WASC | Senior College and University Commission

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
SPECIAL VISIT

To Chaminade University of Honolulu

April 4-6, 2023

Team Roster
Team Chair: Judith Maxwell Greig, President Emerita, Notre Dame de Namur University

Assistant Chair: Melea Fields, AVP/ALO Accreditation, Licensure & State Authorizations, The Chicago School

Team Member: Cynthia (Cindy) Carter, Associate Provost Institutional Effectiveness & Degree Completion Emerita, Fresno Pacific University

Team Member: Harry Fong, AVP Finance, Retired, Santa Clara University

WSCUC VP: Tamela Hawley

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

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT 3
A. Description of Institution, Accreditation History, as relevant, and Visit 3
B. Description of Team's Review Process 4
C. Institution's Special Report: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence 5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS 6
Issue 1: Update on the Strategic Plan 6
Issue 2: Faculty Role in Academic Quality & Assessment 10
Issue 3: Improved Quality of Online Learning 12
Issue 4: Improvement of the New Budget Process 15
SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE 18
Interim Report 18
PsyD Program Implementation from Argosy 19
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 20
Commendations 20
Recommendations 21

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution, Accreditation History, as relevant, and Visit

Chaminade University of Honolulu (CUH) was founded by the Marianists, an order of Catholic brothers and priests, as Chaminade College in 1957 and has been accredited by WSCUC since 1960. It serves primarily residents of Hawai'i and students from the islands of the Pacific; it is designated as a Native Hawai'ian serving institution by the federal government.

The Mission of Chaminade is "Chaminade University offers its students an education in a collaborative learning environment that prepares them for life, service and successful careers. Guided by its Catholic, Marianist and liberal arts educational traditions, Chaminade encourages the development of moral character, personal competencies, and a commitment to build a just and peaceful society. The University offers both the civic and church communities of the Pacific region its academic and intellectual resources in the pursuit of common aims." The University's core commitments focus on service, hospitality, integrity, and relevance to its place.

It is located in Honolulu and serves approximately 2000 students, in full range of programs (79 on WSCUC website), including certificate, associates, bachelors, masters, and professional doctoral programs, many of which are offered in both on-site and distance education formats. Twenty-one of the programs are new since the prior visit, including all five professional doctoral programs.

CUH had its last reaffirmation visit in Spring of 2019, during the first year of new presidential leadership, and was granted accreditation for a period of eight years. An interim report was scheduled for 2021. The institution submitted the report, but an interim review team was not constituted, and thus the institution received no feedback. The Special Visit team was asked to serve also as the interim review team. The institution has been deeply involved in substantive change since the prior visit, including the approval of the five professional doctoral programs, as indicated above.

The Special Visit focused on four primary issues: (1) an update on the implementation of the strategic plan; (2) faculty role in academic quality and assessment; (3) improved quality of online learning; and (4) improvement of the budget process. Each of these issues is reviewed substantively in Section II of this report. All the members of the Special Visit team were present for the reaffirmation visit of 2019. The Special Visit team has not been asked to provide follow-up regarding any matters of substantive change, off-campus sites, or distance education, with two exceptions. The quality of online learning is one of the key issues for the Special Visit and, serving as the interim report team, a report on the progress of the implementation of the new PsyD program.

The team reviewed the self-study and attachments, the interim report, and all documents related to the approval of the PsyD program. From the review the team created lines of inquiry on each issue, as well as additional questions to ask that helped the team further understand the current progress and status of CUH in relation to the four issues. The team also identified additional documents which were made available.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The team reviewed CUH's Special Visit Self-Study, Interim report, and PsyD approval documents and all supplementary materials prior to the full team meeting in mid-March. From these materials, the team developed lines of inquiry that were specific to the four issues and the PsyD program. In addition, the team requested additional documentation from CUH including an updated program review tracking sheet, updated strategic planning reports, the latest dashboard, three-year audited financials, the new credit hour policy, and the results from panels and surveys referenced in the report. Materials were received prior to the site visit at the Honolulu campus on April 4-6. During the site visit members of the

team met with leadership, online students, faculty, key administrative staff, and several members of the governing board executive committee. Additionally, the confidential email account was monitored.

