Institutional Proposal
Submitted to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

Brigham Young University-Hawaii
October 2003

-- D R A F T --
12 September 2003

Institutional Context

Brigham Young University-Hawaii is located in Laie, on the windward shore of Oahu, 38 miles from Honolulu. BYU-Hawaii is part of a three-campus university system that includes campuses in Provo, Utah, and Rexburg, Idaho. The president of BYU-Hawaii reports directly to the system’s Board of Trustees.

The university’s sense of mission comes largely from the circumstances of its founding. Standing in a field in Laie, far from any international centers or from the homes of most of its future students, David O. McKay, a lifelong educator and president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, made an unusual prediction: “From this school . . . will go men and women whose influence will be felt for good towards the establishment of peace internationally.” That proclamation has been a constant, conscious impetus; indeed, one of the university’s strengths is the sense of mission shared by faculty, staff, administrators, and students.

The uniqueness of this campus is quickly apparent. Both U.S. News and World Report and the Institute of International Education’s Open Doors report indicated that BYU-Hawaii has the highest percentage of international undergraduate students of any university in the country. Over forty percent of our students come from outside the United States. Students come from approximately 70 countries: 21% from Asia, 16% from Pacific island countries, and 6% from other regions. This diversity is intentional, and is a crucial part of the experience of living, working, and studying at BYU-Hawaii.

Our Board of Trustees, comprised largely of general officers of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, continues to envision BYU-Hawaii as an environment for training international leaders. Our mission statement charges us to prepare “men and women with the intercultural and leadership skills necessary to promote . . . international brotherhood [and] address world problems.” This charter informs both our teaching and our administrative activities. It guides student recruitment, curriculum and research, campus co-curricular activities, and placement. It channels fund-raising, with 70 percent of our donations specifically earmarked to enhance international opportunities for students. While we, like other institutions of higher education, have experienced sometimes-uncomfortable budgetary restraints in recent years, the Board has made clear their support (including financial support) of our ongoing efforts and has continued to encourage us to explore new initiatives that will foster even greater student success and placement, faculty productivity, and administrative efficiency.

Established in 1955 as The Church College of Hawaii, Brigham Young University-Hawaii adopted its present name in 1974, reflecting both a re-envisioning of the school’s curriculum and the substantial growth of its student body. Once offering a largely vocational/technical education, the university is now classified as a comprehensive university, with a liberal arts core supporting a variety of majors in arts, sciences, and professional and pre-professional programs. The university has made a concerted effort to hire faculty who will be major contributors to their fields both as teachers and as scholars.

Several hundred of our students work adjacent to the university at the Polynesian Cultural Center (Hawaii’s number-one paid tourist attraction) while also attending school full time. The partnership between the two institutions epitomizes our students’ international preparation. Half are on scholarships which obligate them to work 19 hours per week at the PCC as performers, tour guides, customer-service representatives, restaurant
hosts, or in a variety of other capacities, interacting in many languages with students and visitors from around the world. This relationship will continue to be part of what positions BYU-Hawaii to fulfill its mission of providing a rigorous educational experience, preparing men and women to lead in the search for international peace, and instilling in its students a sense of obligation to use the skills they acquire to serve those around them.

In 1996, WASC’s Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities made three major recommendations in its re-accreditation report. BYU-Hawaii has made noticeable changes in response to that report. First, in response to the Commission’s concern about linking fiscal, physical, and academic master plans, the university has instituted a strategic planning process that assigns priorities based on the university’s mission and budgetary constraints. This initiative has formed an important and productive partnership among faculty, staff, and administration to build on the university’s strengths and efficiently address areas of weakness. Second, in response to the Commission’s concern about the delegation of decision-making responsibility, there have been major moves to devolve responsibility from upper administration to faculty. Faculty play central roles on the major university decision-making committees. Cross-membership by key players on some of these committees has helped make the flow of information more timely and thorough. The largest academic unit on campus, the College of Arts and Sciences, has been completely reorganized in order to place more decision-making authority in individual departments. A third challenge from the 1996 report that still requires attention is the recruitment of faculty members who reflect more of the diversity of our student body. We will continue to make efforts in this area, even while we appreciate the challenging differences between recruiting students from Asia and the Pacific, and recruiting faculty from the same backgrounds. Three further issues that were raised in the Commission’s response to our 2000 interim report (faculty role in governance and planning, assessment, and use of data) are directly addressed throughout this proposal, and will therefore be major focal points of our efforts over the next several years. In particular, we have made documentation and data-gathering major emphases in our proposal.

