

INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL

Brigham Young University Hawai'i



Prepared for
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

October 2003



INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL
Brigham Young University Hawai'i

Prepared for
**Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities**

October 2003

CONTENTS

Institutional Context	Page 1
Expected Goals and Outcomes	Page 3
Description of How University Constituencies Were Involved	Page 3
Staging and Timing of Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews	Page 5
Timeline	Page 5
Distribution of Tasks	Page 5
Preparatory Review	Page 6
Educational Effectiveness Review	Page 6
Theme #1: Program Outcomes	Page 7
Theme #2: General Education Outcomes	Page 7
Theme #3: Employment	Page 8
Theme #4: Effective Communication in English for Second Language Students	Page 9
Off-Site Degree Programs	Page 10
Appendices	Page 11
Appendix A. Basic Descriptive Data	Page 12
Appendix B. Institutional Stipulation Statement	Page 14

Institutional Proposal

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

Brigham Young University-Hawai'i

October 2003

Institutional Context

Brigham Young University-Hawai'i is located in Lā'ie, on the windward shore of Oahu, 38 miles from Honolulu. BYU-Hawai'i is part of a three-campus university system sponsored by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church) that includes campuses in Provo, Utah, and Rexburg, Idaho. Though oversight is carried out by a system-wide Board of Trustees, each campus is independent of the others. The president of BYU-Hawai'i reports directly to the system's Board.

The university's sense of mission comes largely from the circumstances of its founding. Standing in a field in Lā'ie, 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 LDS Church, 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 prophetic mission shared by faculty, staff, administrators, and students.

Because of its open and active acceptance of the doctrines and leadership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and its determination to provide an educational experience of high quality, BYU-Hawai'i consciously seeks to combine spiritual and secular learning, neither shunning nor apologizing for either. One of the ways in which the university seeks to accomplish its mission is by providing an environment and a curriculum that will both engage the intellect and build character. We do not shy away from the moral, character-building aspects of education. Rather, we embrace the possibility that an education built on the three pillars of general education, training in major programs, and religious education can help create individuals who are not only competent, but

reflective and moral as well—men and women who, as the university's founder David O. McKay put it, "cannot be bought or sold." Encapsulated in our mission statement is our commitment to building faith, intellect, leadership, and intercultural sensitivity. Historically, the LDS Church has been a strong supporter of education, evidenced by its willingness to devote large financial resources to the establishment of secondary and tertiary schools in the U.S. and elsewhere. Part of the reason for this commitment is a deep belief that education creates the conditions for better families, communities, and nations.

Established in 1955 as The Church College of Hawai'i, the school's name was changed to Brigham Young University-Hawai'i in 1974, reflecting a re-envisioning of the school's curriculum and its place in the educational system of the LDS Church, as well as the substantial growth of its student body. Once offering a largely vocational/technical education, the school 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 is divided into four units: the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, the School of Computing, and the School of Education. The university has made a concerted effort to hire and retain faculty who will be major contributors to their fields as teachers and scholars.

The unique international nature of this campus is quickly apparent. Both *U.S. News and World Report* and the Institute of International Education's *Open Doors* report have indicated that BYU-Hawai'i has the highest percentage of international undergraduate students of any university in the country. Roughly forty-four percent of our students come from outside the United States. Students come from approximately 70 countries: 24% from Asia, 15% from Pacific island countries, and 5% from other regions. This diversity is intentional, and is a crucial part of the

experience of living, working, and studying at BYU-Hawai'i. Our commitment to students from our "target area" of Asia and the Pacific will remain strong, with academic programs, internship efforts, and fundraising focused in ways that make the university's international mission its defining reality. We view the campus as a living laboratory, a place where the principles of international fellowship can be taught by precept as well as by practice.

Our Board of Trustees, comprised largely of general officers of the LDS Church, plays an active part in directing the work of the university in broad terms. The Board continues to envision BYU-Hawai'i 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, placement, and fund-raising. While we, like other institutions of higher education, have experienced budgetary restraints in recent years, the Board has made clear their continuing support (including financial support) for 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.

Approximately 700 of our students work adjacent to the university at the Polynesian Cultural Center (PCC)—Hawai'i's number-one paid visitor attraction—while they attend school full time. The partnership between the two institutions epitomizes our students' international preparation. About 550 of them are on scholarships which obligate them to work 19 hours per week 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-Hawai'i 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-Hawai'i 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. As an example, all requests to fund program improvements now pass through the strategic planning process, where they are carefully scrutinized according to the imperatives laid out in the university's mission statement. They are then ranked according to those criteria when the Strategic Planning Committee's recommendations are passed along to the President's Council for review.
- 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. Budgets have been largely moved to the College, Schools, and departments in order to place budgetary authority and accountability closer to the active management of the curriculum.
- A third challenge from the 1996 report is the recruitment of faculty members who reflect more of the diversity of our student body. In the last four years, we have hired full-time faculty and staff from Taiwan, Hong Kong, Brazil, Haiti, Tonga, and Fiji, in addition to Hawai'i and the U.S. mainland. A number of these new hires have been women. 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. It should also be noted,

however, that a large number of our U.S. faculty have considerable international experience, including language skills and extended residence.