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

Chaminade's institutional report was well written, well organized, and clearly presented, with functional links to supportive evidence. The report accurately represented many elements of the institution's progress over the last few years, particularly with regard to the integration of effective assessment practices and the development of new programs in response to community needs. Other conditions, such as the governance structure and committee responsibilities, required additional evidence and conversations during the site visit. Faculty were articulate, accurate, and effective when describing their understanding of and involvement in instruction and learning outcomes assessment. Their involvement appears to be noteworthy, forming a strong network of collegiality and pride across academic departments. While analysis of evidence was well articulated on site, the report was lean on the inclusion of supportive evidence.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

In its Special Visit report, CUH highlighted major changes that have occurred since the last review that were specific to the four issues noted by the team in the reaffirmation visit. Additionally, CUH provided what they believed were key updates such as new hires and centers. The following details the teams' findings on each previously identified issue along with additional issues that came to the attention of the team.

Issue 1: Update on the Strategic Plan

As CUH continues and deepens the implementation of its strategic plan, particular attention should be paid to the following areas:

- *Prioritization of initiatives, including analysis of the costs required to achieve each specific initiative;*
- *Provision of adequate resources and clear linkage to new budget process;*
- *Monitoring based on clearly identified key performance indicators and periodic reflection and reevaluation of progress. (CFRs 3.7, 4.6)*

The Strategic Plan for Chaminade University of Honolulu had just been created when the comprehensive review team visited the campus in Spring of 2019. The strategic plan helped focus institutional vision and direction; however, it had not yet been sufficiently implemented to evaluate effectiveness. New initiatives were not yet developed, evaluated, prioritized, and implemented. In the four intervening years, much work has been accomplished. Twenty-one new academic programs have been launched or reapproved, including bachelor's degrees (chemistry, community and public health, integrated marketing communication, sports and event management) and professional doctorates (educational psychology, nursing practice, clinical psychology, marriage and family therapy, organizational leadership). Most of the

new programs were developed from a review of community needs, and many of the new programs have been funded via grants or partnership programs. For example, the Doctor of Nursing Practice has been launched with a five-year Title III grant, and the Data Science program also receives federal grant funding. CUH also signed an agreement with Kamehameha Schools to fully fund 150 student teachers for preschool in their teacher credentialing programs over the next three years. The Economic Education Center (EEC) works with elementary and secondary teachers on financial literacy issues, which has a multiplying effect on their students. The team commends the success of fund raising, including gifts, grants, and community support. (CFR 4.6)

The theme of the current strategic plan is Students First; this theme has resonated across the campus and has served the institution well, particularly during the Covid pandemic. For example, faculty commended the improvement of the counseling center and the restructuring of advising under the new student success center. Advising software was implemented, so that faculty, advisors, and students all have access to the same information. Faculty updated the first-year experience curriculum and put an emphasis on social connections in the CUH 100 course. This has helped faculty members connect more easily with students. CUH has also implemented *Apo haumana*, a first-year mentoring program, which pairs individual students with individual faculty members. Although the university did experience some drop in retention and graduation rates during Covid, those have turned around and are again improving.