We see the accreditation review process as a further occasion to look at our strengths and weaknesses, examine the degree to which the initiatives of the past several years have improved our ability to fulfill our mission, and strengthen the alignment of priorities and resources as we continue to meet the challenges of creating a meaningful educational experience for a highly diverse student body.

**Expected Goals and Outcomes**

As a result of the re-accreditation process we expect to:

1. Incorporate critical data into decision-making processes. This will involve identifying what constitutes critical data, enhancing our ability to capture such data, and determining the best ways to ensure that such data are fundamental to the deliberative process. Since our last re-accreditation visit, we have instituted a new database system, Datatel. We are now in the process of designing a data warehouse that will provide key performance indicators that will be useful for all levels of academic planning.

2. Implement a departmental review process for each program area. Some of these reviews will be held in conjunction with program accreditation visits. We anticipate that each program will be reviewed on a six-year rotating basis. The process of rigorously reviewing each program will identify both strengths and weaknesses, and will afford faculty with substantial opportunities to have input into long-term university planning processes.

3. Implement meaningful, positive changes in the teaching-learning process at BYU-Hawaii by building on assessment of student learning outcomes. We will ask each department or curricular area to identify desired learning outcomes for each major or program offered on campus and to provide evidence that graduates demonstrate these learning outcomes. Under the direction of the university’s Assessment
Committee (chaired by a faculty member), we are in the third year of an assessment program, and will continue to collect information that we hope eventually to make available on the Internet.

4. Develop outcomes and means of assessment for selected General Education areas. For two years, since drafting a new mission statement, our General Education committee has been in the process of identifying methods for articulating outcomes and devising means of assessment for the major qualities that the mission statement envisions for BYU-Hawaii graduates. Since most of these outcomes are not major-specific, the task of developing such outcomes and assessment instruments is very complex. We have begun the task, however, and expect to develop, test, refine, and apply assessment instruments for two of these qualities during the re-accreditation period.

5. Educate faculty on the processes and purposes of a culture of evidence. This expected outcome is clearly tied to the other outcomes outlined in this section, and obligates us to make evidence the basis for our claims about what we do well. We anticipate that continued, substantial faculty input into the re-accreditation process, and more conscious socialization of new faculty into an evidentiary culture, will help make verification the norm.

Description of How University Constituencies Were Involved

One of the observations of past WASC teams was that faculty members were under-represented in key deliberative and decision-making processes at BYU-Hawaii. This has been addressed in a number of ways, perhaps no better than in the current re-accreditation process. During the past few years, and more intensively over the past year, faculty, academic leaders, and university administrators have attended WASC meetings, including a training meeting held in Hawaii in 2002, to become familiar with the new standards and accreditation process. A seven-member re-accreditation steering team that attended the January 2003 WASC workshop in Oakland represented faculty, administration, academic leadership, and the institutional research office. The university President and Academic Vice President were part of the team; four of the seven members of the team were faculty members. As we began to envision the contours of our institutional proposal after that workshop, three faculty members from the university’s re-accreditation steering committee made a presentation at the April 2003 WASC conference in Irvine, California. This not only provided an important occasion for us to refine our thinking and commit one portion of it to an organized presentation, it also further increased the familiarity of faculty (and the members of the university administration who were also there) with WASC’s new accreditation model and the work being done by other institutions as they tread paths similar to ours.

Based largely on discussions during and after the January workshop, the steering committee drafted an outline of a proposal plan, which was then distributed to key university constituencies and deliberative bodies. These groups included:

- Academic Planning Council (APC). This group, chaired by the Vice President for Academics, includes the Deans and Associate Deans of the university’s College and Schools (all of whom are also members of the teaching faculty), the Director of the University Library, the chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee, the Director of Continuing Education, the Dean of Admissions, the Director of the Office of Multicultural Student Services, and the chair of the Religion Department.

- Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC). The FAC consists of twelve faculty members drawn from all of the university’s major academic units (one each from the Schools of Computing, Business, and Education; one from the library; one from Social Work; and seven from the College of Arts & Sciences). It generates policy initiatives, approves or disapproves changes in the curriculum, and takes up other matters of interest to the faculty.

- Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee (SPC). This committee, co-chaired by a member of the faculty and by the Assistant to the President for Institutional Research and Planning, is made up of 16 members: seven faculty, seven administration or staff, one student representative, and one at-large member
SPC is charged with creating the university’s long-term strategic plan, receiving input from the rest of the university in formulating that plan, and aligning budgets with institutional priorities.