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.

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. We are now in the process of designing a data warehouse that will provide key performance indicators critical to 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-Hawai'i 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, some of which will be included in the university's e-portfolio that we hope eventually to make available on the Internet.

4. *Develop outcomes and means of assessment for selected General Education areas.* Since drafting a new mission statement two years ago, 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-Hawai'i 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, and expect to develop, test, refine, and apply assessment instruments for two of the seven GE qualities during the re-accreditation period.
5. *Educate faculty on the processes and purposes of a culture of evidence.* This 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. Continued faculty input into the re-accreditation process, and more conscious socialization of new faculty into an evidentiary culture, will help make verification the norm. Creating mechanisms and motivation for faculty input is part of this goal.

Description of How University Constituencies Were Involved

The 1996 WASC review gave us an opportunity to look carefully not only at matters of efficiency and curriculum, but at fundamental questions of institutional identity as well. Following our last accreditation, our Board asked us to closely examine the way in which we utilized church resources in carrying out our mission. In particular, they directed us to become more efficient, while at the same time doing an even better job of fulfilling the university's educational mission. In response, President Eric Shumway issued a 14-point charge to university personnel in February 1999. This charge called on the entire faculty, administration, and staff to do a better job of advancing students toward timely graduation; reduce cost per student FTE and per graduate; recruit more international students (particularly from Asia); make contacts locally, regionally,

and internationally that can expand internship and placement opportunities for our students; and in a variety of ways become more cost-effective *without in any way diminishing educational quality*.

This challenge was taken up vigorously by the faculty, guided by the Faculty Advisory Committee and a newly-formed Strategic Planning Committee. Successes have included the streamlining of the General Education program, curricular reform resulting in a reduction of the graduation requirement to 120 hours, and a dramatic increase in the graduation rate with a concurrent reduction in cost per graduate. This process provides a good example of the way in which major stakeholders have participated in the ongoing process of positive reform. Prompted by the Board and articulated by the President, the charge to become better at what we do was actively supported by the faculty, who took substantial leadership in seeing the process through. The focus which this proposal gives to our current re-accreditation efforts should therefore be seen as part of a dynamic process that began with the 1996 WASC report, was re-articulated in the 1999 charge by the President, and continues today.

One of the observations of past WASC teams was that faculty members were under-represented in key deliberative and decision-making processes at BYU-Hawai'i. This has been addressed in a number of ways. During the past several years, and more intensively over the past year, faculty, academic leaders, and university administrators have attended WASC meetings, including a training meeting held in Hawai'i 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, providing an important occasion for us to refine our thinking and commit one portion of it (regarding alignment of mission, resources, and curriculum) to an organized presentation.

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 Academic Internships, 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, recommends approval or disapproval of 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 (generally drawn from the faculty). 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.
- *Faculty*. Department chairs from the College and the three Schools, as well as the faculty generally by means of faculty meetings under the direction of the Academic Vice President, surveys, 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. Students have also been invited to sit on major university committees, another WASC recommendation.

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, many members of the faculty, as well as members of the administration, have felt strongly 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 by the faculty as a whole have been actively sought and regularly generated (sometimes quite vigorously).

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, writing team guidelines, and other information, can be found in the accreditation section of the BYUH website: <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, a substantial number 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.

Another level of input that has been important in determining future directions for the institution has come from a Futures Committee commissioned by the Board of Trustees and comprised of faculty and administrators from BYU-Hawai'i and BYU-Provo. As they relate to this proposal, the committee's concerns are particularly reflected in Educational Effectiveness themes 3 and 4.

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 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 institutional effectiveness in higher education.

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 will be a visual display of the connections between accreditation priorities and 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-Hawai'i).
- 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 Planning, Institutional Research, Assessment, and Testing.

Educational Effectiveness Review

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) 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 the English language.

All of the themes reflect BYU-Hawai'i'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-Hawai'i 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. Specific means of assessment vary widely across programs. Reports on departmental efforts, including the annual assessment plans and results, will be included in our university portfolio as part of the presentation of evidence on this theme. At the same time, we recognize that looking at what is measurable will not tell us every-thing; there are things that are important to our mission that may be difficult or impossible to accurately measure.

