in the form of additional investment in programs that show the greatest need for improvement or in the form of decisions to reallocate in favor of more effective ones (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

There are goals, plans, and priorities aimed at adequate support for students—but, often insufficient funds to accomplish them. While all of the planning may be impressive, UHMC

seems determined to be the College that serves every educational goal. This determination may in some sense be commendable. Clearly, both the college community and its leadership share a positive and ambitious vision of success for UHMC. However, given the current situation (2013, p. 40), a more realistic, strategic vision, one incorporating difficult decision making well informed by information, may be more viable in the long run. It was not clear to the team that there has developed a capacity to think strategically, comprehensively about selecting and developing programs in the light of available resources. An institution experiencing severe financial constraints cannot afford an “opportunity *du jour*” approach to prioritization (CFR 4.2).

Beyond program selection, the alignment of college size with and student success is one way to perceive opportunities and challenges. UHMC has demonstrated that it is eager to continue implementing programs while it observes that it is unable to adequately support its students. The institutional report states that UHMC has the “ability to adapt and change quickly to funding reductions and revenue stream changes” (2013, p. 62) and, yet, it has not been able to think differently enough regarding the students it is serving and enrollment growth to provide adequate and sufficient support for them. Insufficient funding for student support in conjunction with the College’s thoughtful evaluation of what its students need evokes questions about what it means to serve one’s students well. Additionally, one can imagine that achieving the 2018 goals for student success that have been articulated by UHMC will require thinking differently, thinking strategically.

Another way to approach this issue is to identify strategic thinking, the strategic allocation (and reallocation) of resources, and sustainability as a triad of critical issues for the next review cycle. These three challenges each represent a priority in terms of the College’s continued development in its unique environment to serve its unique communities.

D. Ensuring Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness in the Future

This report of the WSCUC Visiting Team on the educational effectiveness of the University of Hawai'i Maui College reflects documentary analysis and campus consultation that must be seen as coinciding with an extraordinary if not unique level of challenge. UHMC presents a biennial budget process in the University of Hawai'i system along with the resource funding allocation models in use. In addition to current sources of state funding, the UHCC system is engaging the legislature regarding two additional approaches to funding (2013, p. 56). UHMC also has a track record of extramural funding that has contributed to faculty professional development and student support (CFR 3.5).

On the one hand, UHMC has received encouragement in the expansion of its mission to offer three baccalaureate degrees. This modest expansion in mission has prompted a broader expansion in the College's conception of itself beneficial in some respects, problematical in others. On the other hand, many in the UHMC community believe that the College has not received the additional support its expanded mission necessitates. Without question, like other campuses of the University of Hawai'i, the College has faced and continues to face a serious budget challenge. Whether the College has suffered disproportionately in a period of constraint represents a matter of debate.

UHMC has responded resourcefully and strategically to this challenge. From administrative affairs to student affairs to curricular assessment and improvement, UHMC has focused on its students and its community as it has endeavored to "do more with less." But the expansion of mission in an environment of static or reduced support inevitably raises concerns about the choices that must be made and the levels of quality that can be maintained.

While the budget challenge in itself appears formidable, other circumstances exacerbate its effects. First, the College's support for its off-campus locations, an important expression of its

commitment to Maui County as a whole, represents a financial obligation in some ways atypical within the UH system. Second, Maui continues to show more vigorous growth in population and capital than Oahu. Third, despite the modest expansion of the College's mission to include selected baccalaureate degrees, there appears still to be a contrast between what Maui needs most (open access, remedial education, "practice" baccalaureate degrees, many associate degrees) and what many in the Maui community appear to desire (a comprehensive university). At the same time, in meeting these challenges, UHMC has benefited from effective leadership, a culture of assessment, and a dedicated faculty and staff.

The budget challenges and the position UHMC has as one college in the University of Hawai'i system, however, suggests that the new leaders of the College should place a priority on comprehensive strategic planning so as to direct the College's limited resources to offerings and services that will serve the people of Maui most effectively (See above, ref. CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3.).