- **President’s Council.** This seven-member body includes the university President; the Vice Presidents for Academics, Administrative Services, Student Life, and University Relations; the Chief Information Officer; and the Assistant to the President for Research and Planning.
- **Department chairs from the College and the three Schools.**
- **The faculty generally, by means of faculty meetings under the direction of the Academic Vice President, and focus groups facilitated by the Faculty Advisory Committee.**

In addition, the Steering Committee sought input from the president and officers of the BYUH student government and from the Student Advisory Committee. At the WASC workshop in January, the committee worked with our WASC liaison, Martha Balshem, Associate Director of the WASC Senior College Commission, in preparing the proposal. Follow-up conversations between team members and Martha Balshem at the April conference in Irvine were very helpful as we solidified our approach to re-accreditation and clarified the interplay between WASC expectations and university priorities.

Faculty involvement has been a key element in the preparation of the proposal. While the teaching requirements of faculty at a small university are always demanding, there has been a strong feeling—among faculty as well as administration—that the re-accreditation proposal must be faculty-driven and faculty-owned. Not only have faculty members been part of the Steering Committee and the other university committees outlined above, but participation and feedback has been actively sought and vigorously generated by the faculty as a whole.

In order to determine the themes that we would pursue during the re-accreditation process, fifteen areas of possible emphasis were identified by faculty focus groups, the accreditation steering committee, the FAC, and SPC. In the late spring of 2003, faculty were encouraged to participate in a survey that asked them to rank these areas according to the importance they felt should be placed on them. Eighty faculty members (including a few administrators) completed the survey, out of a total faculty of about 120. The results of the survey were presented and discussed in a general faculty meeting.

The Steering Committee met in June 2003, reviewed the results of the survey and feedback from the faculty meeting, and selected the four themes that will receive special emphasis in our Educational Effectiveness review. The Vice President for Academics then met with a sub-group of the Steering Committee to organize teams that fleshed out the background, importance, and implications of each of the themes. (More details on this process, including the survey results, Steering Committee minutes, focus group minutes, and writing team guidelines, can be found in the accreditation section of the BYUH website: [http://w3.byuh.edu/about/pair/accreditation](http://w3.byuh.edu/about/pair/accreditation).)

A draft of the Institutional Proposal was finished in mid-September 2003 and discussed by the Steering Committee. It was then presented to a meeting of the general faculty, after which further focus groups were organized in order to get additional feedback prior to the drafting of the final document.

Throughout this process, most members of the faculty and administration have been involved in discussions and/or writing. The Steering Committee is determined to keep faculty members, academic leaders, university staff, and senior administrators involved as the Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness reviews proceed over the next several years. This will be done through faculty participation in our Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness reviews, faculty meetings, focus groups, e-mail updates, regular maintenance of the university’s accreditation website, a regularly-updated strategic planning website, articles in the campus newspaper *Ke Alaka‘i*, and other means. We also intend to create a web-based portfolio linked to the campus homepage, though the technical and time implications of this aspect of the process are still being analyzed. Additionally, faculty, staff, and administrators will continue to engage in broader discussions regarding accreditation standards and campus initiatives by attending workshops and conferences, including the annual WASC
conference. As the accreditation goals and themes become imbedded in the lexicon of university life, we hope that more and more members of the university community will see ways in which the process can be beneficial to them and their programs.

**Staging and Timing of Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews**

**Timeline**

- **December 2005:** Completion of self-study for Preparatory Review.
- **Spring 2006:** Preparatory Review site visit.
- **December 2006:** Completion of self-study for Educational Effectiveness Review.
- **Spring 2007:** Educational Effectiveness site visit.

**Distribution of Tasks**

The WASC Steering Committee will continue to oversee the work of re-accreditation through the Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness stages. The support structure for the committee will be expanded both to avoid overburdening committee members and to ensure participation and ownership by broad segments of the university. Support teams will be created, tasked with specific portions of the review process. One team will be given the specific task of examining institutional capacity as we work on our self-study for the Preparatory Review, and during the review itself. Other teams will be given responsibility for tracking progress on each of the four topics that will form the model for our Educational Effectiveness study, as outlined below. Existing university committees under whose purview the four topics most reasonably fall have already been tasked with overall management of the Educational Effectiveness studies for those topics.

