

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To Hawaii Pacific University

February 8-11, 2022

Team Roster

Chair, Dr. Mary Marcy

President Emerita

Dominican University of California

Assistant Chair, Mr. Les Kong

Librarian Emeritus

California State University, San Bernardino

Dr. Robert Allison

Vice President for Business and Finance

Vanguard University of Southern California, Retired

Dr. Chester Haskell

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and University Provost

Antioch University

Dr. Luoluo Hong

Vice President for Student Engagement and Well-Being

Georgia Institute of Technology

Dr. Susan Opp

Vice President

WSCUC Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 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 (WSCUC). 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

	Page
Section I Overview and Context	3
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	3
B. Description of the Team’s Review Process	4
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update. Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	4
 Section II Evaluation of Institutional Essays	 6
A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions	6
B. Component 2: Compliance: Review Under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements	6
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees	31
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation	33
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention and Graduation	34
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence	35
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment	36
H. Component 8: Reflection and Plans for Improvement	36
 Section III Findings, Commendations and Recommendations from the Team Review	 41

Section I: Overview and Context.

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History.

Hawaii Pacific University (HPU) is a private non-profit university located on the island of Oahu, Hawaii. HPU was established in 1965 as Hawaii Pacific College, a private liberal arts college. It received initial WSCUC accreditation in 1973, and became Hawaii Pacific University in 1990. In 1992 HPU merged with Hawai'i Loa College, a merger which expanded the physical footprint and capacity of the university.

Hawaii Pacific University's mission is to create an international learning community, providing an American education built on a liberal arts foundation. The university focuses its work around three Hawaiian values: *pono*, *kuleana* and *aloha*. *Pono* in Hawaiian culture means righteous, and can also mean to be in a state of balance – with oneself, with others, with life itself. *Kuleana* refers to an individual's personal sense of responsibility. *Aloha* is not only a gentle greeting in Hawaii, but also means to treat one another with love and respect.

The main operations of HPU are in Honolulu, and there are four primary sites across the island. In addition, HPU maintains a presence on seven military installations across Oahu. Since the last site visit, the university has relocated its primary facility to downtown Honolulu.

As of fall 2021, the university enrolled 3,575 students, with 3,144 FTE undergraduate students and 429 FTE graduate students. HPU is highly diverse, with students from all 50 states and around the world, and no majority racial or ethnic population. In 2021, HPU was designated as a federal Minority Serving Institution (MSI).

B. Description of the Team's Review Process.

The team conducted its review of HPU February 8-11, 2022 in a hybrid format, with three members and the WSCUC staff liaison on site, and two members participating remotely. The team found the accreditation report to be well written, and the university to be responsive to the team's requests. The team met with the president; senior leadership; the chief financial officer; the provost/chief academic officer; the board of trustees; deans; faculty leadership; as well as with administrators and staff concerning strategic planning, student success, and diversity, equity, and inclusion. Open fora with faculty, staff, and students were also conducted. Team members were given tours of the Hawai'i Loa and Makapuu campuses, the HPU main campus, and Hickam Air Force Base. The university also provided the team with technology-enabled rooms on campus and at the hotel to facilitate its work and discussions.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The process of developing the institutional report was managed through the office of the chief academic officer with subsections developed primarily by the WSCUC Steering Committee. Members of the campus community were aware of the upcoming accreditation review and visit, but did not appear to have read the institutional self-study nor participated in its development.

The university has undertaken significant work to address concerns raised by the WSCUC Commission relative to financial stability. Much of this work is still in process. This work includes several contracts with online program managers for the launch of new, high demand academic programs. The university has also reevaluated facilities usage in an effort to address

financial stability concerns, and has plans to renegotiate debt service. These initiatives and their progress were evaluated thoroughly by the team, and are discussed at some length in this report.

Like all institutions, the university has faced challenges associated with the pandemic. The shelter-in-place order issued by the State of Hawaii in March, 2020 required an abrupt move to fully online instruction. The university undertook the intensive work of creating a safe learning environment with diligence. Reduced revenue in auxiliary income, coupled with increased expenses related to the pandemic, led to significant pandemic-related financial losses. However, the university also positioned itself to respond to the pandemic in a manner that supported enrollment and ongoing operations. HPU offered limited in-person instruction in 2020-2021. Due to social distancing measures required by city and county mandates at the start of the 2020/2021 academic year, most classes were hybridized to some extent. Full in-person instruction then resumed at HPU in fall 2021. In summer 2020, the university upgraded its air conditioning systems with MERV (Minimum Efficiency Rating Value) 13 filters where possible. External air purifiers were subsequently purchased and installed during summer 2021, thus facilitating the university's actions to cease hybrid instruction and resuming in-person instruction in fall 2021. This provided a significant student recruitment advantage when other institutions, particularly those in California, were still operating in a primarily remote environment. Due to HPU's MSI status in 2021, it received an additional boost in Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund (HEERF) support as well.

Section II Evaluation of Institutional Essays

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

In 2016 the university was reaccredited for a period of six years, with a progress report required in 2017, and a Special Visit scheduled for 2019. While commending the university for its program review process and progress in data-informed decision making, in its report, the 2016 evaluation team expressed concern about financial stability, communication, turnover at the senior leadership level, student advising, and enrollment declines. Following the scheduled Special Visit, in 2020 the university was issued a Notice of Concern, citing in particular concerns about “Criteria for Review (CFR) 3.4 regarding financial stability caused in large measure by enrollment declines.” This Notice of Concern, which has been in place since 2020, has caused some specific challenges for HPU, including a misunderstanding about the institution’s status with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (which has now been resolved), and questions from prospective students.

B. Component 2: Compliance: Review Under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with federal requirements

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes

The university has a distinctive mission that leans into its location: *"Hawai'i Pacific University is an international learning community set in the rich cultural context of Hawai'i. Students from around the world join us for an American education built on a liberal arts foundation. Our innovative undergraduate and graduate programs anticipate the changing needs of the community and prepare our graduates to live, work, and learn as active members of a global society."* As discussed previously, the university centers its work on a set of three Hawaiian

values: *pono* (righteous, honest, moral, to do the right thing; be in a state of balance with oneself, others, the land, work, and life itself); *kuleana* (personal sense of responsibility for self and others); and *aloha* (regard/treat one another with love and respect).

Integrity and Transparency

HPU demonstrates that it has a clear purpose, has identified a distinctive mission, and developed a strategic plan with support for implementation. The strategic plan's call for enrollment growth appears to stray from the liberal arts foundation of the institution's mission; clarifying this would be helpful (CFR 4.6).

The recent establishment of a cross-campus Justice, Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (JEDI) Work Group is laudatory; two years into existence, it appears the group is catalyzing critical conversations that have not taken place and beginning to raise questions that can lead to positive change. However, there also seems to be an over-reliance on educating students, staff and faculty on the three core Native Hawaiian values as a pathway to addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI); research has not shown cultural awareness programs to actually impact equity and inclusion outcomes (CFR 1.4). The university will administer its first-ever diversity, equity, and inclusion survey after spring break 2022 and plans to use the results to inform initiatives and interventions (CFR 1.1).

