

Memorandum

April 25, 2011

TO: Susan Hippensteele
Chair, Senate Executive Committee
Mānoa Faculty Senate

FROM: Sarita Rai, Chair
Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP)

RE: AY 2010-2011 Final Report

Duties of the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning

The Committee, acting upon recommendations and findings made by its subcommittees, shall make specific recommendations of either approve, disapprove or recommended action to the Senate Executive Committee on matters of academic goals, policies, and programs with respect to standards of professional ethics; establishment and modification of degree programs and curricula, admissions and graduation requirements, and ways of supporting and encouraging improvements in faculty performance; and planning for changes in academic goals and in academic programs.

In addition, the Committee may provide advice and/or specific suggestions, as requested by or through the Manoa Chancellor or the UH President, on matters of concern to the Committee. (Bylaws Faculty Congress and Senate, University of Hawai'i at Manoa Article I. Organization of the Faculty Congress, p.8, May 2007)

Committee Membership

Chizuko Allen (SPAS), Edoardo Biagioni (Natural Science), James Cartwright (Library), Timothy Halliday (Social Sciences), Cynthia Hew (Medicine), Ken Kipnis (Arts and Humanities), Jon Matsuda (Outreach), Katrina-Ann Oliveira (Hawaiian Knowledge), Hamid Pourjalali (Business), Sarita Rai (Chair, Academic Affairs), Stacy Roberts (Education), Cynthia Ward (LLL), and Pavel Zinin (SOEST).

CAPP membership initially included Elton Daniel, Ellen Hoffman, Jennifer Shultz, and Guangyi Wang. However these members resigned, were re-assigned to other committees and/or left the University. Committee on Faculty Service was very prompt and efficient in assigning new members to CAPP. Pavel Zinin joined CAPP in November 2010 followed by Ken Kipnis in February 2011.

Senate Executive Committee Liaison Rosanne Harrigan was later replaced by Robert V. Cooney in March 2011.

CAPP's minutes and agenda show that Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) Reed Dasenbrock attended most of CAPP's meeting beginning Spring 2011. This enabled CAPP to communicate and clarify with the VCAA on several academic policy

items. Further, the 30-minute meetings allowed time for CAPP to inform the VCAA, in advance of its decisions and recommendations.

All 13 members of CAPP were senators representing the Mānoa campus-wide faculty constituencies. CAPP met twice a month beginning September 22, 2010. Quorum was achieved at each meeting with the exception of one. Members of the committee were dedicated and made valuable contributions at every meeting.

Business Items

CAPP had a busy academic year and addressed multiple business items. Detailed actions of CAPP are recorded in the minutes and available at http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/minutes/2010_11/index.html#capp

To date of this report, each of the motions and resolutions that CAPP brought forward to the full Senate has passed by unanimous or majority vote. In this regard CAPP has had a successful but busy year.

I. Status of Follow-up Business Items from 2009-10 Academic Year

1. Academic Action Proposal Pilot Project

The Council of Academic Advisors (CAA) and the Office of the Assistant VC for Undergraduate Education put forward an Academic Action Proposal for CAPP's consideration. The plan called for a one semester trial period at the end of Fall 2009 to not implement Academic Actions such as probation, suspension and dismissal. In the past such actions were implemented each semester. The impact of such actions would be monitored by the Council and the Office of the AVC for Undergraduate Education at the end of Spring 2010.

CAPP made a motion to approve the Academic Action Proposal and forwarded it to SEC with the proviso that it was a pilot project for Fall 2009 and that the proposing offices would report the impact of such an action to SEC. The full Senate approved the motion.

CAPP made a unanimous motion to request that SEC follow-up with the concerned offices and asked for a report on the impact of the Academic Action Pilot Project. On October 18, CAA responded to CAPP's request for the impact report indicating that the group needed additional time. CAA through the AVCUE Ron Cambra indicated that the final report would be submitted at the end of May 2011.