To help coordinate these various activities, the Steering Committee will be assisted by an advisory committee consisting of experienced faculty and other stakeholders who, while perhaps not directly involved in the drafting of reports, will provide feedback and support. As the advisory committee will be one step removed from the hands-on compiling of evidence and preparing of documents, it will be their specific task to ensure that all of our efforts are focused on the Core Commitments to institutional capacity and educational effectiveness, and on WASC’s four Standards of Accreditation. This combination of working groups and reflective feedback should help ensure that the re-accreditation process responds to institutional needs while also speaking the common language of WASC.

**Preparatory Review**

One of the primary objectives we hope will result from the re-accreditation process is a greater ability to identify, capture, and use critical data in all university decision-making processes, linked to the development of a university-wide “culture of evidence.” To this end, we have already begun to assemble relevant data, policies, and procedures as evidence in support of the accreditation standards. The standards will provide the organizational framework with which we will present information for the Preparatory Review. Data will be accompanied by descriptions of how the evidence was compiled, what use is being made of it, and how the presentation of data links the preparatory and educational effectiveness reviews to goals and themes outlined in this proposal.

Part of the accumulation and display of data will be facilitated through a website that dynamically links accreditation priorities to other university processes, including program reviews and strategic planning. A web-based portfolio, connected to the university’s home page and its accreditation website, will become the electronic clearinghouse for information related to the review processes (including the work of the Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness teams).
We have identified key performance indicators which we have used to track our progress, and are in the process of developing a data warehouse that will provide other key performance indicators for use in decision making by academic leaders.

Information in the portfolio will include:

- Basic descriptive data (student demographics; enrollments and degrees; majors; data on faculty and staff; fiscal, physical, and information resources; current assessment activities; and standard statistics about BYU-Hawaii).
- Institutional policies as they relate to the four standards.
- Common data set. (This will involve the identification of peer institutions and the acquisition of data in response to common questions.)
- Assessment data, compiled by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Educational Effectiveness

We have elected to use the special themes model for the Educational Effectiveness Review. This model allows us to most effectively address areas that are central to the mission of the university and that reflect the thinking and concerns of key stakeholders (faculty, staff, administration, board, and alumni) in the re-accreditation process. Stated in terms of intended outcomes, the four themes that will form the core of our Educational Effectiveness Review are:

1. Improve learning through assessment of program outcomes.
2. Improve learning through assessment of General Education.
3. Improve efforts to help graduates find meaningful employment.
4. Improve the ability of non-native English speakers to communicate effectively in English.

All of the themes reflect BYU-Hawaii’s fundamental commitment to high-quality instruction that equips our graduates to become useful and productive global citizens. In addition, they all emphasize the collection and strategic use of data throughout the university, in support of the major goals and outcomes we have established for the re-accreditation process. The four themes are more fully discussed below.

Theme #1: Program Outcomes.

I. Background

BYU-Hawaii has recently taken steps to become an outcomes-driven university. Following a visit to our campus by Jim and Karen Nichols in March 2001, a University Assessment Committee (UAC) was organized to oversee annual departmental assessment efforts. At the UAC’s request, each department or program submitted an initial assessment plan in the fall of 2001. Every program at the university has now embarked on an annual cycle of assessment and evaluation. Means of assessment vary widely across programs, but they can be summarized as follows: external, nationally administered exams and tests; locally created and administered exams and tests; student portfolios; capstone papers, presentations, and/or performances (including audio and video recordings); external reviewers of student skills and performance; internal reviewers of student skills and performance; service projects; surveys of students, alumni, and employers; and other methods. Reports on departmental efforts, including the annual assessment plans and results, will be included in our university portfolio as part of the evidentiary presentation on this theme.

Our first Educational Effectiveness theme is intended to link ongoing assessment efforts to accreditation standards. Our program reviews will therefore focus on questions such as the following:
a. To what extent are BYU-Hawaii’s educational programs appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, and staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered?
b. How are BYU-Hawaii’s outcomes for learning and student attainment developed, and what process is used to widely disseminate these outcomes among faculty, staff, administrators, and students?
c. At what level does the university’s faculty take collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these outcomes?
d. How do BYU-Hawaii’s academic programs actively involve students in learning, rigorously challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with immediate and appropriate positive and corrective feedback?
e. To what extent can BYU-Hawaii demonstrate that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensure that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the criteria and standards faculty use to evaluate student work?
f. What processes are in place to demonstrate that the university actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular instructional innovation, and creative activity, as well as the dissemination of this work in ways appropriate to its mission statement?
g. How does BYU-Hawaii undertake to regularly identify the characteristics of its students and assess their needs, experiences, and levels of satisfaction to shape a learning-centered environment and to deliberately promote student success?

