1. “The Institutional Proposal is the first element of the Institutional Presentation and the first stage in the accreditation review cycle. Its purpose is to guide the entire accreditation review process. Once the Proposal is approved, it becomes part of the total body of institutional material that supports the review during its subsequent two stages. . . . The Proposal enables the review process to be anchored in each institution’s distinctive context and its intended goals for the accreditation process.” (WASC Handbook of Accreditation, p. 37)

2. Please see the entire 12 September draft of BYUH’s Institutional Proposal at our accreditation web site, accessible from the Faculty/Staff area of the homepage.

3. Faculty involvement will continue to be a key WASC indicator that the re-accreditation process is tied to core commitments and goals.

4. The sections on expected goals and outcomes, Preparatory Review, and Educational Effectiveness Review are the sections that both give direction and commit the university to certain actions.

5. Expected goals and outcomes in BYUH proposal draft:
   - Incorporate critical data into decision-making processes.
   - Implement a departmental review process for each program area.
   - Implement meaningful, positive changes in the teaching-learning process at BYU-Hawaii by building on assessment of student learning outcomes.
   - Develop outcomes and means of assessment for selected GE areas.
   - Educate faculty on the processes and purposes of a culture of evidence.

6. After considerable faculty input, we plan to propose that WASC examine the following four themes in the Educational Effectiveness Review, the last stage of the re-accreditation process:
   a. Improve learning through assessment of program outcomes.
   b. Improve learning through assessment of General Education.
   c. Improve efforts to help graduates find meaningful employment.
   d. Improve the ability of non-native English speakers to communicate effectively in English.

7. In our Institutional Proposal, we have attempted to link the four Educational Effectiveness themes to our expected goals and outcomes. Data gathering and documentation are the primary areas in which WASC will be examining our efforts. It is crucial that we document everything we do in support of these themes.

8. The expected goals and outcomes and the four Educational Effectiveness themes were determined through a process of faculty/staff/administration collaboration, including substantial faculty input, over the course of several months beginning in January 2003. They cannot be substantially changed at this point. Since the entire university will be involved in the pursuit of these goals, however, ongoing input into the process is encouraged. **In particular, we would welcome input into the “action” section of each of the four Educational Effectiveness themes as we fine-tune the Institutional Proposal prior to the 15 October submission deadline.** These are the sections that commit us to do certain things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DOCUMENT/ACTIVITY</th>
<th>EMPHASIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 October 2003</td>
<td>Institutional Proposal</td>
<td>Establish re-accreditation context, define goals, define institutional strategy (themes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>Preparatory Review Self-Study</td>
<td>Identification, capturing, and using critical data; developing information portfolio; tracking key performance indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>Preparatory Review Site Visit</td>
<td>Institutional capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>Educational Effectiveness Self-Study</td>
<td>Program outcomes, GE assessment, employment, EIL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Educational Effectiveness Site Visit</td>
<td>“Sustained engagement by the institution on the extent to which the institution fulfills its educational objectives,” i.e., the objectives we have set for ourselves in our own proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>