In response to the prior Commission Action Letter, the faculty were evaluating the online programs and making improvements. One of the benefits of this was that they had already planned training for all faculty in online teaching for the summer of 2020. As a result, in fall 2020, they essentially asked students whether they would like in-person, online, or hybrid courses and offered the course in the format desired by students. This is another example of the depth of the Students First impact. The team was impressed by the commitment to students and student success across the university and the investments the university has made in academic and student support. (CFRs 2.10, 2.13)

The strategic plan drives the annual goals and evaluation of the president. The president and provost monitor implementation on a regular basis. The president provides regular updates to the board and to the campus community. Key Performance Indicators and a dashboard have been developed. It was interesting for the team to note, however, that almost no one on the campus recognized the links between the dashboard and the strategic plan, with the exception of retention and graduation rates and some relationship to fiscal health. Nonetheless, the team noted the unity of the campus around the Students First theme and commends the confidence and enthusiasm of major constituencies, including board, administration, faculty, and staff regarding the mission, values (Marianist characteristics), direction, and leadership of Chaminade University of Honolulu. (CFRs 1.2, 3.6)

As the campus reaches the end of the implementation period, they have convened a new strategic planning steering committee with representation from students, staff, faculty, and administration to guide the development of the new plan, under the leadership of the provost. The provost has sought a broad range of input from around the campus through Talk Story groups (focus groups done in the Hawaiian tradition) and a questionnaire sent to all campus constituencies, including alumni. The full data set was sent to all members of the committee (and were provided to the team as evidence). The committee then held a meeting to draw out themes from the feedback. Sixteen themes emerged from that session, which were aggregated into eight and then five draft themes, after vetting with the president and the *Hui Alika'i* (Cabinet) group. The next step is that cross-constituency teams will work on each of the five themes and develop strategies and measurable goals. The team recommends that the measurable goals be tied directly to the strategies, so that the campus constituencies recognize the links. As CUH develops its new strategic plan, the university should monitor the implementation of the plan based on clearly identified key performance indicators. (CFR 4.6)

The number of new programs launched was of concern to the visiting team. The provost indicated that one of the requirements in the development of each of the five professional doctoral programs was a

cohort minimum size; he indicated that if programs do not meet the minimum size, new cohorts will not be launched, and such programs would be sunset. This does appear to reflect fiscal responsibility with respect to the new programs. However, the team also evidenced concerns about program ownership and responsibility. Previously, there was no formal approval process for new academic programs. When the new provost arrived, he initiated a new process whereby a variety of individuals could propose a new program. The deans typically develop new programs in conjunction with the faculty. The curriculum committee for the school where the program resides then reviews and approves the academic aspects of the program. It then goes to the Academic Council for review. The program then goes to *Hua Alika'i* for fiscal and marketing review and ultimately the president, provost, and CFO give approval.

Faculty voiced concern that they do not have institutional voice regarding the approval of new programs. They are concerned about revenue drain from current programs. Faculty stated that are informed about, but not involved in, decisions to implement new academic programs subsequent to the review and approval process by other bodies. The team recommends that the institution's faculty exercise primary responsibility for academic quality and character, including the development and approval of new programs. (CFR 3.10)

As the team talked with the board executive committee about new programs, it became clear that the board role does not include approval of new programs. Board members indicated that although new programs were brought to their attention, neither the Academic Affairs Committee nor the full board approve new programs. This was verified through a review of board minutes. During the last year, such new programs as the doctorate in educational psychology, the doctorate in marriage and family therapy, the baseball program, and the beach volleyball program were noted in the board minutes, but without any formal action to accept or approve these new programs. The team recommends that, consistent with its responsibility to ensure the institution's adherence to its mission, compliance with accrediting and

federal requirements, achievement of educational effectiveness and institutional sustainability, and in accordance with its By-laws, the Board of Regents should:

- Deepen the understanding and practice of its fiduciary role and responsibility to the institution;
- Review and approve institutional academic and administrative policies; and
- Review and approve new programs and any initiatives that require significant funding resources. (CFR 3.9 and WSCUC Governing Board Policy)

Issue 2: Faculty Role in Academic Quality & Assessment

> *The institution's faculty should take collective responsibility for academic quality and assessment, with appropriate accountability, supported by necessary institutional expertise and guidance. Assessments of student work require linkage to measurable course and program learning outcomes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4 & 2.7)*

In response to the 2019 WSCUC visit and subsequent team report, Chaminade instituted a series of scaffolded faculty training events intended to enhance academic quality and improve assessment activities. In addition to several on-campus interviews, the team reviewed the topics, attendance, accessibility, faculty responses, and training content to more fully understand the resulting effectiveness.