The Visiting Team shares above all a concern that the College's financial challenges may over time impair one of the distinctive strengths: a willingness by faculty and staff to go beyond the call of duty in order to serve the students and the College's other constituencies. Whether the extraordinary level of commitment the team observed can be sustained over the long term may be doubtful.

There are several possible implications to consider. First, priorities developed during a more optimistic time may need to be reexamined. Second, planning must become more agile, more responsive to challenges not yet fully apparent. Third, ordinary tensions between constituencies –such as those the team found between some technical disciplines on the "lower campus" and disciplines offered on the "upper campus" may become more problematical. Finally, confidence in the capacity of the institution to maintain its effectiveness can suffer.

The three baccalaureate programs represent a particular point of contention. By one standard, they enable the College to respond more fully to the needs of its students and the broader community. By another perspective, one voiced assertively, these degree programs, with their exceedingly modest enrollments, represent a drain on resources that might have been invested more appropriately in the College's primary instructional mission. The Visiting Team believes that the wisdom of this expansion may or may not be confirmed over time. What is clear, however, is that in a more prosperous time, the debate would not be as divisive as it appears to be.

In short, the Visiting Team cannot and should not disregard the effects of a fiscal environment that can magnify issues of otherwise moderate importance, provoke assertions of favoritism, and obscure what are after all commendable achievements. Hence, this report attempts to maintain an important balance by offering a candid, detailed, and objective assessment that acknowledges the challenges faced by the College during a period of extraordinary stress while focusing directly on a careful review of documentation and an assiduous pursuit of confirmation "on the ground."

III. EVALUATION OF ELECTRONIC EXHIBIT PORTFOLIO

The team reviewed each of the following items in the electronic portfolio and has provided evaluation and supporting evidence in the Appendices for the following:

- Credit Hour and Program Length (Appendix C)
- Student Complaints (Appendix D)
- Marketing and Recruitment Review (Appendix E)

The Visiting Team also reviewed prior to the Offsite Review, UHMC's response to previous commission actions, the financial review and the Retention and Graduation Review.

The Visiting Team also followed up during the Accreditation Visit and did not identify any issues other than those noted within this report.

IV. FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

The WSCUC Visiting Team has expressed its deep gratitude to Chancellor Sakamoto and to the many colleagues at Maui College whose preparation enabled this team to conduct a thorough, objective and constructive review. We appreciated the ample hospitality we enjoyed, and we indicated our gratitude to the members of the College community both for making themselves available and for the substance and candor of their reflections. We were especially grateful to the WSCUC Steering Committee at UHMC: Diane Meyer, Kulamanu Vorhies, David Grooms, John McKee, Laura Nagle, Jan Moore, Karen Hanada, and Jeannie Pezzoli.

From the start, the team benefited from the thoroughly researched, carefully written, and thoughtfully designed documentation provided by the College. That documentation supported a substantive discussion at the heart of the Offsite Review in April 2013. In the months following the teleconference, the College considered the questions and concerns that had been raised by the WSCUC team and developed an extensive response. Both the initial documentation and this response provided a firm platform for the campus visit.

The team takes pleasure in offering commendations. UHMC has much of which to be proud, and the team has singled out for attention only a few points:

- The administration, faculty, and staff of the College demonstrate through energetic, highly professional, and sometimes Herculean effort a deep and remarkable commitment to student success and to the College.
- Through the leadership of Chancellor Sakamoto, the College has formed close ties with the communities of Maui and its neighboring islands, it has tracked emerging educational needs

of this community, and it has endeavored to respond to them within the limits of its resources.