Our first Educational Effectiveness theme is intended to link ongoing assessment efforts to accreditation standards. Our program reviews will therefore focus on support for teaching, learning, scholarship, and creative activity, emphasizing the centrality of such activities to our university mission. Questions to be asked will fall into several general areas: the engagement of students in active learning, and the timeliness and quality of feedback from faculty; the reflection of learning outcomes in evaluation criteria; the match between program standards and faculty numbers and expertise;

the development and publicizing of student learning outcomes; the promotion and dissemination of scholarly work, creative activity, and instructional innovation; and the ability of library resources to support the university's academic programs.

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, conducting a library resource usage study related to program assessment, 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. Direct assessment by faculty will be an important means to gain data on the success of programs in meeting objectives. As many faculty members are probably unfamiliar with direct assessment, they will need support and resources to help them become more effective in this area.

Theme #2: General Education Outcomes

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-Hawai'i education: general education, major education, and religious education. The main outcomes of the GE 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. This will also include demonstrating the attainment of information literacy outcomes. Such embedded assessment can make teachers more aware of how students can use what they are learning in class after they leave school. 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*. The committee will also charge a team to do the same for *Solve Problems*, with the expectation that an assessment group will be able to produce a rubric for assessing that aspect of the GE program's expectations, as is currently being done with the writing aspect of effective communication. 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. It can include obtaining gainful employment, 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-Hawai'i'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. In particular, we see our international students as future leaders in their church in their home countries, equipped now with new skills and qualifications that will help them build local economies and social and political institutions. 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 opportunities. Consistent with the emphasis on a culture of evidence, 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 focus attention on four general areas:

- 1) establishing an organizational structure, physical setting, and resources necessary to manage effective career development programs, placement services, and evaluation systems;
- 2) educating the university community regarding awareness of career

development as a concept linking academic preparation and post-collegiate employment; 3) increasing student awareness of, and involvement in, career development and placement programs, from first year to graduation; 4) increasing internship and practicum opportunities in students' home countries which can serve as stepping stones to employment and/or graduate education.

Over the next three years, BYU-Hawai'i will centralize relevant existing data collected from admissions, registration, alumni surveys, and departmental surveys, and establish a common framework for departmental analysis, placement efforts (career services), and student tracking. The data collected will identify and track addresses of graduates, degrees earned at BYU-Hawai'i, post-graduate education, employment positions, self-assessed measures of satisfaction with employment, and the relevance of BYU-Hawai'i 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, determine ways in which data collected by academic programs can best be blended with the centralized data collection to eliminate fragmentation, and identify ways of ensuring that appropriate information is available to faculty, administration, student advisors, and career services personnel. We will also acquire a better picture of where our alumni are by means of a major alumni placement survey. Though some of the information described in this paragraph has been collected in the past, we are determined to manage and use the data better to help students develop exit strategies, and to provide them with the means to do so from the time they enter the university. We have hired a new Director of Career Services to coordinate these efforts. The BYU-HONU (BYU-Hawai'i Online Network Users) database, developed for the School of Business, provides one model for a networking tool that can potentially link students with alumni working in our target area and elsewhere (<http://cfet.soc.byuh.edu>). Some faculty members have been especially proactive in opening internship and employment possibilities in

our target area during professional visits to these countries. We will encourage more faculty to look for such opportunities.

Theme #4: Effective Communication in English for Second Language Students

I. Background

Again consistent with a culture of evidence, we wish to apply an empirical perspective to evaluate one of BYU-Hawai'i's central competencies as an institution: the teaching of the English language. BYU-Hawai'i has a unique linguistic environment, with nearly 45% of our student body coming from countries outside the United States, most from places where English is a second language (L2). The single greatest challenge in having such a linguistically diverse student body is that many of our students come from countries and educational systems where advanced English language instruction is not readily available to them. Given the large numbers of second-language students on this campus, English language competency has a direct and profound impact on nearly every aspect of campus. Nowhere is this more evident than in the classroom. The acquisition of English at BYU-Hawai'i is essential in order for the institution to maintain academic integrity as it continues its international mission. Our Board of Trustees recently issued a charge to BYU-Hawai'i to become even more expert in providing students with outstanding English language skills. In order to meet this challenge we have determined to develop an institutional language plan that both allows for English language development of all L2 students, and at the same time respects and celebrates the diversity of their native languages.

Steps have been taken to establish such a language plan. A new faculty member has been hired in the English as an International Language (EIL) program with expertise in language assessment. 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-Hawai'i must have a university-wide language plan. Since English language competency will not simply happen in such a multilingual environment, the EIL program cannot bear sole responsibility for language development. This is a university-wide issue.

II. Action

Attention to language issues has already begun to find expression in academic initiatives. For example, our first learning community, launched in Fall 2003, is a conscious effort to bring students together in an academic context that also promotes English mastery. We have intentionally populated the learning community with half international students and half mainland and Hawai'i students, along with a student mentor who helps both with English and with course content. We will do this again in the Winter 2004 semester, and hope that we can assess this effort in ways that will tell us whether or not it is useful for L2 students in the transition from EIL to the rest of the university curriculum.