II. Action

Having embarked on the initial phase of program assessment, the university must now encourage faculty to align learning outcomes in individual courses with those identified at the department and program level. We expect that program outcomes will also improve as faculty assess the outcomes of their individual courses and use the feedback from such assessments to improve their courses.

The key element in pursuing this theme is the commitment by faculty and departments to document learning outcomes and assessment measures. A number of approaches will be adopted to help faculty understand the effectiveness of outcomes assessment, including following up on department action plans, publicizing successes that departments and faculty are having in assessing student learning, sending faculty members to regional and national assessment conferences, asking faculty who are already advocates of assessment to engage other faculty in discussions about why assessment efforts are crucial, inviting experts to campus both to instruct us on the values of assessment and to advise us regarding means, and ensuring that discussion of assessment occurs regularly in faculty meetings.

Theme #2: General Education.

I. Background

As directed by the 1996 WASC accreditation report, we have thoroughly reviewed and revised our general education program, making it more streamlined and integrated, focusing on developing those qualities in students we feel most effectively meet the mission of the university. Over the course of more than two years, an interdisciplinary committee on general education assessment (involving more than 20 faculty members, with input and review from the faculty at large) drafted a new Mission Statement on General Education which defines the three pillars of a BYU-Hawaii education: general education, major education, and religious education. The main outcomes of the generally educated program have been articulated in terms of seven qualities of a generally-educated person. Such a person will pursue truth, communicate effectively, solve problems, respond aesthetically, behave ethically, integrate socially, and be globally responsible.

II. Action
The GE Committee will work with faculty who contribute to general education to identify ways in which the seven qualities are supported by the GE curriculum. This process will lead the committee to work with faculty across departments to identify and develop embedded assessment, encouraging faculty input and ownership. By working the specific qualities and corresponding outcomes into their syllabi and assignments, the faculty will facilitate the incorporation of the language of the GE qualities into university culture, making the endeavor a university concern rather than just another program. This will also help achieve assessment goals in a timely manner.

Over the next three years, with input from faculty, general education assessment will focus on the qualities of Communicate Effectively and Solve Problems. Work on the first of these qualities has already begun. A subcommittee was appointed to develop an assessment plan for Communicate Effectively. Focusing on the writing aspect of effective communication, the subcommittee drafted a set of outcomes which were then turned over to a Writing Assessment Group (WAG). The WAG then developed a rubric by reading student papers from upper-division general education courses. A second has applied the rubric to a different set of papers this year to begin the process of assessment.

The GE committee will continue to refine the writing rubric based on further testing and discussion, with the next step being a decision on where in the GE curriculum to apply the rubric. The committee will also populate and charge a team to do the same for Solve Problems, in the expectation that a similar assessment group will be able to produce a rubric for assessing that aspect of the GE program’s expectations. By the time of the Educational Effectiveness self-study, we should have initial data from which we can evaluate the effectiveness of the GE program in achieving these qualities in our graduates. Such data will also help us redirect our efforts toward those qualities which the program does not support as effectively. Our goal will be to acquire the data through embedded assessment using a standardized rubric for each quality. Over the subsequent five years, we will identify assessment sites and instruments for the other five qualities.

**Theme #3: Employment.**

I. Background

“Placement” beyond the undergraduate degree has many aspects: obtaining gainful employment related to one’s course of study; satisfying personal employment needs outside one’s course of study; continuing on to graduate or professional school; and enriching one’s home and family life while strengthening civic, professional, religious, and social affiliations.

One of BYU-Hawaii’s goals is to prepare men and women with the intercultural and leadership skills necessary to promote world peace and international brotherhood, to address world problems, and to be righteous influences in families, professions, civic responsibilities, social affiliations, and, for most of our students, the church of which they are members. Our Board of Trustees is particularly interested in our ability to achieve this objective in our target areas of Asia and the Pacific. In order to be the most positive influence possible in our target areas, our students must have professional opportunities—that is, employment. Therefore, this theme relates to our ability to achieve the objective in our target area (and elsewhere) by providing career services for our students to assist them in obtaining employment. Consistent with point 5 of our expected goals and outcomes, we intend to apply an empirical perspective to evaluate our placement record—a task that we have historically relegated to an alumni association, with uneven results.

II. Action

We will work toward four specific outcomes: 1) to establish an organizational structure, physical setting, and resources necessary to manage effective career development programs, placement services, and evaluation systems; 2) to provide a centralized, integrated career development and placement program for BYU-Hawaii students; 3) to educate the university community regarding awareness of career development as a concept
linking academic preparation and post-collegiate employment; 4) to increase student awareness of, and involvement in, career development and placement programs, from first year to graduation.