CAPP discussed the request for an extension and unanimously agreed to extend the final report deadline to May 2011 with the proviso that the Council of Academic Advisors submits an interim report to CAPP through SEC by January 2011. The report should contain the following information:

- a. Comparative data on the number of academic actions implemented during the 2008-2009 and the 2009-10 Academic Years. (Two academic actions per year vs one.)
- b. Comparatively how have the academic actions helped students to re-gain good academic standing?

On January 3, CAPP received a preliminary report from Assistant VC for Undergraduate Education Ronald Cambra via VCAA Reed Dasenbrock. The Mānoa Institution Research Office (MIRO) has been asked to track the academic performance of students entering as Freshmen from Fall 2007 to Spring 2010. According to the report, MIRO's analysis of the preliminary data ***“Of the 223 Freshmen that returned on probation in Spring 2008; 53% did not continue on to Fall 08. 17% continued on probation, and 30.5% were removed from probation and continued on. As expected, students on probation are more likely to stop-out, but it appears that students that do continue on are likely to get off probation. Will be interesting to see how other cohorts compare.”*** (Report on Status of Suspension of Academic Actions; January 3, 2011).

Although the report suggests that the initial impact of the Academic Action pilot project appears to be a positive academic evaluation for the students, it is unclear that there is a direct correlation. Multiple factors such as early intervention, implementation of STAR in Spring 2007, mandatory advising in Fall 2008, etc. must be included in the final analysis. Time is needed to study the overall ramification and as a result the AVCUG will provide a final report no later than October 1, 2011.

The full report is attached.

2. Shortened Academic Calendar

CAPP was asked to review the shortened academic calendar in Fall 2009. It was not clear whether the intent of such a calendar was to have three terms in one academic year or simply a shortened term. A calendar change needed to have a broader discussion within the academic community and it appeared that the proposal was initiated by a small select group. A broader academic community at UHM will be able to contribute to the calendar discussions from an academic perspective, discussing the impact the changes may, or may not, have within UHM and the community at large. Additionally, it would be prudent to have a faculty survey, a survey of individual programs, as well as a survey of the students. We suggested that summer be used to collect hard data in terms of budget impacts, data from other schools on the Mainland who have implemented similar changes and in the Fall 2010, to have a campus-wide discussion on the matter.

CAPP requested that SEC followup on this issue with VCAA Dasenbrock so that CAPP may fully discuss the shortened academic calendar. A list of questions was provided to SEC, to be forwarded to the campus administration. CAPP to date has not had a response and questioned whether we somehow missed a response from the administration. CAPP therefore made a unanimous motion to ask SEC to follow-up on

this issue again. In addition to the above items, following are the questions that CAPP raised for easy reference.

- In what concrete manners does the calendar change benefit the students?
- What and where are the savings and the benefits?
- How will the “shortened” school year from 16 to 14 weeks be marketed to the public? What about public perception?
- What are the ramifications of the teaching between 8:30 am and 10:00 PM and what were the assumptions behind this?
- What does “modifying the contracts of 9-month ‘I’ faculty to include summer as part of the normal duty period” mean? In other words how will the University attempt to “modify the contracts of 9-month I-faculty”?

On March 2, 2011 VCAA Dasenbrock stated that CAPP should ask Assistant VC for Undergraduate Education Ron Cambra about the list of benefits for the students regarding a shortened academic calendar. His office had no position in reference to the shortened calendar and that if there is a discussion, the faculty needs to be involved. However, he would probably support the shortening of the calendar if faculty supports it. CAPP considered some of the pros and cons of shortening the academic calendar. The VCAA also discussed the influence of current energy savings on the budget. He reported that the process has not saved a lot of money. He suggested that the major energy savings would come from structural changes (such as efficient air-conditioning). As for changing the calendar from a semester to a trimester or quarter system, the VCAA indicated that Mainland Universities that changed from two-semester terms to three terms reverted to two semesters because it was not successful due to multiple reasons. Hence it is unlikely that Mānoa would adopt a trimester system.