For instance, cross disciplinary trainings were provided in course and program learning outcomes, assessment ambassadors were assigned for each discipline, links were established between course and program outcomes, syllabi audits were initiated, and assessment grants, approximating $1,500 per function, were offered and awarded to increase faculty involvement. When interviewed, faculty provided concrete examples of effective assessment applications and articulated the value of these applications to

enhance educational quality as well as to improving the institutional culture. Benchmarking minimum competency standards has been allocated to individual programs with varying levels of completion.

The new General Education (GE) Committee applied effective assessment techniques to create a revised curriculum, weaving mission related elements throughout the coursework and tying course learning outcomes to program level outcomes. A GE curriculum map illustrates those links, the addition of a capstone course, and the integration of core competencies. High levels of satisfaction with both the development processes and the resulting program were expressed by involved faculty. Because of its nascent status, a GE program review has not yet been written.

Data-informed program review budgetary recommendations have not yet been implemented across disciplines. While program reviews typically result in recommendations requiring financial resources, those recommendations are generally substantiated with other rationales. It is expected that increased familiarity with the significance of outcomes assessment will contribute to the value of funding efforts that are demonstrated to enhance academic quality. Internal discussions are currently being held about the value of further integrating explicit evidence-based program review reports as opposed to the institution's more traditional integration of implicit community-based values.

Syllabi audits are recorded at very high levels with less attention to details and without explicit accountability when remediation is needed. Follow up actions, for instance, are not recorded in the audit records, nor did documentation record under whose responsibility follow up would rest. Likewise, accountability for faculty who do not complete recommended pedagogical training, such as those offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning, is not clear. Instead, there is an expectation that individuals will self-monitor. In another example of implicit rather than explicit practices, peer review analysis of online course delivery is copied to the faculty and their deans but is not required in annual faculty reviews.

The Faculty Senate's charge addresses more than program reviews, such as, for example, the credit hour policy. However, their function is limited exclusively to program reviews, with their other responsibilities reportedly assigned as needed to ad hoc committees under the direction of the Provost. The ad hoc redistribution of responsibilities leads to confusion and lack of internal coherence, particularly with regard to decision making processes and their continuity. Clarity regarding such processes would benefit the institution.

Issue 3: Improved Quality of Online Learning

In order to further support the academic offerings, the institution is encouraged to improve the quality of online learning by:

a. *Prioritizing the integration of effective instructional design elements;*
b. *Ensuring consistent interaction among students, and between students and faculty; and*
c. *Provide technology resources that are sufficient in scope and quality.*

(CFRs 2.1, 3.5 & WSCUC Distance Education Policy & Technology-Mediated Instruction Policy)

CUH has made impressive progress in the area of improving the quality of online learning. It is apparent that CUH has prioritized integrating effective instructional design elements by creating online education workshops for teaching faculty, additional CTL resources, additional online technology, hiring an educational technologist, rethinking online program review, restructuring the delivery of undergraduate online programs through the CUH course Flex model, and reconstituting the University Technology Advisory Committee (UTAC).

It is evident that the CTL is an asset to the University. Its leadership and structure are creating a culture on campus that is focused on development, support, and the prioritization of effective teaching

and learning. Noted activities include the CTL Online Education Workshops, the Faculty Institute (hosted each term), and the CTL menu of services, which includes not only group development opportunities, but also individual development sessions if requested. The Center has also created a CTL strategic plan that is directly related to the University's strategic plan, that is comprehensive, and used to guide the work being done. This CTL strategic plan is exemplary and can be used as an example for other non-academic offices on campus. (CFRs 2.1 & 3.5)