In order to create an environment more conducive to English language learning at BYU-Hawai'i, 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 direct language planning.

- a. *Archival search and presentation of current levels of student proficiency and usage.* The BYU-Hawai'i 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-Hawai'i. 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 (between exit from EIL and graduation) 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:

- provides students with maximum second language learning opportunities and at the same time respects the rich diversity of their first languages;
- 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-Hawai'i campus;
- is built on a model that allows for constant assessment, evaluation, and modifications.

Off-Site Degree Programs

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A.

Basic Descriptive Data

HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT BY LEVEL (FALL SEMESTER)

YEAR	TOTAL HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT	LOWER DIVISION HEADCOUNT	UPPER DIVISION HEADCOUNT	GRADUATE HEADCOUNT	NON-DEGREE HEADCOUNT	TOTAL FTE ENROLLMENT
1999	2,281	916 (40.2%)	1,348 (59.1%)	N/A	17 (0.7%)	2,212
2000	2,393	972 (40.6%)	1,391 (58.1%)	N/A	30 (1.3%)	2,314
2001	2,328	815 (35%)	1,439 (61.8%)	N/A	74 (3.2%)	2,230
2002	2,649	912 (34.4%)	1,576 (59.5%)	N/A	161 (6.1%)	2,497
2003	2,703	1,390 (51.4%)	1,170 (43.3%)	N/A	143 (5.3%)	2,547

12

HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT BY STATUS AND LOCATION (FALL SEMESTER)

YEAR	TOTAL HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME	ON-CAMPUS LOCATION	OFF-CAMPUS LOCATION
1999	2,281	2,124 (93.1%)	157 (6.9%)	2,281 (100%)	0
2000	2,393	2,239 (93.6%)	154 (6.4%)	2,393 (100%)	0
2001	2,328	2,159 (92.7%)	169 (7.3%)	2,296 (98.6%)	32 (1.4%)
2002	2,649	2,385 (90%)	264 (10%)	2,517 (95%)	132 (5%)
2003	2,703	2,447 (90.5%)	256 (9.5%)	2,581 (95.5%)	122 (4.5%)

DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES GRANTED BY LEVEL (ACADEMIC YEAR)

YEAR	TOTAL DEGREES GRANTED	ASSOCIATE DEGREES	BACHELOR DEGREES
1998-1999	371	32 (8.6%)	339 (91.4%)
1999-2000	472	29 (6.1%)	443 (93.9%)
2000-2001	538	31 (5.8%)	507 (94.2%)
2001-2002	514	13 (2.5%)	501 (97.5%)
2002-2003	546	3 (0.5%)	543 (99.5%)

FACULTY BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

YEAR	TOTAL FACULTY HEADCOUNT	FULL-TIME FACULTY	PART-TIME FACULTY	TOTAL FACULTY FTE
1999	206	113 (54.9%)	93 (45.1%)	144
2000	204	114 (55.9%)	90 (44.1%)	144
2001	204	114 (55.9%)	90 (44.1%)	144
2002	205	114 (55.6%)	91 (44.4%)	144.3
2003	205	114 (55.6%)	91 (44.4%)	144.3

KEY FINANCIAL RATIOS

KEY FINANCIAL RATIOS	2001	2002
Return to Assets Change in Net Assets/Total Net Assets at beginning of fiscal year	9.27%	0.13%
Net Income Ratio Change in Unrestricted Net Assets/Total Unrestricted Revenues	9.73%	-2.98%
Operating Income Ratio Operating Income/Total Expenses	1.12 : 1	0.91 : 1
Viability Ratio Expendable Net Assets/Long Term Debt	5.68 : 1	5.43 : 1
Instructional Expense per Student	11,483	10,600
Net Tuition per Student	1,894	1,812

APPENDIX B.
INSTITUTIONAL STIPULATION STATEMENT

ERIC B. SHUMWAY
President



October 1, 2003

Western Association of Schools and Colleges
985 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

INSTITUTIONAL STIPULATION STATEMENT

Brigham Young University Hawai'i is using the review process to demonstrate its fulfillment of the two Core Commitments and will engage in the process with seriousness. We also stipulate that the data are accurate and fairly represent the institution.

BYU-Hawai'i has published and makes publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission in Appendix I of the *WASC Handbook*. Policies will be available for review on request throughout the period of accreditation.

BYU-Hawai'i will abide by procedures adopted by the Commission to meet United States Department of Education (USDE) procedural requirements as outlined in Section VI of the *WASC Handbook*.

BYU-Hawai'i will submit all regularly required data, and any data specifically requested by the Commission during the period of accreditation.

BYU-Hawai'i has no off-campus programs nor degree programs offered by distance learning.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric B. Shumway".

ERIC B. SHUMWAY

lm