- The College enjoys a splendid cadre of native Hawaiian students. Beyond the initiation of a Hawaiian Studies program at the associate degree level, the College regularly finds opportunities to celebrate and showcase Hawaiian culture.
- The College enjoys access to high-bandwidth communications technology.
- The College enjoys significant potential for institutional development within an unusually coherent and prosperous growing island community.
- On its seaside setting, the College has built a campus of distinctive charm and capacity, and through diligent maintenance conveys to students and the community a respect for its environment.
- Student appreciation for faculty expertise and engagement is laudable.
- There is evident throughout the campus a commitment to collegiality grounded in a shared commitment to students and to the College. Faculty and staff members regularly step out of their silos to collaborate with colleagues from other disciplines or offices and to offer assistance.
- Many long-standing members of the faculty and staff have offered the College an enviable continuity.

Precisely because the Visiting Team believes that the College enjoys significant potential for further growth in quality and service, it has discussed at some length the following concerns:

- In contrast with a clear upward trajectory in terms of visibility, enrollments, and program offerings, the College must cope with a flat or downward trajectory in terms of budgetary support. As a result, many faculty members are managing substantial teaching loads, multiple committee assignments, and, in many cases, leadership responsibilities. While the team

admires the dedication such examples reveal, it questions whether they can be sustained over the long term. Although resource limitations must not be ignored, the Visiting Team believes that viable and well-subscribed programs require more than one or two full-time faculty, that full-time faculty in well-subscribed programs deserve colleagues who can share teaching and administrative responsibilities, and that students deserve to be taught so far as possible by a preponderance of full-time faculty members.

- Similarly, many members of the staff must balance multiple responsibilities. For instance, counseling staff must do double duty as the College's recruiters. Moreover, some staff members face the additional stress of working to provide grant-supported services that despite demonstrated effectiveness may not be institutionalized.
- While the Visiting Team finds much to admire in the implementation of an annual academic program review process, it questions whether the essential link between genuine assessment, program evaluation, and budgetary recommendation has been clearly established.
- Notwithstanding a strong sense of community identity, many members of the College community describe themselves as detached from and unknowledgeable about the critical processes of planning and budgeting.
- The Visiting Team was not able to identify a critical, systematic process supporting well-informed reallocation within the institution—an important priority for any institution, but one especially so for an institution confronting fiscal challenges.

In the light of these observations, then, the Visiting Team has discussed the following recommendations. Subsequent discussion and further information may well direct their revision. Thus, they should not be regarded as final, but they will at least indicate areas of concern the final recommendations are likely to address. The Visiting Team recommends

- (1) That the strategic planning process referred to in the College statements be initiated once the transition in leadership is complete, that it be broadly participatory, and that it function to delineate and resolve difficult choices among priorities that the College appears to confront.
- (2) That the program review process be reconsidered in the light of best practices, perhaps with the assistance of an experienced consultant, so as to require more thoroughgoing assessment based on evidence of consistent quality, more direct advice on program strengthening directed to increased student success, and clear guidance for the budget process.
- (3) That attention to student success include a clear delineation of program effectiveness, where it can be documented, of gaps in student services, where they appear, and of opportunities for reallocation of resources, where they are appropriate.
- (4) That the College, given its unique setting and creativity, explore additional opportunities for revenue consistent with its mission. Such opportunities might include summer institutes and camps, a nationally competitive program on sustainability, an annual giving fund, etc.
- (5) That the College develop and implement a distance education plan that includes the following components: assessment of the needs of distance learners, evaluation of course success for distance learners, training for faculty delivering distance education courses, the offering of student support services for distance learners, and a method for evaluating the effectiveness of distance education.

In sum, the Visiting Team believes that the faculty and staff of Maui College, in concert with the administration, are fully capable of furthering the growth and the quality of an institution with significant potential for both. In particular, through participation in a systematic and broadly representative planning and budget allocation process, the Maui College community can

contribute significantly to framing a positive vision for the future of the college and to the realization of that vision.