For an institution with such a diverse student population, it is incumbent upon the administration to strengthen its DEI efforts. Currently, the functions of Title IX compliance and diversity coordination seem to overlap. The university will want to proceed carefully and not confuse efforts to bring about compliance and cultural change simultaneously within the same organizational structure. The team recommends that the university promote diversity, equity, and

inclusion, in alignment with its mission and strategic plan, throughout all levels of the institution following systematic assessments and campus-wide consultation on a regular basis (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 4.1, 4.5, and 4.6).

Commendation

HPU is to be ***commended*** for its consistent incorporation of the three Hawaiian values: *pono* (righteous, honest, moral, to do the right thing; be in a state of balance with oneself, others, the land, work, and life itself); *kuleana* (personal sense of responsibility for self and others); and *aloha* (regard/treat one another with love and respect).

Recommendations

The WSCUC Team ***recommends*** that HPU:

1. develop the appropriate staff capacity and institutional infrastructure to more effectively ensure equitable educational outcomes among its highly diverse student population (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 3.1, and 4.1);
2. promote diversity, equity, and inclusion, in alignment with its mission and strategic plan, throughout all levels of the institution following systematic assessments and campus-wide consultation on a regular basis (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 4.1, 4.5, and 4.6); and
3. continue efforts to assess faculty, staff, and student satisfaction and campus climate on an ongoing basis in order to make informed improvements in the living-learning-working environment (CFRs 2.13, 3.2, 4.1, and 4.3).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided **sufficient evidence** to determine compliance with **Standard 1**.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

The institution has demonstrated its compliance with CFRs 2.1 - 2.9 with regard to undergraduate and graduate students and programs. It should be noted that HPU enhanced student success through the creation of a mandatory first-year experience course (UNIV 1000), which debuted in fall 2020 and was co-led by faculty, staff, and peer mentors. The one-credit seminar focuses on helping students navigate college life and includes topics related to DEI, health and wellness, academic success strategies, and Hawaiian culture. Of the first-year students who completed the UNIV 1000 course, 90.5% re-enrolled for the spring 2021 semester (this was shared with the team in a meeting with the provost).

Student Learning and Success

The institution has not provided adequate information to demonstrate compliance with respect to CFRs 2.10 - 2.14 in particular with regard to graduate students and programs, and the team has concerns that the campus is at risk of being out of compliance. Specifically, there are insufficient details and plans concerning graduate programs and the extent of support for graduate student learning and engagement, in particular for the new programs coming on board. The institution acknowledges that it historically has served a predominantly undergraduate population; as such, it is not clear if it has invested in the requisite infrastructure and personnel needed to support graduate student educational needs. For example, graduate students – even when studying online - have unique mental health needs, are more likely to have difficulties related to child and elder care, and more likely to experience challenges related to interpersonal conflicts, harassment, bullying and other climate-related issues (CFRs 2.11 and 2.13).

The institution is encouraged, as it continues to implement, assess, and improve its student success efforts to focus not just primarily on strategies which strive to make students more “college ready,” (which include activities such as orientation, freshman seminar, advising, summer bridge, tutoring and mentoring) but to also engage in a courageous self-analysis regarding institutional practices which may serve as barriers to student success, or impede educationally equitable outcomes - so that the college may become more “student ready.” Similarly, a review of disaggregated data with regard to retention and graduation should not only identify students who may need additional support but also highlight gaps and deficiencies on the part of the institution in terms of instruction, student services, practices and policies (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, and 2.13).

The team suggests that it would be helpful if the institution were to make the results of assessments and surveys more readily available on its website, as well as make data on student success outcomes and educational equity gaps more accessible (CFR 2.10).

Furthermore, HPU recently reassigned responsibility for planning and implementing student activities and events to staff in University Relations. Reasons cited included lack of bandwidth among the Division of Student Life staff and a “mindset” about student events that was preferable. This shift is concerning, as it reflects a rather outdated view of the purpose of student activities and events, which ultimately should be part of co-curricular programming designed to advance the academic mission, complement the instructional experience, and promote student development. It seemingly reflects a greater emphasis on creating future donor alumni, than it is on fostering improved student success outcomes. It also further fragments the student affairs professional team, making it even more challenging to develop a cohesive, coordinated view of

the student engagement experience at HPU. In a meeting with the chief academic officer, the team learned that this restructure was a pilot, and would be evaluated after a year or so.

It is unclear if the institution has assessed the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. At a minimum these raise questions about CFRs 2.11 and 4.1.

The team learned in an open forum with HPU students, that there appear to be two themes regarding transparency: (1) students cited concerns that what was represented to them prior to admission differed from what actually happened to them once they enrolled at HPU; and (2) students perceive that the university is not communicating changes in academic policies and practices with students in a timely manner, and requested that HPU do better in this regard. Similarly, students report that access to student services is notably inequitable across the three locations, e.g., limited and/or delayed access to laundry in housing at the Hawai'i Loa campus, and inadequate parking at the Aloha Tower Marketplace location. Female students, in particular, also reported concerns about safety and security, especially during evening hours. Furthermore, students expressed concerns regarding the availability of timely mental health counseling, as well as the accuracy of advising information provided. Transportation and dining services were cited as not being reflective of students' (several athletes provided examples) academic schedules (CFRs 1.6, 2.12 and 2.13).

The team also raises the question as to whether appropriate faculty qualifications have been adopted for the expanded graduate programs (an HPU document cited that only 82% of faculty have a terminal degree) (CFR 2.1).

Suggestions

The WSCUC Team *suggests* that HPU:

1. evaluate the effectiveness of its recent realignment of student support services under University Relations; and
2. make available on its website the results of institutional assessments and surveys, as well as data relevant to student success outcomes and educational equity gaps.

Recommendations

The WSCUC Team *recommends* that HPU:

1. provide evidence of the faculty's direct role in curriculum design and ongoing assessment of student learning in support of all of its academic programs, including its OPM programs (CFR 2.4);
2. design, deliver and assess the effectiveness of, co-curricular programs (including academic support) for both undergraduate and graduate students and use the results for improvement (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 3.5, and 4.1);
3. develop the appropriate staff capacity and institutional infrastructure to more effectively ensure equitable educational outcomes among its highly diverse student population (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 3.1, and 4.1);
4. promote diversity, equity, and inclusion, in alignment with its mission and strategic plan, throughout all levels of the institution following systematic assessments and campus-wide consultation on a regular basis (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 4.1, 4.5, and 4.6); and
5. continue efforts to assess faculty, staff, and student satisfaction and campus climate on an ongoing basis in order to make informed improvements in the living-learning-working environment (CFRs 2.13, 3.2, 4.1, and 4.3).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided **sufficient evidence** to determine compliance with **Standard 2**.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

Faculty and Staff

The team found the number of faculty and staff members adequate for the programs that the institution currently offers. Moreover, with the anticipated rapid growth in program offerings, the institution also anticipates adding faculty and staff as these new program offerings begin accepting students. The addition of these new programs, most requiring specialized accreditation, will provide hiring challenges, but will be made easier as Hawaii residency will not be required as much of the instruction will be conducted through a distance education modality. The university has a staffing plan that appears reasonable to support the new programs. The large class of new students in the fall of 2021 has taxed the current undergraduate faculty, requiring many overloads to accommodate the additional sections of classes. Together with the 4-4 teaching load, this has caused stress for faculty in meeting their teaching, research, and community service needs (CFR 3.1).