Over the next three years, BYU-Hawaii will centralize relevant existing data collected from admissions, registration, alumni surveys, and departmental surveys, and establish a common framework for departmental analysis, job placement (career services), and student tracking. The data collected will identify and track addresses of graduates, degrees earned at BYU-Hawaii, post-graduate education, employment positions, self-assessed measures of satisfaction with employment, and the relevance of BYU-Hawaii education to employment. As part of our effort to acquire and use critical data, we will continue to update information collected from alumni, create and maintain a country-by-country listing of associations between potential employment categories and degrees offered by the university, identify areas within the university organization that can contribute to the collection and maintenance of all employment-related information, and identify ways of ensuring that appropriate information is available to faculty, administration, student advisors, and career services personnel.

**Theme #4: Effective Communication in English Language.**

**I. Background**

Again consistent with point 5 of our intended goals and outcomes, we wish to apply an empirical perspective to evaluate one of BYU-Hawaii’s central competencies as an institution: the teaching of English language. BYU-Hawaii has a unique linguistic environment, with over 45% of our student body coming from countries where English is a second language (L2). The single greatest challenge in having such a linguistically diverse student body is that many of these students come from countries and educational systems where advanced English language instruction is not readily available to them. The teaching of English language at BYU-Hawaii is essential in order for the institution to maintain its academic integrity and continue its international mission. Our Board of Trustees recently issued a charge to BYU-Hawaii to become even more expert in providing students with outstanding English language skills.

Steps have been taken to respond to the Board’s challenge. Faculty hires in the English as an International Language program (EIL) have been focused on language planning and assessment. A university-wide leadership retreat was dedicated to a discussion of ways in which everyone on campus can improve student language learning. Dr. William Eggington, a nationally-prominent language planning consultant, spent a full semester in residence in 2003 analyzing and assessing the language learning environment on our campus. His report has been distributed to key members of the faculty and administration. These steps are precursors to increasing the institution’s commitment to its international students and their needs. An institution with as many non-native speakers as BYU-Hawaii must have a university-wide language plan. Since English language competency will not simply happen in such a multilingual environment, the EIL (English as an International Language) program cannot bear sole responsibility for language development. This is a university-wide issue.

**II. Action**

In order to create an environment more conducive to English language learning at BYU-Hawaii, we are proposing two distinct action steps: extensive data collection, and the development of a campus-wide language plan. The first step will be used to inform the second step. Our language planning process will be grounded in data that describe English use and competence across campus. We will make use of three types of data to inform language planning.

a. **Archival search and presentation of current levels of student proficiency and usage.** The BYU-Hawaii EIL program has accumulated considerable data that evaluate English proficiency as students enter and exit from EIL. We will continue to collect these data and organize them to present an evaluation of EIL performance.
b. **Post-EIL English development.** Students who are non-native speakers of English spend an average of one year (two semesters and a spring session) in the EIL program. In addition to more carefully assessing English acquisition in the EIL program, we intend to evaluate English competency at graduation from BYU-Hawaii. We will use both cross-sectional and longitudinal methods to perform this evaluation. We will collect cross-sectional data from L2 students at graduation beginning in the 2003-2004 academic year. We will also track student performance over time so that within four years we will have longitudinal data that allow us to track English language acquisition at the level of individuals.

c. **Qualitative data.** Questionnaire data described above will be supplemented by qualitative investigations of English usage on campus. Building on research conducted by Dr. Eggington, we will generate a composite view of language use in our campus community. For example, we will investigate students’ attitudes about English, English developmental opportunities across campus, students’ reasons for learning English, and students’ expectations of their English after graduation.

These data will then lead to the development of a university language plan that:

- informs and is informed by all corners of the campus—from employment to curriculum, from Housing to Admissions, and from ecclesiastical responsibilities to Student Life;
- systematically collects data on students’ language development at all stages of their university career;
- is managed by a standing L2 committee that broadly represents campus life—a committee that has already been constituted and will manage our investigation of English language acquisition on the BYU-Hawaii campus;
- is built on a model that allows for constant assessment, evaluation, and modifications.

**Basic Descriptive Data**

See attached Appendix for data tables.

**Off-Site Degree Programs**

We currently have no degree programs where 50 percent or more of the program is offered off-site.

**Institutional Stipulation Statement**

See attached statement.