V. APPENDICES

A. *Off-Site Programs and Distance Education*

DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: University of Hawai'i, Maui College

Name of reviewer/s: Willard Lewallen

Date/s of review: April 1-4, 2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs¹ and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Courses reviewed

MAU GEOG-102 Group [SP14]

MAU ENG-100 Online Group 1 [SP14]

MAU PSY-100 Group 1 [SP14]

MAU CULN-115 Group [SP14]

¹ See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

UHMC currently has no programs that can be completed entirely through distance education.

Distance Education Classes Fall 2013

Online	Hawai'i Interactive Video Service	Cable TV	Hybrid	Total
40	16	7	2	65

Distance education accounts for 11% of total class hours offered in fall 2013.

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Reviewed online class materials and viewed a HITS class session.

Interviewed Distance Education Committee on April 3, 2014.

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?	UHMC serves 3 islands and multiple locations on the island of Maui so distance education is aligned with its mission, operations, and administrative structure. Meetings are held to plan distance education offerings for subsequent terms and these are attended by staff from	

	outreach centers and counselors.	
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Each of the outreach centers has activities and services for students attending those sites.	
<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?	The learning management system and other distance education technology infrastructure adequately support learning, faculty/student interaction, and student/student interaction. Technology is adequately supported and there are adequate back-ups of information systems.	
<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?	Support services for distance education learners are evolving, but are not comprehensive. There is no evidence of assessment of the needs of distance education learners. The distance education committee is beginning to address student support services. Some satisfaction information is collected following counseling/advising appointments at college centers, but there is no evidence that other support services have been assessed for their effectiveness.	What are plans for developing and delivering support services for distance education learners? What are the procedures/methods for evaluating the effectiveness of support services for distance education learners?

<p><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?</p>	<p>Full and part-time faculty teach distance education courses. Some part-time faculty only teach distance education courses. There is no formal procedures for orienting, supporting, and integrating distance education faculty into the academic life of the institution. All faculty are engaged in the curriculum development and assessment of student learning. Training for faculty, particularly those that teach online, has been inconsistent and intermittent. Currently, there is no training being provided. Instructional designers used to provide some training, but those positions are now funded through specific grants and are unable to provide services to faculty in general. The Distance Education Committee is beginning to address orientation and training for distance education faculty, particularly for those that teach online.</p>	<p>What are the plans for developing and delivering consistent training and support for distance education faculty?</p>
<p><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.)</p>	<p>Faculty design distance education programs and services. Distance education programs and services are approved and evaluated utilizing the same procedures as for on-ground courses. Distance education programs and courses are comparable to on-ground</p>	

	offerings in content, outcomes, and quality.	
<p><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?</p>	<p>Data on retention and graduation of online students is not currently available. End of course grade data has been examined on a limited basis (fall 2012). For example, the Moloka'i Education Center has disaggregated distance education course success data and found disparities in success rates for both liberal arts courses and CTE courses. Additional analysis of end of course grades in fall 2012 revealed disparities in success rates as well. Disparities are evident in success rates between online and on-ground students and "suggested" explanations were provided. However, without disaggregating the data by discipline, course, etc. it is impossible to determine potential explanations for the disparities. Additionally, examining data only from one semester is not enough to draw conclusions. The Distance Learning Committee has developed a set of recommendations for improving student learning and for improving learning resources for distance learners.</p>	<p>Many initiatives, strategies, and recommendations have been suggested. However, there is no overall plan for distance education. What is the plan for assessing the effectiveness of distance education?</p>

<p><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?</p>	<p>Assessment of student learning outcomes for online courses is consistent with on-ground courses. No information is currently available on how online student learning outcomes compare with student learning outcomes for on-ground courses.</p>	<p>What is the plan for comparing student learning outcomes for online courses with on-ground courses?</p>
<p><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>?</p>		
<p><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?</p>	<p>No evidence was provided</p>	

B. *UHMC Accreditation Visit Interview and Meeting Descriptions*

OPEN MEETINGS

OPEN COMMUNITY meeting for all UHMC and Maui County community members, includes Lana'i, Hana, Lahaina, and Moloka'i participants via HITS
Wednesday, (4/2) 3:30pm-4:15pm (KA'A'IKE 105)