At the present time 78% of the faculty hold doctoral degrees, 18% master's degrees and 4% have master's degrees that are considered to be terminal degrees in their disciplines. The table below illustrates the racial composition of both full-time (FT) and part-time (PT) faculty:

	White	Asian	Native Hawaiian	Hispanic	Black/African American	2 or more	Native American
FT	63%	23%	3%	4%	1%	4%	2%
PT	53%	28%	8%	4%	2%	4%	1%

At the time of the preparation of the institutional report the university reported 146 full-time faculty members and 145 adjunct faculty. The 4-4 workload of 12 credits each semester, per full-time faculty member combined with the number of adjunct faculty, supported the conclusion

that the institution maintained a sufficient number of faculty to adequately staff its academic programs. However, the team also observed that many faculty were contracted for additional classes for which they were paid. The team could not conclude if this was a temporary need, due to a very large freshmen class or a need to supplement their income. The team believes that given plans for more students, both undergraduate and graduate, the university will need to carefully monitor staffing to ensure a sufficient number of staff and faculty for its program offerings, in order to effectively manage the workload of faculty to support the integrity of all its degree programs (CFR 3.1).

Hiring within the university is described in the faculty and staff handbooks and appears to conform to those handbooks in practice. Onboarding of new hires has been intentional since 2016 and includes an introduction to the ethos of Hawaiian culture. The institution considers itself an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual identify, and other issues that are contrary to federal and state laws (CFR 3.2).

The university has a continuing contract system for faculty that for new hires is three years. Evaluations are conducted during this period and upon successful completion of the first three years are offered a four-year contract. At the conclusion of the four years and a satisfactory evaluation, seven-year contracts are then issued on a continuing basis and the faculty members are considered to be on career status. Once career status is achieved evaluations are conducted during the third and sixth year and includes peer reviews. The University Faculty Review and Promotion Committee is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate and provides peer reviews and promotion recommendations for the career faculty (CFR 3.2).

The faculty handbook describes a robust professional development plan that includes faculty working with their deans and department chairs to ensure professional development occurs and is supportive of individual and institutional goals. This is more rigorous prior to career status but continues throughout the duration of the individual's career. However, resources for professional development activities are only available upon request and demonstrated need, and are limited to \$50,000 of budgeted funds for the entire faculty, leaving faculty development primarily supported by outside funding, rather than institutional funds. The team observed that this approach provided different programs with disparate resources and could unintentionally preclude some faculty from adequate professional development opportunities. Therefore, the team recommends that the institution evaluate and adequately resource faculty development activities and needs in order to ensure the academic quality of its degree programs and effectively manage the workload of faculty to support the integrity of all its degree programs (CFRs 3.1 and 3.3).

Evaluations for staff are conducted on an annual basis by the employee's supervisor and a sampling of staff confirmed reviews are routinely conducted. A well attended meeting with staff confirmed that many staff had been provided professional opportunities during the past year (CFRs 3.2 and 3.3).

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

Since the last WSCUC review the institution has strengthened its financial position, even with the challenges the COVID-19 pandemic provided. In at least one prior fiscal year, the near lack of compliance with the bond covenants, a primary focus of the CFO and the board's finance

committee was to ensure compliance, as the lack of compliance would have placed the institution in jeopardy. During the past few years, the institution complied with its covenants, and its future projections predict continued compliance. The institution routinely conducts audits of its finances for compliance with reporting standards and has unqualified independent financial audits for the past decade (CFR 3.4).

During the meeting with members of the board of trustees (BOT), the chair of the board's finance committee characterized the past five years as a "financial turnaround" but noted that at least another year or two will be required to provide a greater level of confidence that the future of the institution is secure. Overall, the team perceptions were much the same as the finance committee chair's, noting that much has been accomplished, but much is left to do. The following paragraphs describe the team's observations and recommendations.

The financial operating results for the past three years are reflected in the table below. The information was taken from annual financial reports with "clean audit opinions" conducted by a major, national level auditing firm.

Net Increase (decrease)	2019	2020	2021
Without Donor Restrictions	(\$14,240,729)	(\$1,157,437)	\$ 4,516,986
With Donor Restrictions	3,779,600	(1,440,797)	8,819,275
Changes in net Assets	(\$10,461,129)	(\$2,598,234)	\$13,336,261
Losses shown in brackets			

As one can see, the institution has significantly improved its financial performance during 2021, as compared to the two preceding years, but again points to the notion that while a turnaround appears to be underway more financially successful years are needed to confirm that the turnaround is successful. The latest budgeted forecast for FY 2022 provides a net increase from operations at approximately \$945,000, with larger increase in the future years. Discount rates for

the institution have been steadily rising for many years. In 2015 the rate was 37% and the number of freshmen was 473. By 2021 the rate had risen to 55% with 780 freshmen.

The following table illustrates the history:

Fall UG Fresh	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Discount %	37%	42%	47%	55%	58%	57%	55%
HC	473	449	480	556	479	514	780
Net Tuition per Student	13.7	13.4	13.5	11.8	11.5	12.5	13.3
Total Net Tuition	6,480	6,036	6,480	6,572	5,506	6,447	10,396

HPU believes that improved efforts at marketing, focused discounting and emphasis on retention and graduation rates led to the large fall 2021 undergraduate class (though the team perceives that the increase may be attributed, at least in part, to HPU's decision to run limited in-person instruction during the pandemic, while most universities were not doing so), and it believes that this will lead to improved undergraduate net tuition as well. However, this improvement is projected as minimal and will not lead to the level of undergraduate net tuition that the university experienced between 2010 and 2015. Hence, they have chosen the new graduate programs to generate the majority of new net tuition revenue.

For graduate students the rate has risen from 9% in the fall of 2015 to 18% in 2021. The following table illustrates the changes during those years:

Graduate Tuition Discount History							
Fall	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
% discount	9%	10%	11%	13%	12%	12%	18%
HC	745	613	541	499	469	441	519
Net tuition per Student	13.9	15.1	16.1	15.8	17.9	16.6	15.5
Total Net Tuition	10,320	9,235	8,717	7,898	8,395	7,322	8,005

The team noted that the institution set about planning for its future sustainability in an intentional way. Given its past declining undergraduate student counts and the anticipated significant decline in college age freshmen taking place in 2025, the senior administration concluded that diversification in tuition revenue must take place. As a result, three new professional graduate programs were envisioned and are starting in the next few years, Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT), Master's of Science in Medical Science (Physician Assistant), and Doctor in Occupational Therapy (OTD). In addition, three other programs, a Master's in Nursing, a Doctorate in Nursing Practice, and a Doctorate in Psychology (PsyD scheduled to begin during the summer 2022) have been rebooted in a new format. Together these programs are expected to provide an additional net tuition revenue of approximately \$8,000,000 in FY 2023. By FY 2026 the institution believes it will realize \$39,000,000 in net tuition revenue from these new programs.