Based on feedback from relevant constituents CUH redesigned its online undergraduate programs to a Flex model, where students can complete online programs at their pace. The CUH Flex model was launched in January 2022. The students the team met with expressed how accommodating the Flex model was and that their experiences were all positive. While they all agreed that faculty are very receptive, accessible, and responsive, they did note that they would benefit from more opportunities for engagement with their peers. (CFRs. 2.1 & 3.5)

To assist CUH faculty an engagement calculator was created and provided to all online teaching faculty. This was created as a resource to help guide the hours of engagement for online courses. Additionally, each course goes through a quality assurance review prior to launch. Support is also available from the CTL staff for peer review, instructional design, assessment, and educational technology.

While CUH has developed various tools to ensure student-to-student engagement and faculty-to-student engagement, the students that the team met with expressed a desire for more opportunities for peer engagement. Students agreed they engage in one-on-one feedback with their instructors, that instructors are extremely receptive and available and that there is faculty-initiated feedback and interaction. Students in every class join and, as part of their credit bearing class, participate in communities of practice. The communities of practice however, as students expressed, have more of a Facebook discussion feel and not a real time activity where they are interacting with peers.

CUH utilizes and provides technology resources that are sufficient in scope and quality and both faculty and students feel comfortable with the platforms. The team reviewed the LMS and note that it is appropriate and useful.

Committee Structure and Policy Review/Approval

CUH has created a credit hour policy. However, the current draft needs to be revisited as the policy is not comprehensive in scope. Additionally, the policy has yet to be reviewed and approved through a shared governance committee structure. The current committee structure at CUH does not allow for easy reviews. It is imperative that CUH create a pathway that allows for shared governance in developing, reviewing, and approving academic policies. For example, the team met with the Academic Policies and Programs Committee. When asked about recent policies the committee has reviewed, the team was told that this committee only conducts peer reviews and they do not participate in academic policies. After more conversations the team was told that academic policies are drafted by an administrator, and it is unclear what the review and approval process is once drafted. Another example is the institution has a Regular and Substantive Interaction policy (a requirement by the Department of Education (ED) from July 2021) and procedure document that the CTL Director has developed, however this has not been moved forward for reviews or approvals. The team recommends that CUH review and develop a committee structure that is inclusive and appropriate for developing, reviewing, and approving academic policies. In doing so CUH should review the current structure, rename and re-establish committees appropriately, with updated charters. (CFRs 1.7 & 3.7)

Issue 4: Improvement of the New Budget Process

CUH should continue to improve upon the new budget process for the best use of limited resources and continue to monitor financial stability. (CFR 3.4)

At the time of the 2019 reaffirmation visit, CUH had just changed the way annual budgets were developed and managed. The new process was initially used to create the 2019 academic year budget. In order to better oversee the fiscal management, the budget process was moved to the vice president for finance from the president's office. Initial comments about the new process were favorable stating the process was more engaging and collaborative than before when departments were unable to provide any input into the annual budget development.

The new budget process changed the fundamental approach to how budgets were created. The most significant change to the process was moving from a centralized top-down approach to a bottom-up approach. Under the new process, individual units at various levels have the ability to prioritize budget decisions to better align documented educational purposes, strategic plan goals or unit reviews. It creates a sense of ownership of the limited resources so that they can be used to achieve the overall objectives of the educational or administrative units.

The budgeting process starts with historical financial data and budgeting guidelines sent to units in January. The separate units may make modifications how their current budgets are used or make requests for new expenditures. In academic units, new initiatives, degrees, or certificate programs go through a thorough school level curriculum committee review and the respective dean before moving forward to a university level review. Many comments were made about how analyses and decisions are driven by available data. Monthly financial reports, marketing data, competitive information are available for such analyses if needed. All the analysis must be included when requesting new initiatives.