OPEN STAFF meeting for all APT, O&M, and civil service employees
Thursday, (4/3) 8:15am-9am (IKE LEA 102)

OPEN EMPLOYER meeting for employers of UHMC graduates
Thursday, (4/3) 11:15pm-12pm (LAULIMA 225)

OPEN STUDENT meeting, includes Lan, Hana, Lahaina, and Moloka'i students via HITS
Thursday, (4/3) 1pm-1:45pm (KA'A'IKE 105)

OPEN EXIT meeting, includes Lana'i, Hana, Lahaina, and Moloka'i participants via HITS
Friday, (4/4) 9:30am-10am (KA'A'IKE 105)

SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

WEDNESDAY April 2, 1:15-1:45

Planning and Assessment (KA LAMA 102)

David Tamanaha, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs

Cathy Bio, Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs

John McKee, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Jan Moore, Program Coordinator of Accounting, Assessment Coordinator, Associate Professor of Accounting

Michele Katsutani, Counselor

Lee Stein, Human Services Program Coordinator, Associate Professor, Human/ Social Services

Sean Calder, Associate Professor, Biology

UH Center (Laulima 225)

Karen Hanada, Director of University of Hawai'i Center, Maui

Tom Benjamin, Associate Specialist UH Mānoa Outreach, UH Mānoa College of Education

Kehau Newhouse, UH Mānoa Outreach

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 2:00-2:45pm

College Wide Academic Student Learning Outcomes (CASLO) (KA LAMA 102)

Eric Engh, Professor of English, CASLO Coordinator

Ellen Peterson, Librarian

Joyce Yamada, Assistant Professor of Dental Assisting, Program Coordinator of Dental Assisting

Baccalaureate Program Faculty (Laulima 225)

David Grooms, Interim Assistant Dean of Instruction

Crystal Alberto, Counselor

Debasis Bhattacharya, ABIT Instructor

Anil Mehta, Instructor ET/ECET

Refugio Gonzalez, ABIT Program Coordinator

Mark Hoffman, ECET Program Coordinator

Jung Park, ET Program Coordinator

Tim Botkin, SSM Program Coordinator

Linda McCormick, ABIT Instructor

Rick Miller, BUSC Program Coordinator

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 3:30-4:15pm

Governing Board Meeting with Board of Regents Chair via phone (KA'A'IKE 210)

THURSDAY, April 3, 8:15-9:00am

Program Review with Program Coordinators (LAULIMA 225)

John McKee, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Jan Moore, Assessment Coordinator

Program Coordinators

THURSDAY, April 3, 9:00-9:45am

Counseling and Financial Aid (LAULIMA 225)

Counseling Department

Financial Aid Office

Academic support (LAULIMA 106)

Kristine Korey-Smith, Learning Center Director, C3T grant Coordinator

Melissa Yoshioka, Instructional and Student Support, TLC

Kealii Ballao, Instructional and Student Support, TLC

Ellen Peterson, Librarian

Ben Guerrero, Title III Coordinator, Kaiao Center

Carrie Ann Shirota, Title III Counselor, Kaiao Center

Mike Albert, Media Center Coordinator

Lisa Sepa, Librarian

THURSDAY, April 3, 10:30-11:15am

Math Faculty (KA LAMA 102)

Kate Acks, Professor

Samantha Bowe, Instructor

Teri Evangelista, Instructor

Amir Amiraslani, Instructor

Donna Harbin, Assistant Professor

Kari Nunokawa, Math Task Force, Student Support Services Program (Pai Ka Mana)

Director

Finance and UH Foundation (WONG ROOM)

David Tamanaha, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs

Ray Tsuchiyama, Director of Institutional Advancement
 Cindy Yamamoto, Institutional Support, Business Office
 Flora Mora, Institutional Support, Business Office

THURSDAY, April 3, 11:15-12:00pm
 Lau'ulu Hawaiian Faculty and Staff

THURSDAY, April 3, 11:15am-12:00pm

Faculty Development (KALAMA 102)