Finally, he informed CAPP that the shortened calendar is a system issue and he will find out the status and report to CAPP if any action/response is needed. Further discussion was deferred to a future time when there is a better understanding of the System’s take on the issue.

3. Definition of Satisfactory Academic Progress, Maintaining Good Academic Standing and Minimum Mānoa Academic Standards

The Senate passed a resolution to define “Satisfactory Academic Progress,” “Maintaining Good Academic Standing” and “Minimum Mānoa Academic Standards” as “2.0” and that the language be included in the UH Mānoa Undergraduate Catalog beginning 2010-11 academic year. The Senate also advised that the definition be placed within the Undergraduate Education section of the catalog.

On February 23, 2011 CAPP requested VCAA Dasenbrock to provide an update on this matter and asked when it would be finally published. Additionally CAPP indicated that the electronic version of the Mānoa Undergraduate catalog can be updated immediately. On March 2, 2011 VCAA informed CAPP that Chancellor Virginia Hinshaw approved the policy to be part of the Mānoa Undergraduate Catalog. The

VCAA will inform the Undergraduate Education Office for the new policy implementation purposes.

4. Undergraduate Enrollment Goals for UH Mānoa

In the Fall 2009, CAPP, CAB, and CSA discussed the four enrollment goals with VCAA Reed Dasenbrock. After much consideration and recommendations by the standing committees, the Senate passed a resolution to support the four goals and requested that the administration continue to consult with faculty and the university community in developing the detailed implementation strategies of the enrollment management plan, mindful of issues including workload, infrastructure, capacity, and ensuring the funds generated from the increased enrollment be used in a fiscally responsible way to support the core mission of the University.

The four goals as endorsed are:

- Keep more of Hawai'i's high school graduates here in-state attending UH-Mānoa;
- Address the differential rates of education attainment across Hawai'i's population;
- Increase mobility between the two and four-year sectors;
- Improve Retention and Graduation Rates at Mānoa

On September 15, 2010 VCAA Dasenbrock and VCS Hernandez updated the Senate concerning enrollment management goals. However, a fifth goal was stated, "the recruitment of international students." This goal was, however, never part of the four original goals.

CAPP made a unanimous request that SEC discuss this fifth goal with VCAA and VCS as to why, how, and when the recruitment of international students became part of the enrollment management goals. Further, CAPP notes that it was never discussed or reviewed by the SEC Standing Committees. What is the cost differentiation between recruitment of non-resident students from the US Mainland versus international students both in terms of our own teaching capacity to support the core mission of the University, infrastructure, and revenue generation? Additionally, how are we going to support the international students? What is the projection of revenue generation?

This issue has not been resolved, nor has CAPP heard from SEC.

II. Board of Regents

CAPP was asked to provide feedback and recommendation to SEC concerning the Board of Regent's Policy on Chapter 5: Academic Affairs. On February 22, CAPP provided comments to SEC with suggested changes in four areas. CAPP found that the revised Policy deletes substantial language in Chapter 5 and delegates the implementation of the Board Policy firmly within the President's Office as the Chief Executive Officer. CAPP's concern relates to whether the deleted policies will be systematically added on to the Executive Policy and who will track the changes; it is unclear as to how much further

delegation will be delineated from the President to the individual Campus Chancellors or whether there will be expansion of administration at the system level; the policy does not specify the non-resident cap and is silent on the obligation of the administration to consult with the appropriate faculty Senates concerning the enrollment cap numbers; and finally concerning research there is no policy statement supporting “*non-contractual unclassified research in terms of freed of information and public access.*”

III. UH System Related Business

1. Common Course Alpha Articulation Implementation throughout the System Campuses

On November 2, 2010, SEC asked CAPP to consider recommending the following language by the ACCFSC in reference to common course numbering throughout the System campuses. CAPP was asked to provide feedback in time for the Senate December meeting.