The following table illustrates net tuition growth for these graduate programs:

5 Year Net Tuition Projections: FY 22 - FY 26	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY	FY
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
UG/GR net tuition*	63	59	56	54	55	54	56	57	60	62	64
Graduate with OPM							0.6	8	20	32	39
Total	63	59	56	54	55	54	57	65	80	94	103
*excludes Grad partnerships with OPMs											
Source: December update on tuition discounts and tuition rate projections											

The table above illustrates the aggressive increase in tuition revenue projected from these graduate programs utilizing online program management (OPM) partners. A significant percentage of the revenue (over half) goes to the partners, and the costs of those partnerships are included in program expenses in the expense section of the institution's financial statements. In order to meet the established guidelines, these programs must attain specialized accreditation and begin delivering according to the established timeline. The team recommends that the institution continue its efforts to improve its financial stability by further diversifying revenue streams, improving the effectiveness of fundraising, and refinancing debt (CFR 3.4).

The December 31, 2021 interim financial statements for HPU forecast positive financial results for FY 2022. The institution is now predicting a surplus for FY 2022 of approximately \$950,000; however, this is primarily the result of additional, unbudgeted federal financial support, amounting to approximately \$9M. The following table is an excerpt of information provided to the team during the visit:

Excerpt FY Budget Forecast and Preliminary Forecast for FY 22				
	FY 22 Budget	FY 22 Preliminary Forecast	\$ Variance	% Variance
Net Tuition	\$ 60,489,000	\$ 57,130,000	\$ (3,359,000)	-6%
Private Gifts and Grants	\$ 4,555,046	\$ 1,578,248	\$ (2,976,798)	-65%
Government Grants	\$ 7,196,875	\$ 16,687,740	\$ 9,490,866	132%

The preliminary forecast now raises the net asset increase from operations to \$945,413, a significant improvement over the original 2022 budget, and primarily due to the large amount of unbudgeted federal financial assistance.

First time, full-time new students significantly increased from the previous year, 515 to 780. However, the budget was built upon 830 first time, full-time new students. This contributed to a net tuition shortfall of \$3.4M, including \$200,000 from graduate, military, and other programs. In addition, the unrestricted fundraising goal was set at \$4,555,000 and the December 2021 forecast was for approximately \$1.6M. The resulting shortfall of these two lines are offset by the additional federal support for the year. The team was concerned by: (1) the magnitude of the estimation variance; (2) the impact upon future year tuition revenues; and (3) the lack of federal COVID-19 generated support in future years. Therefore, the team recommends that the institution develop accurate revenue, enrollment and timeline projections of new degree programs based upon evidence-based assumptions and data, and clear assessment of specialized accreditation requirements (CFR 3.4).

During the visit, the CFO and members of his staff provided updated forecasts for future years. The net tuition forecast for FY 2023, indicates an increase of \$7.1 from new programs. The team reviewed the reasonableness of this estimate in detail. The current status of applications for the DPT and the two nursing programs, appeared reasonable, and support the forecasted budget for

2023. However, given that these programs are supported by the OPM entities, *Evidence in Motion (EIM)*, and *Pearson*, who are paid over half of the net tuition, the team also noted that the net to the institution was much less. However, the institutional projections did carry these costs in the budget projections as well. The only unknown for the team was the amount of payback for up front costs payable to *EIM* and whether those expenses were adequately covered in the forecasts.

By FY 2026, revenues from the new partner-supported graduate programs are forecasted to reach \$39.0M, which if the OPMs perform in a timely manner, is as expected would provide sufficient revenues to ensure the institution is continuing on a sustainable path. The team viewed these forecasts as aggressive, but possibly attainable. The team recommends that the institution continue to strengthen the financial sustainability of the institution through increased net tuition revenue (CFR 3.4).

In addition to the creation of new graduate programs, the institution began consolidating its physical facilities in downtown Honolulu. The results are nearing completion and must be completed by the fall of 2023, with the relocation from the Hawai'i Loa campus - that now houses most of the College of Natural and Computational Sciences, 207 on-campus residential spaces, and a library with study spaces - to new space in the downtown area. Most of the institution's downtown locations are within a 15-minute walk of each other, in a safer environment than some of its previous space in other downtown locations. The Makapuu campus also must have some renovation to accommodate approximately 180 upper-division marine science majors. The team recommends that the institution complete the windward island

relocation and improvement to ensure adequate capacity for academic program quality (new and continuing) (CFRs 3.4, and 3.5).

The team observed the following challenges still extant for the university in order to complete its turnaround:

- outstanding long-term debt of approximately \$73,000,000;
- endowment of approximately \$56,000,000;
- average interest rates on the debt of almost 7%;
- aggressive forecasts for students in new graduate programs;
- first-year undergraduate discount rate of 55%;
- first year retention undergraduate retention rates of 66% (2019);
- execution risks pertaining to new programs, with heavy reliance upon OPM entities;
- fungible fundraising to support operations of the university.

For these issues, the team concurred with the BOT chair of the finance committee statement that two more years is needed to assess that the turnaround will have been successful.

The institution has developed a robust information technology system that supports the needs of its current academic programs and supporting activities. Almost every classroom is a “smart classroom” with video conferencing capability. Wi-fi is uniformly accessible in each campus location, and the centralized computing systems appear to support the campus needs as well. The team heard no complaints about the learning management system from either the faculty or students (CFR 3.5).

The library appears to be adequately resourced at the present time, but will require additional resources as new graduate programs are brought online. Of more immediate concern is the anticipated closure of the Hawai'i Loa campus that has a library that is larger in physical space than the main campus library in downtown Honolulu. The resources there are being deselected in preparation for the upcoming move and the library staff are nervous about the potential

negative impact on holdings and student study space. Digital holdings have decreased during the past years as budgets for the library have been stagnant, while the costs for digital subscriptions have increased. A librarian search is now underway for a new head librarian as the vacancy existed during the visit. The institution should carefully review the library space and holdings needs to ensure sufficient resources continue to be available to support its academic programs (both existing and emerging) (CFR 3.5).

The institution's leadership has substantially changed since the last regular visit, and the team viewed the new leadership to be competent, prepared, and committed. The senior team was focused on its mission to provide a sustainable future for the university. During many of the meetings with staff at other levels the team encountered leadership that were committed, focused and well-prepared for their roles (CFR 3.6).