Kristine Korey-Smith, Learning Center Director, C3T grant Coordinator
 Kari Nunokawa, Student Support Services Program (Pai Ka Mana) Director
 Joyce Yamada, Improved Teaching Committee Chair, Assistant Professor of Dental
 Assisting
 Emma White, English Instructor and Reading Across the Disciplines Co-Coordinator

THURSDAY, April 3, 1:00-1:45pm

UH System Vice President of Community Colleges John Morton via phone
 (KA'A'IKE 210)

THURSDAY, April 3, 3:00-3:45pm

Academic senate and curriculum (KALAMA 102)

Ann Emmsley, Academic Senate Chair, Professor of Agriculture
 Kahele Dukelow, Co-chair Curriculum Committee, Assistant Professor of Hawaiian
 Studies

Distance and outreach (KA'A'IKE 103)

Donna Haytko-Paoa, Moloka'i Education Center Coordinator
 Pam Alconcel, Lana'i Outreach Center Coordinator
 Brenda Pua, Hana Outreach Center Coordinator
 Marti Wukelic, Lahaina Outreach Center Coordinator
 Deanna Reece, UH Media Specialist and Distance Learning Committee Chair
 Derek Snyder, Instructor of English and Distance Learning Committee member

C. Credit Hour Program Length

Institution: University of Hawai'i Maui College

Date: April 3, 2014

Overview:

Under federal regulations, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information

clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES
	Where is the policy located? Academic Planner and on the Curriculum web site
	Comments: the policy is also included under policies and procedures on the faculty web site
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)? X YES
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES
	Comments:
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES
	Comments: both the online and print versions of the schedule of classes show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 2
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? AA and BAS
	What discipline(s)? English
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X 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)	How many syllabi were reviewed? Three
	What kinds of courses? Capstone course; Advanced Culinary; Hospitality
	What degree level(s)? BAS, and AAS
	What discipline(s)? Business Technology (ABIT), Culinary Arts, and Hospitality
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES
Comments:	

<i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Four
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Several
	What degree level(s)? AS and AAS
	What discipline(s)? ABIT, Culinary Arts, Human Services, Sustainable Construction Technology
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? X YES
	Comments:

Rev 9/2013

D. Student Complaints Review – Team Report

Institution: University of Hawai'i Maui College

Date: April 4, 2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?	Yes
	Comments:	

	<p>(a) Yes UHMC website under academic grievance policy on the Support for students site:</p> <p>(b) http://maui.Hawaii'i.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/academic-grievance-policy.pdf, as well as the faculty and staff site</p> <p>(c) http://maui.Hawaii'i.edu/faculty-and-staff-policies-procedures/, as well as in the academic planner.</p>	
Process(es) / procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: described above	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Students cannot easily see how to direct a complaint. The college web site and the Catalog provide policies for student misconduct and academic obligations, but not complaints.</p>	

Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? Records are maintained in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: The Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs maintains annual records of complaints and their resolutions.	Yes
	Comments:	

E. Marketing and Recruitment Review – Team Report

Institution: Maui College

Date: 4 April 2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
*Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments: Found no evidence that Maui College pays employees or any 3 rd party vendors to enroll students.	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	Comments: Information about the typical length of time to degree is provided in the description of programs in the college catalog. Information about total cost of degree is provided under gainful employment reporting.	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Yes

	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	Yes
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Information about the kinds of jobs available for graduates is provided for most programs. However, the way the information is provided is inconsistent. For some programs the information is more about the kinds of skills and knowledge that are gained through the program (see Human Services). For some programs the information is about preparing students for an industry sector (see ABIT). It might be useful to include a list of potential types of positions (position titles) that are possible through completion of the program. This is provided for several programs, but it is not consistent across all program descriptions.</p> <p>Information about employment of graduates is provided through gainful employment reporting.</p>	

*Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.