All system courses with the same alpha and same number will be 100% articulated, i.e., meet the same requirements on every campus. Current same number courses that do not meet the criterion will be renumbered and the forms and processes of each campus will facilitate the goal of ensuring that courses with the same alpha number articulate by (date). ”

CAPP at its November 10th meeting made the decision to inform SEC that it was not willing to support the language and articulation due to insufficient time to research the issue. However, CAPP noted that it would be willing to work on the implementation procedure at a later date before accepting the language of articulation.

SEC responded, asking CAPP in Spring 2011 to make recommendations for the Common Course Alpha Articulation Implementation. According to SEC *the ACCFSC have been reviewing proposals to fully articulate all UH courses in an effort to facilitate students transfer among campuses and eliminate some of the A&R and student confusion over course equivalencies. CAPP was asked to review implementation approaches and make a recommendation to the full Senate.*

On January 12, 2011 CAPP discussed the implementation plan and unanimously approved to make the following recommendations to the Senate. The full Senate voted to approve CAPP’s motion/recommendation at its January 20, 2011 meeting.

CAPP’s Motion/Recommendation

If there is a problem of Course Alpha Numbers used in the UH campuses that do not always match with UH Mānoa courses, leading to misunderstandings and mistakes for students and the Records Office, CAPP recommends that Department concerned be encouraged to resolve and correct the problem.

- a. The discrepant courses be identified by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
- b. The relevant departments be notified
- c. The problem be resolved at the departmental levels
- d. Progress report provided to the Senate/CAPP for follow-up

2. General Education Numbering Articulation

On February 1, 2010 CAPP was asked to review the new modified version of course articulation for all common courses to address only the General Education Courses. CAPP's position is similar to the common course number and alpha articulation plan. Further, CAPP defers to General Education Committee to provide the lead on this issue.

IV. Mānoa Administration

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Reed Dasenbrock put forth three academic business items for the Senate's consideration. These were: 1) Graduation with distinction, 2) Registration wait-listing, and 3) Mid-term Grade reporting on Banner.

1. Graduation with Distinction

In the past Mānoa has recognized those students who have achieved 3.5 and higher cumulative grade point average as graduating with distinction. The proposal was to recognize students with standard tripartite designations (cum laude, magna cum laude, summa cum laude) with the appropriate grade point averages.

CAPP presented a motion to recognize with High Academic Achievement during Graduation Ceremony which was voted for approval by the full faculty Senate on March 16, 2011.

2. Electronic System Registration Wait-listing

CAPP was asked to consider and make recommendation on the proposal, Implementation Plan for April 2011 for Fall 2011 Registration Wait-listing at the University of Hawai'i.

The purpose of the proposal, beginning Fall 2011 registration, is to have: a) an automatic wait-listing of students in classes that are considered closed, and b) the waitlisted students would then be notified of space in the class, should a student drop.

Faculty would still maintain control and provide over-rides; and that the electronic wait-listing would be turned off before the start of the semester.

CAPP presented a motion to support a **One-Year Trial Electronic Registration Wait- Listing** with the proviso that the administration returns to CAPP for

reconsideration and adjustments. The motion was voted for approval by the full Faculty Senate on March 16, 2011.

3. Mid-term Grade Reporting, Recommendations and Motion

SEC requested that CAPP review the report on VCAA Reed Dasenbrock's January 20, 2011 memo concerning Mid-Term Grade reporting on Banner. CAPP's full report is available at

http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/documents/20110420_Report%20on%20Mid%20Term%20Grade%20Reporting.pdf

In the report CAPP states that according to the VCAA, mid-term grade reporting could be used as an early diagnostic so that students can get better feedback about course performance earlier in the semester and respond appropriately. However, the drawback of this grade uploading on to banner would be that there are no areas for qualitative information.