The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes were well understood by the university community. The team did observe that the quest for financial sustainability was foremost in thought from almost all levels of the institution, sometimes appearing to place too little priority on educational effectiveness. For example, until 2021 increases in salaries had not occurred in many years; the library budget had been stagnant, or decreasing in ability to acquire new holdings, budgeted faculty development funds had become more scarce, or in some departments almost non-existent. Also, the team noted that the decision-making structures were very centralized at the senior cabinet level, and left a limited role of the faculty in decision-making. However, the team found no confusion in roles, responsibilities, or lines of authority (CFR 3.7).

The university has both a full-time president/CEO and chief financial officer, the resumes for both the individuals describe individuals with sufficient training and experience to fully discharge their respective duties. HPU also has sufficient other administrators to carry out the academic and supporting functions of the university (CFR 3.8).

The board of trustees is a self-perpetuating, independent board, that requires all members, except the president of the university, who is *ex officio*, to be independent members. An appointment from a community member to the board requires resignation from a staff or faculty position. The BOT selects, evaluates, retains, or dismisses the president. Each year the president is evaluated by the board of trustees. This review begins in late summer of each year, with the president preparing a self-review, which is supplied to the chair. From the board, additional members are brought into the review, and ultimately the review is discussed at a full meeting of the trustees. The board of trustees has the following standing committees: executive committee; student success committee; finance and investment committee; and audit committee. The team met with members of the board, primarily the executive committee members, and noted that the members were very engaged and knowledgeable of current issues and plans (CFR 3.9).

The faculty's role in shared governance is explicitly laid out in the Faculty Handbook which states that the faculty have primacy in the areas of policy relating to:

- the curriculum;
- modes and methods of instruction;
- academic standards and professional ethics;
- academic appointments and reappointments;
- review, evaluation, and promotion of faculty;
- degree requirements;
- program development; and
- aspects of student life that relate most closely to the educational process.

It states that the faculty is responsible to the administration for fulfilling these responsibilities. Should there be a disagreement, the administration must clearly explain why it does not agree. Furthermore, the faculty should also have a significant role in the following:

- mission development and strategic and operational planning;
- budget development;
- institutional assessment; and
- searches for key university leaders

The faculty senate is the primary deliberative and decision making body for the faculty's role. The faculty's role in terms of leadership in curriculum review and development meets the spirit of the definitions outlined in the faculty handbook, but the team noted that the initiatives for new programs are primarily generated from the senior leadership of the institution; however, the nursing faculty were supportive and encouraging of the new format for the MSN and DNP programs. The faculty do provide curriculum review and assessment of learning outcomes. In terms of budget development, a shared governance committee on budget exists and does have some influence upon budget inputs; however, these inputs appear to be limited. University search committees do often contain faculty members but institutional assessment appears to be limited to curriculum assessment (CFR 3.10).

Commendations

HPU is to be *commended* for:

1. the dedicated commitment and active engagement of its board of trustees; and
2. the identification of new programs with the goal of improving financial sustainability.

Recommendations

The WSCUC Team *recommends* that HPU:

1. strengthen the financial sustainability of the institution through increased net tuition revenue (CFR 3.4);
2. improve its financial stability by further diversifying revenue streams, improving the effectiveness of fundraising, and reducing debt (CFR 3.4);
3. develop accurate revenue, enrollment and timeline projections of new degree programs based upon evidence-based assumptions and data, and clear assessments of specialized accreditation requirements (CFR 3.4);
4. complete windward island relocation and improvement to ensure adequate capacity for academic program quality (both new and continuing) (CFRs 3.4 and 3.5); and
5. promote faculty development to ensure the academic quality of its degree programs and effectively manage the workload of faculty to support the integrity of all its degree programs (CFR 3.3).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided **sufficient evidence** to determine compliance with **Standard 3**.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

Quality Assurance Processes

There is considerable evidence HPU took seriously the WSCUC Commission guidance of February 26, 2020, producing a lengthy and detailed report with a large number of detailed appendices. It accomplished this in a period of major changes, both internal and external. Internally the institution grappled with challenges in finances, enrollments, shifting strategies and new leadership, while externally they had to cope with the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The institutional report points to an emphasis on internal processes of engagement and an effort to be inclusive in their deliberations (CFR 4.1).

The response concentrates in large part on the pursuit of institutional financial stability, a key element of the Notice of Concern expressed by WSCUC. There was a coordinated effort to develop a strategy and long-term plan to address this fundamental, even existential matter. As part of the concern about financial stability, WSCUC called for an overall strategic plan with specific plans for implementation (CFR 4.6).

Institutional Learning and Improvement

The team met with the strategic planning group, the members of which described a detailed, iterative process. The three “pillars of success” (the term coined by this group) were described as enrollments, finances and student success. There were discussions at all levels and units that were centered on the pillars. Additionally, the university’s investment in consulting services generated considerable data and perspectives that were incorporated into plans to develop new partnerships and other avenues to enrollment and financial enhancement (CFR 4.6).

While enrollment management staff were not part of the group’s representation, all members of this group were acutely aware of the financial challenges facing a university with a modest endowment, significant debt and high tuition discounting. Such knowledge meant all units made only limited requests for additional support as part of the process. It was unclear how these data were incorporated by the overall strategic planning by the BOT and the senior leadership.

HPU was enjoined by WSCUC to develop a means to prioritize action steps and improve its capacity to measure and monitor progress in implementation. Prioritization was called for in recognition of HPU’s limited resources and to caution against having more ideas and initiatives than could be managed effectively. A central element of monitoring and managing such efforts

was a call for HPU to develop a sophisticated institutional research capacity (CFRs 3.4, 3.6, 4.1, 4.3, and 4.6).

The institutional report addresses all of these matters. Major investments have been made or are being made in various means of data acquisition and analysis. These include several products and services provided by external vendors including: (a) a new data portal; (b) a web-based catalog and curriculum management software; (c) an enhanced student evaluation data; (d) an improved capacity to collect student learning data; and (e) software that supports program reviews and strategic planning efforts. The total investment in these services is presented as \$600,000 per year (CFR 4.1).

This range of services raises questions about HPU's commitment to improvement based on data, as the coordinated management and effective utilization of so many disparate systems and services is unclear. The data collection effort is quite large for a small institution. The question arises as to how the "loop will be closed." Further, it is not clear how the university is coordinating, managing and overseeing these multiple efforts. Neither is it clear how HPU makes such efforts accountable. While the institutional research office has been restructured with new staff, there is little evidence in the report as to its effectiveness. The team found evidence of improvement in this area, but it is still a work in progress, as the institution concentrates on the implementation of its plans to build enrollments (CFR 4.3).

There are other new large scale programmatic initiatives that go beyond the collection and assessment of data. *Pearson* and *Evidence in Motion (EIM)* have both been contracted with on lengthy, multi-year bases for development and implementation of graduate professional programs. Much of the plan for achieving financial stability is staked on these arrangements.