In March each year once all budget requests are submitted, there is a continuous dialogue between the requestor and the CFO to fully understand the impact of the requests on the overall university finances and alignment with the strategic plan. The University community has generally been realistic and reasonable in their expectations to advance new requests given the limited amount of additional resources projected to be available. Typically, there are more resources requested than are available. Around April, those requests that move forward and the initial budget are consolidated and reviewed by the president, provost, vice president for finance in consultation with *Hui Alaka'i*. This group takes into consideration current enrollment, projected revenues for the next academic year and the strategic plan. The strategic plan is the basis that helps guide the decisions about which requests will go forward. Once the internal reviews are completed and the final proposed budget is created, it is reviewed and approved by the Board of Regents Finance Committee, typically in May, before recommendation to the full Board for approval at its June meeting.

Examples of improvements resulting from the budgeting process include consolidation of various student services into the office of student success, expansion of financial aid services, improvements to information technology services, increased emphasis on alumni relations and fund raising, reorganizations of human resources, the library, and enrollment management. A program to enroll more Hawaiian students was the just launched "Hawaii Guarantee" that guarantees new first-time college or first year students the same tuition rate as the University of Hawaii Manoa for four years. In some cases, the institution used external reviews to assess the way the university services were organized. These organizational changes have helped improve departmental operational efficiencies and have provided better service to students, faculty, and staff.

An example of an external review was the analysis of the advancement department that identified what the fund-raising efforts lacked, needed changes, and suggested best practices for fund raising. This

department has been entirely reorganized under new leadership and has managed to increase engagement with donors, alumni, and the community. Measurable data is used to track the number of contacts, levels of giving and program success. Current and former students are contacted early and consistently during their enrollment to enforce the message of staying connected with the alma mater throughout their lifetime. The results have been consistent increases in unrestricted giving over the past years, identification of prospective donors, increased community engagement, and specific fund-raising goals. The team commends the institution for its success in fundraising, including gifts, grants, and community support.

The team also found evidence of successful implementation of the budgeting process by reviewing the last three fiscal years operating income statements. There have consistently been net annual operating surpluses with increasing net revenue and expenses. Also, the team's review of the last three years' audit reports revealed unqualified auditor opinions and net surpluses each year resulting in higher net assets. There were no auditor management letter concerns in any year. (CFR 3.4)

A closer look at the operating income statements shows one of the largest revenue components, traditional undergraduate day tuition, declining over the past three years; however, enrollments were higher by the fall 2022. Conversely, enrollment in nursing programs, graduate and doctoral programs have increased significantly. These increases have more than surpassed undergraduate declines, resulting in higher net tuition revenue. Also as mentioned, there have been increases in unrestricted gifts in the last three years.

A few months prior to the 2019 reaffirmation team visit, Moody's Investors Service, the bond rating agency, downgraded CUH's rating one notch to Ba3 and maintained a negative outlook. Moody's cited concerns for continuing decline of enrollment and limited financial flexibility should the enrollment trend continue downward. In December 2020, Moody's had revised their outlook to stable, further stating "...relatively stable enrollment with growing financial reserves and liquidity as well as favorable and

steady cash flow." This is further evidence that CUH has been able to manage the financial challenges associated with enrollment fluctuations and COVID disruption.

The institution successfully managed most of the disruptions caused by the pandemic years of 2020 through 2022. To mitigate the impact in the spring, 2020, CUH quickly pivoted to teaching classes online by providing equipment and support for faculty to transition to online instruction. Fortunately, CUH had already had the foundation for online education in place when the pandemic hit. Additionally, all faculty were certified to teach online after receiving the necessary training. A COVID Navigator was hired to develop safety protocols so that a safe environment was in place when in-class instruction resumed. There were no layoffs of faculty or staff during the pandemic period which is further evidence of sound fiscal management. CUH received over $4 million in Payroll Protection Program loans which were eventually forgiven by the government and recorded as additional revenue, helping to increase the net surplus in 2021.