If the intent is to provide early intervention and support to poorly performing students, then there are other existing alternatives on campus. Students should be encouraged to take the initiative/responsibility and ask for assistance from the many on-campus academic and other support services. Additionally, faculty members should be periodically provided with updated information on such support services so that they may be able to refer students as needed. Examples of student academic and other support services on campus are:

Writing Center: <http://www.english.hawaii.edu/writingcenter/>

Student Support Services: <http://www.sss.hawaii.edu/>

Student Success Center: <http://gohere.manoa.hawaii.edu/>

Learning Assistance Center: <http://manoa.hawaii.edu/learning/index.html>

Counseling and Student Development Center (has the Testing Center):

<http://studentaffairs.manoa.hawaii.edu/departments/csdc.php>

College Opportunities Program: <http://www.hawaii.edu/cop/>

Kua'ana Student Services: <http://www.hawaii.edu/kuaana/>

Kokua: <http://www.hawaii.edu/kokua/>

Residential Learning Programs (in student housing):

http://manoa.hawaii.edu/housing/sites/web41.its.hawaii.edu.manoa.hawaii.edu/housing/files/RLP_Brochure_11-12.PDF

Women's Center: <http://www.hawaii.edu/womenscenter/>

Based on the discussion and for the above listed reasons, CAPP at its February 9, 2011, meeting unanimously voted to not support mid-term grade reporting. The motion stated below was presented to the full Senate on April 20, 2011

Motion on Mid-Term Grade Reporting

While tracking under-performing undergraduate students is worthwhile, CAPP does not support mid-term grade reporting as the appropriate solution.

However, the following version was approved by the full Senate.

While tracking under-performing undergraduate students is worthwhile, CAPP does not support “mandatory” mid-term grade reporting as the appropriate solution.

V. Senate Executive Committee

CAPP, during the 2010-11 year, was given eight academic policy-related items to review, and make recommendations to the full Senate. Three of the policy items were assigned to other committees as well. CAPP has completed all the reviews and provided recommendations to the Senate on all items.

1. Major Requirement Issue

Charge from SEC

Major requirement issue (CAPP): There is significant variability in credit requirements for undergraduate major degree completion across Manoa departments; requirements range from 30-90 credits. In addition, some departments have a GPA graduation requirement higher than the Manoa GPA graduation requirement. Both the higher credit and GPA requirements in some departments produce barriers to graduation for some students. SEC asks CAPP to form a working group to review the data provided by the AVCUE on undergraduate degree requirements, conduct any additional fact-finding on department policy rationale, and if necessary, provide recommendations for action to the Senate or before the November 2010 meeting.

CAPP formed a sub-committee to review the major requirements across campus departments. The information in the UHM catalog versus the departmental major information sheets provided to the students are not always the same. Not all majors have the same credit requirements. For example, professional schools have higher major requirements than those majors within liberal arts. Most professional school degrees are terminal followed by graduates entering the workforce. On the other hand, liberal arts majors would require 24 to 27 credits within their area of concentration. It is generally understood that liberal arts majors need to pursue post-baccalaureate degrees and/or training.

Based on discussions, CAPP at its November 10th meeting unanimously voted on the following motion. The full Senate approved the motion on December 8, 2010

The University of Hawai`i at Mānoa prides itself on academic rigor and freedom. In recognition of the uniqueness of individual programs throughout the campus and our commitment to academic rigor, CAPP recommends that individual academic

programs continue to exert autonomy over their major course requirements including credit hours and GPAs.

Concurrently, CAPP recommends that departments and programs mention reasons for high credit and GPA requirements in the UHM catalog to better communicate with students. CAPP also recommends a more uniform approach to the catalog compilation, especially in degree requirement descriptions. The current inconsistency in catalog presentations of course requirements across departments and majors can inflate the perception of disparity.