It is not clear from the report how these initiatives and contracts will be led, overseen and managed. Experience shows that such vendors require considerable administrative oversight and it is unclear as to how a small institution will manage this. The team met with the Online Program Management (OPM) group which is composed of senior administrators and graduate program directors. The group is focused on implementing and growing the new partnership programs on which much of the needed new tuition increase depends. The largest program already implemented is the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT), while others are planned to come on line in the next two years (CFR 3.7).

HPU clearly has a strategy for pursuing financial stability. This is front and center for the entire institution. The plan's core element greatly increases graduate professional program enrollments in a short time period (by FY 2025) through the *EIM* and *Pearson* partnerships. At the same time, there is a common recognition of the continuing challenges for undergraduate enrollments, especially in the face of coming demographic changes. One example of this is the dilemma about tuition discounts. It is widely recognized by many of the dangers of the very high discount rates for first-year students (55%), but there are limited steps being taken to reduce these factors. Steps have been taken to improve undergraduate rates and make modest adjustments in the planned FY 2023 budget. However, the expressed hope was for HPU's capacity to keep its undergraduate enrollments from reverting to the low levels of two years ago (CFR 3.4).

Other strategies include the reorganization of facilities into a more integrated campus structure and finding ways to restore military enrollments that have dropped dramatically because of pandemic restrictions to military base access. The institutional report describes an extensive program review process designed to assure quality (CFRs 2.7, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4).

Recommendations

The WSCUC Team *recommends* that HPU:

1. in its pursuit of new graduate degree programs, (a) sustain focus on legacy degree programs, (b) remain true to its mission, and (c) continue to maintain the academic quality of undergraduate programs by using systematic assessments of teaching and learning (CFR 4.3);
2. design, deliver and assess the effectiveness of, co-curricular programs (including academic support) for both undergraduate and graduate students and use the results for improvement (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 3.5, and 4.1);
3. develop the appropriate staff capacity and institutional infrastructure to more effectively ensure equitable educational outcomes among its highly diverse student population (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 3.1, and 4.1);
4. promote diversity, equity, and inclusion, in alignment with its mission and strategic plan, throughout all levels of the institution following systematic assessments and campus-wide consultation on a regular basis (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 4.1, 4.5, and 4.6); and
5. continue efforts to assess faculty, staff, and student satisfaction and campus climate on an ongoing basis in order to make informed improvements in the living-learning-working environment (CFRs 2.13, 3.2, 4.1, and 4.3).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided **sufficient evidence** to determine compliance with **Standard 4**.

Federal Requirement: 1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review

This area was reviewed, and HPU met all requirements in this area.

Federal Requirement: 2 –Marketing and Recruitment Review

This area was reviewed, and HPU met all requirements in this area.

Federal Requirement: 3 –Student Complaints Review

This area was reviewed, and HPU met all requirements in this area.

Federal Requirement: 4 – Transfer Policy Review

This area was reviewed, and HPU met all requirements in this area.

C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees

The institutional report provides an overview of what it describes as the “unique ethos” underlying the meaning, quality and integrity of all academic programs. This “uniqueness” is described as having five characteristics: 1) a solid foundation in the liberal arts; 2) specific knowledge and content for professional development; 3) an infusion of Hawaiian values based on moral guideposts, a responsibility for service to community and that provide a lifestyle that treats others with respect and love; 4) applied experiences and 5) self-discovery that hones judgment and evolves through educational journey.

Further, the report states: “The educator and the student together ultimately determine the value of the degree” (p.38). There is no further explanation of how this is done, nor any discussion about how the institution translates this into action. Additionally, the report states “The HPU experience is a personalized delivery of content expertise in a unique and unsurpassed, culturally and scientifically rich environment” (p.38). The team could not locate any data to back up such a broad assertion. Indeed, versions of such statements can be found on the websites of many institutions.

The report goes on to describe active faculty scholarship along with its process for assigning adjunct faculty members to provide specialized and professionally oriented expertise and experience. There are some examples of faculty achievement, but no detailed data (CFR 3.1).

One element of assuring meaning, quality and integrity is the process by which faculty are evaluated. HPU clearly has an extensive process based largely on peer reviews and that stresses the importance of comprehensive reviews. There is excellent evidence for the faculty evaluation process (CFRs 2.9 and 3.2).

There are Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) at all degree levels and every program has detailed Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) linked to Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) (CFRs 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7). The board of trustees has a student success committee that receives quarterly reports from each academic unit, as well as more general data on retention, graduation and student successes. This committee is designed to assure relevance and rigorous outcomes aligned with the needs of the larger external communities (CFRs 4.5, and 4.6).

The undergraduate common core General Education program is described as taking particular advantage of HPU's Pacific and Asian connections as part of the 14 required curricular components.

Program assessment is noted as being taken "quite seriously" as the key to assuring quality, meaning and integrity. There is a regular 5-8 year cycle of program assessment that involves deans and (starting recently) the provost. Several programs are reviewed and accredited by external specialized accreditors, including all programs within the College of Health and Society (Social Work, Public Health, Nursing.) A number of other programs are in the process of seeking such accreditation. However, there is insufficient information as to how these specialized accreditations are accomplished and reviewed internally. Such accreditation can be an important source of quality assurance (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, and 4.6).

Assessment of quality is also done through multiple forms of surveys (graduating students, alumni, employers and providers of practicum opportunities). However, it appears most of these surveys are focused on undergraduate programs. There are several new graduate programs and it is unclear how the university proposes to assess quality in those programs as they come online.

The university acknowledges that greater capacity is needed for the collection and assessment of data.

D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

The university is to be commended for completing alignment of its Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) with WSCUC and presenting relevant evidence. A comprehensive coordinating committee, Academic Assessment and Program Review Shared Governance Committee (AAPRSGC) is in place and the campus has adopted the use of *TaskStream* to document, analyze, manage and archive outcomes assessment and annual reporting. A five-year cycle is in place for review of ILOs for AA, BA, and graduate-level degrees. The team notes that HPU relied on *AAC&U* (*American Association of Colleges and Universities*) rubrics for written/oral communication to assist in assessing student competencies (CFR 2.3).

As with most institutions, “closing the loop” can sometimes be problematic, so HPU is encouraged to adopt measures to ensure that assessment outcomes are utilized to improve learning. The team supports efforts by the AAPRSGC to include professionals from student affairs, who also have expertise in student learning. HPU may want to consider employing other rubrics and/or instruments to assist in assessing student competencies, in addition to the *AAC&U* rubrics (CFRs 2.3 and 2.10).

Diversity is repeatedly cited as a strength at HPU. The team would like to see more evidence of how data is disaggregated by various student identities to identify any potential differences in ILO assessment and retention/graduation outcomes, as well as what mindful efforts have been made to close any educational/learning equity gaps (CFR 2.10).