The team commends the University for the budgeting process, which has continuously improved since it was introduced in 2019. It is highly praised by the university community and has become part of the expectation and culture of the University. This has allowed the University to deploy its limited resources in a more effective manner in alignment with its strategic plan over the years.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE

Interim Report

The team reviewed the Interim Report and found it was in alignment with the special visit report and activities confirmed on campus during the visit.

PsyD Program Implementation from Argosy

In place of the pre-implementation site visit to CUH, WSCUC intended to conduct a site visit on or about September 2020 to review the institution's progress with integrating Argosy faculty to the CUH purpose and mission and in management of increased enrollment. Instead, those topics were reviewed during the current site visit, along with an update regarding APA approval for the integrated program.

In their May 2021 review letter, APA noted that the PsyD program, which was integrated into Chaminade from Argosy, provided substantial compliance with APA standards of accreditation and scheduled their next site visit to be held in 2030, thus conferring ten years of approval. This decision indicated adherence to the Standards of Accreditation in Health Service Psychology. APA's few reportable findings noted in the 2021 letter were subsequently cleared by January 2023.

Argosy's Psy.D. faculty, who underwent a series of scaffolded Chaminade culture and practice orientation trainings, brought high levels of academic quality and assessment practices to CUH and actively support the integration of those practices in faculty committees, particularly with regard to university efforts to launch additional doctoral programs, set up learning competencies, establish measurable outcomes and other assessments, develop program catalogs, and initiate and maintain dissertation processes.

Current Psy.D. enrollment is described as the best since 2005, with 30 new students this year and a decision to grow the program slowly by holding to that maximum enrollment. Previous to moving from Argosy to Chaminade, attrition varied between 2-6%. It increased to 11% under COVID restrictions and increased unexpectedly to 14% last year. In response, the admissions process has undergone review and multiple revisions were applied to improve retention, in addition to an increased effort to enroll local applicants rooted in Hawaii who will return their skills to the community. As a result of their collective efforts, this year's attrition rate reverted back to 3%, more in line with its history.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

The Team commends Chaminade University of Honolulu for:

1. The budgeting process, which has continuously improved since it was introduced in 2019. It is highly praised by the university community and has become part of the expectation and culture of the University. This has allowed the University to deploy its limited resources in a more effective manner in alignment with its strategic plan over the years.
2. The Center for Teaching and Learning and its current leadership. The CTL is an important and widely respected resource for Chaminade and its faculty. Its strategic goals align with the institutional goals for increasing educational quality and excellence.
3. The success of fund raising, including gifts, grants, and community support.
4. The consistent use of data to inform decisions in all areas of the University.
5. The confidence and enthusiasm of major constituencies, including board, administration, faculty, and staff regarding the mission, values (Marianist characteristics), direction, and leadership of Chaminade University of Honolulu.
6. The successful integration of the Argosy Psy.D. program, which shows positive trends in applications and retention, and demonstrated external accreditation compliance.
7. Faculty development in assessment practices and the application of outcomes assessment across disciplines to improve academic quality.

Recommendations

1. Consistent with its responsibility to ensure the institution’s adherence to its mission, compliance with accrediting and federal requirements, achievement of educational effectiveness and institutional sustainability, and in accordance with its By-laws, the Board of Regents should:
    a. Deepen the understanding and practice of its fiduciary role and responsibility to the institution;
    b. Review and approve institutional academic and administrative policies; and
    c. Review and approve new programs and any initiatives that require significant funding resources. (CFR 3.9 and WSCUC Governing Board Policy)
2. Senior leadership needs to ensure that its decision-making practices and processes, including the committee structures, support the adoption and prompt implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound and clear business practices, and compliance with federal regulations. (CFRs 1.7 & 3.7)
3. The institution's faculty should exercise primary responsibility for academic quality and character, including the development and approval of new programs. (CFR 3.10)
4. As CUH develops its new strategic plan, the university should monitor the implementation of the plan based on clearly identified key performance indicators. (CFR 4.6)