E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention and Graduation

Attention has been devoted to improving graduation and retention rates, with specific goals set for improvement. HPU provided descriptions of improvements and evidence of progress at the undergraduate level. Advising became an important issue following the 2016 visit and notable improvements have been made, including increased training for advisors, incorporation of a one-stop model, and enhancements to online platforms. Efforts to automate four-year degree pathways have been initiated. A new system of advising has been instituted with plans for it to be evaluated in 2022 (CFRs 2.12 and 2.13).

There were improvements in the first-year retention rate; the campus provided some breakdown of graduation rates by activities students participate in. Investments have been made in some student services personnel, e.g., student services manager, retention specialist, clinical psychologist. (The team notes that the Title IX Coordinator is compulsory and that this role is ultimately more compliance driven).

The overall graduation rate seems low. Additional disaggregation and analysis of retention, graduation, and other student outcomes data by sub-cohorts of students would allow the campus to better gauge what helps or hinders student success and progress. For example, the campus should examine student success outcomes by race, ethnicity, first-generation status, and Pell-eligibility, as well as adopt best practices for improving retention/graduation for each of these target communities. Similarly, the institution has acknowledged that graduate students constitute a very different population with different assistance and support needs; specific improvements need to be adopted in the graduate programs to support student success. While the improvements to advising are positive, they also seem basic in nature and focus on

progress-to-degree; it is unclear if the campus provides more integrative advising or if advising is just about credits and class scheduling (CFRs 2.10 and 2.12).

In Appendix C.05.01 - Overview of Student Support Services, the university delineates inputs and processes more than it reflects impacts and outcomes. Many of the initiatives/actions implemented to improve retention sound promising, but it is not clear if HPU has determined the contributing factors to attrition and how these identified activities redress them. The institution will also need to develop plans to enhance student success metrics for its emerging graduate student populations. Similarly, plans for enhancing staffing, student support services and other infrastructure mechanisms will need to be delineated soon to support these emerging programs (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, and 2.14).

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, and Use of Data and Evidence

There is a single committee (Academic Assessment and Program Review Shared Governance Committee (AAPRSGC) composed of deans, college faculty, faculty senate representatives and administrators that has the mandate to review all program learning outcomes (PLO) and program assessment activities. One interesting element is the requirement that at the end of a review a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for further improvement is presented to, reviewed and executed by chairs, deans and the provost. The entire process is presented clearly in the University Program Review Guide, which also includes templates of MOUs, samples of prior reviews and the like. The review guide has been updated recently to better align with WSCUC standards and is accessible to all faculty members (CFR 4.1).

The MOU process creates a situation where the senior administrators have to understand key elements of various programs. Additionally, the MOU is an effort to make sure those with budgetary responsibilities consider the data outcomes and recommendations of the review.

HPU has also begun a process where the appropriate dean and provost must meet with the program's external reviewer. These and other process steps are evidence of recognition of the importance of "closing the loop" (CFR 4.1).

The WSCUC Commission action letter notes the need to enhance HPU's institutional research capacity and the report provides evidence of it doing so. *Banner* is the primary data software and there is a committee on data governance which works to coordinate and organize data processes (CFRs 4.2 and 4.7).

G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability. Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

For a lengthy discussion in this area, please refer to Component 2: Compliance: Review Under WSCUC Standard 4.

H. Component 8: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

Hawaii Pacific University has a senior leadership team that is fully focused on addressing the significant financial challenges that have been facing the university, and their strategic initiatives are designed to generate more net tuition revenue, increase enrollment, and manage the institution's debt covenant. These initiatives are crucial to the stability of the institution, and indicate a commitment to the long-term health of the campus. The team discussed with university leadership in some detail about enrollment expectations, financial projections, reliance

on external partners (especially through OPMs), and the requirements of specialized accreditations that are necessary to realize the strategic plan. The team reviewed the current facilities of the university, and the considerable changes underway as it prepares for new programs while changing some locations and facilities. The team also explored the institutional context for academic excellence, student support and student success, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (CFRs 1.4, 2.13, 3.4, and 3.5).

The team was impressed with the level of engagement and knowledge shown by its board of trustees, most of whom are not alumni but who have a commitment to the mission of the university. HPU embraces its location, and incorporates Hawaiian values as well as utilizes its position to conduct regionally-specific research and serve students who are drawn to its unique location. The team also noted the ongoing dedication of HPU to serving the considerable number of military students based in Hawaii.

It is clear that HPU is in a state of transition, and the challenges, strains, and opportunities associated with intensive change are evident throughout the university. The focus on financial stability is essential, but the promise of these initiatives is far from certain and not yet realized. Undergraduate enrollment has increased the last two years, but it is unclear whether this improvement is due to new marketing efforts or the result of astute positioning to be fully in-person (while most universities were not) during the pandemic. The annual budget saw a modest surplus, with the infusion of HEERF funds, austerity measures, and increased undergraduate enrollment. The university continues to carry a large debt load with restrictive covenants (CFR 3.4).

The launch of new graduate programs in partnership with various OPMs offers the potential for significant enrollment growth, and if successful these programs would go some way to stabilizing the institution financially. However, most of the programs are in their infancy, or not yet underway, and many require specialized facilities, faculty, and accreditation that suggests the current aggressive timeline may be optimistic. The programs are being developed with third party providers, which can assist with infrastructure support but also creates risk in terms of curriculum design and academic standards, and will require significant oversight that is only now being developed by the university (CFRs 2.1, 3.4, 3.5, and 3.7).

Similarly, refinancing debt would also make a significant difference in financial stability; there are some intriguing efforts underway but not yet realized. Finally, facilities relocation and upgrading in support of the academic program and university ethos is also in process (CFRs 3.4 and 3.5).

While the financial efforts are essential, the laser focus on these initiatives may place other essential work concerning student support and academic quality in an unhealthy state. New graduate programs and dramatic growth in graduate students would require a change in culture from a primarily undergraduate, liberal arts-based institution to a more graduate focused culture. Graduate students need different support systems as well as research functions, and the university does not appear to have built such systems at this time (CFRs 2.6 and 2.10).

HPU has recently been designated as a Minority Serving Institution, and states it is the most diverse university in the United States, yet the institutional infrastructure to support diversity,

equity, and inclusion is nearly nonexistent, and to date the focus on MSI status seems to be related to grant writing and acquisition (CFR 1.4).

Student support systems and co-curricular work also need attention. The team believes the university should be much more intentional in designing current integrated co-curricular opportunities that strengthen the educational experience for students, and adapt these programs to the changing needs of a highly diverse –and perhaps increasingly graduate – student profile (CFR 2.11).

The focus on the development of new, revenue generating academic programs means the legacy degree programs are in danger of being neglected. If HPU grows at the scale and in the manner that it intends, the balance of student enrollment and faculty and staff positions will shift considerably, putting strain on the existing ethos. Moving forward, the university will either need to ensure it maintains the quality and goals of its legacy programs or consider revisiting its mission (CFRs 1.1, 2.1, 2.10, 2.13, and 3.1).

The team found Hawaii Pacific University to be in a state of significant transformation. While respecting the profound work that is underway to make the institution more stable and respond to a changing external environment, the team also believes the university has considerable work ahead before it achieves stability. Many of the major initiatives are just coming online or will do so in the next few years, and it will be important to reassess the institution's progress as they do so (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, and 4.7).

Commendation

HPU is to be *commended* for its ongoing commitment to serving the educational needs of students in the armed forces on military bases in Hawaii.

Recommendations

The WSCUC Team *recommends* that HPU:

1. promote faculty development to ensure the academic quality of its degree programs and effectively manage the workload of faculty to support the integrity of all its degree programs (CFR 3.3);
2. in its pursuit of new graduate degree programs, (a) sustain focus on legacy degree programs, (b) remain true to its mission, and (c) continue to maintain the academic quality of undergraduate programs by using systematic assessments of teaching and learning (CFR 4.3);
3. provide evidence of the faculty's direct role in curriculum design and ongoing assessment of student learning in support of all of its academic programs, including its OPM programs (CFR 2.4);
4. design, deliver and assess the effectiveness of, co-curricular programs (including academic support) for both undergraduate and graduate students and use the results for improvement (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 3.5, and 4.1);
5. develop the appropriate staff capacity and institutional infrastructure to more effectively ensure equitable educational outcomes among its highly diverse student population (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 3.1, and 4.1); and
6. promote diversity, equity, and inclusion, in alignment with its mission and strategic plan, throughout all levels of the institution following systematic assessments and campus-wide consultation on a regular basis (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 4.1, 4.5, and 4.6).

Section III Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations from the Team Review

Commendations

HPU is to be *commended* for:

1. its consistent incorporation of the three Hawaiian values: *pono* (righteous, honest, moral, to do the right thing; be in a state of balance with oneself, others, the land, work, and life itself); *kuleana* (personal sense of responsibility for self and others); and *aloha* (regard/treat one another with love and respect);
2. the dedicated commitment and active engagement of its board of trustees;
3. the identification of new programs with the goal of improving financial sustainability;
4. its engagement of undergraduate and graduate students in research including creative alignment with the university's physical location at the Makapuu campus;
5. the dedication demonstrated by the entire campus community to promote the health and welfare of students throughout the COVID-19 pandemic; and
6. its ongoing commitment to serving the educational needs of students in the armed forces on military bases in Hawaii.

Recommendations

The WSCUC Team *recommends* that HPU:

1. strengthen the financial sustainability of the institution through increased net tuition revenue (CFR 3.4);
2. improve its financial stability by further diversifying revenue streams, improving the effectiveness of fundraising, and reducing debt (CFR 3.4);
3. develop accurate revenue, enrollment and timeline projections of new degree programs based upon evidence-based assumptions and data, and clear assessments of specialized accreditation requirements (CFR 3.4);
4. complete windward island relocation and improvement to ensure adequate capacity for academic program quality (both new and continuing) (CFRs 3.4 and 3.5);
5. promote faculty development to ensure the academic quality of its degree programs and effectively manage the workload of faculty to support the integrity of all its degree

programs (CFR 3.3);

6. in its pursuit of new graduate degree programs, (a) sustain focus on legacy degree programs, (b) remain true to its mission, and (c) continue to maintain the academic quality of undergraduate programs by using systematic assessments of teaching and learning (CFR 4.3);
7. provide evidence of the faculty's direct role in curriculum design and ongoing assessment of student learning in support of all of its academic programs, including its OPM programs (CFR 2.4);
8. design, deliver and assess the effectiveness of, co-curricular programs (including academic support) for both undergraduate and graduate students and use the results for improvement (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 3.5, and 4.1);
9. develop the appropriate staff capacity and institutional infrastructure to more effectively ensure equitable educational outcomes among its highly diverse student population (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 3.1, and 4.1);
10. promote diversity, equity, and inclusion, in alignment with its mission and strategic plan, throughout all levels of the institution following systematic assessments and campus-wide consultation on a regular basis (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 4.1, 4.5, and 4.6); and
11. continue efforts to assess faculty, staff, and student satisfaction and campus climate on and ongoing basis in order to make informed improvements in the living-learning-working environment (CFRs 2.13, 3.2, 4.1, and 4.3).

Federal Compliance Forms

1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? On HPU website, under Registrar.
	Comments: One credit hour constitutes a minimum of three class work hours where a "class work hour is defined as 50 minutes. Typically, class work hours include one hour of direct faculty instruction ("seat time") and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class work by the student per week of the 16-week term for a one-credit-hour course.
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)? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Program reviews occur at regular intervals, at which time credit hour assignments are reviewed.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Available on HPU website.
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? Four
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? ☒ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☐ MA ☐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Business Administration, Biology, Nursing, Social Work.
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	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) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? Four
	What kinds of courses? Internships, independent study, labs, clinical.
	What degree level(s)? ☒ AA/AS ☐ BA/BS ☐ MA ☐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Marketing, Nursing, Chemistry, Aerospace Science.
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Sample program	How many programs were reviewed? Three

information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	What kinds of programs were reviewed? <i>Doctoral, Masters, Bachelor of Science.</i>
	What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☐ MA ☒ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? <i>Nursing Practice, Diplomacy & Military Studies, Criminal Justice.</i>
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: ***Luoluo Hong***

Date: ***2/10/22***

2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: <i>HPU complies with federal regulations concerning the recruitment of students.</i>
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: <i>Tuition and Student Fees information are available on the HPU website. HPU currently has a "California Match" program which holds the cost of tuition for California students to no more than \$14,000 a year, which matches the cost of tuition at the nine University of California campuses.</i>
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: <i>HPU's Career Development Center makes available to students companies that recruit for part-time, internship, and full-time work. It also arranges for seminar/workshops and other career events.</i>

Review Completed By: **Les Kong**

Date: **2/10/22**

3. Student Complaints Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? Yes, Student Complaint Procedures are delineated in the HPU Student Handbook.
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, please describe briefly: Yes, the Student Handbook outlines procedures for addressing – Complaints against Faculty or Staff, Discrimination or Harassment Complaints, and other Student Complaints (e.g., grades or academic integrity).
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, where? Dean of Students office.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, please describe briefly: This is overseen by the Dean of Students office.
	Comments: Records of formal complaints are kept for a minimum of five years. The Dean of Students office tracks and monitors student complaints on a regular basis.

Review Completed By: **Les Kong**
Date: **2/10/22**

4. Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where? Available on HPU website under Undergraduate Admissions: Transfer Students.
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: <i>Students seeking to transfer to HPU with 24 or more transferable credits are preferred to have a 2.75 GPA or higher. Applicants must submit official transcripts from each accredited college or university attended in order to be considered for transfer credit. For applicants who have been out of school for several years, HPU makes a comprehensive assessment by examining not only their prior academic performance but other factors (e.g., work experience) as well. Students seeking to transfer to HPU with fewer than 24 transferable credits must also submit official high school transcripts, GED, or their international equivalent for review.</i>

Review Completed By: **Luoluo Hong**

Date: **2/10/22**