2. 60 Non-intro Course Credit Requirement

Charge from SEC

60 Non-intro Course Credit Requirement (CAPP): Manoa counts any 200-level course with a specific pre-requisite (content-based) as a non-introductory course. The CCs require Eng 100 as a prereq for many courses so their 200 level courses “non-intro” by Manoa standards. When students transfer from the CCs A&R must check each lower division course—this is time consuming for A&R and confusing for students. The Committee on Enrollment Planning suggests the 60 Non-intro course credit requirement be removed in favor of a 45 credit upper division credit requirement. SEC asks CAPP to consider this proposal and make a recommendation to the Senate on or before December 2010.

It is clearer for the UHM Admissions and Records office to have 45 upper division credits as the requirement, so that they do not have to look up the pre-requisites for every community college 200-level course to see if it qualifies as a non-introductory course and the pre-requisite.

The non-introductory credit requirement is confusing to students – some 200 level courses have pre-requisites and some do not. Students and the Records Office must look up every 200 level course to determine whether it qualifies as a non-introductory course. For clarity the change of the 60 Non-Introductory credit requirement to 45 upper division credits is necessary.

Currently, the catalog defines:

Non-Introductory (NI) courses are from UH Mānoa courses at the 300 level and above, or 200 level with an explicitly stated college-level course pre-requisite (transfer credits are subject to evaluation).

Adoption of CAPP’s Recommendation on 45 Upper Division Credits

After reviewing and extensive discussion CAPP recommends to adopt the new graduation requirement to be 45 upper division credits instead of the 60 Non - Introductory credits. CAPP also defines “45 upper division” to be clearly stated as “300- and 400-level course credits.” It further states that the “UHM Undergraduate Catalog”

delete Non-Introductory credits and replace it with Upper division credits and define Upper division credits as 300-and 400-Level courses credits.”

The full Senate adopted and approved CAPP’s above recommendation on December 8, 2010.

3. 124 Credit Graduation Requirement to be Reduced to 120

Charge from SEC

124 Credit Graduation Requirement (CAPP): The Committee on Enrollment Planning suggests the Manoa graduation credit requirement be reduced from 124 to 120 credits. SEC asks CAPP to consider this proposal and make a recommendation to the Senate on or before December 2010.

CAPP formed a sub-committee to consider the proposal to reduce the minimum number of credit requirement from 124 to 120 credits to graduate from UHM with a Bachelor’s degree. The sub-committee’s findings were based on reviewing several land grant universities, UHM’s peer institutions and consultation with some faculty. The findings are surveys are on the Senate’s website.

The rationale for CAPP’s recommendation is that 1) the minimum hours (length) of the BA at UHM will be similar to most other schools; 2) students may complete their degrees within four years if they choose to take 15 credit hours each semester; 3) there is no strong feeling that the reduction will adversely affect the quality of education; and 4) it will make UHM BA programs more competitive, giving potential students an additional argument to choose UHM.

CAPP unanimously passed the following motion; it was approved by the full Senate on December 8, 2010.

1. UHM BA graduation requirement be changed from a minimum of 124 to a minimum of 120 credit hours.
2. UHM course catalog state that students may enroll in an average of 15 credit hours per semester in order to graduate in four years with 120 credit hours.
3. Full-time undergraduate standing remains at 12 credit hours per semester.
4. 148 credit notice to undergraduate students – aka Excess Credit Policy

Charge from SEC

148 credit notice to undergraduate students (CAPP): Current Manoa policy requires students who reach 148 credits to justify their continued enrollment--a Dean can involuntarily "graduate" a student who has met Manoa and a department graduation requirements. The policy is aimed at students who remain on campus for extended periods of time when they could graduate and move on in their education. We have twice the number of seniors as juniors on campus; seniors are more expensive for the campus and limit our ability accept transfer students who might be motivated to complete degrees

and graduate. But there may also be an unintended cost to the policy since it may discourage highly motivated students seeking double majors and/or certificates since they, too must petition and justify their continued enrollment on campus. CAPP to reevaluated this policy in light of our current effort to attract and retain top local students and is asked to report the final results of their effort at the January 2011 Senate meeting.

Current Excess Policy

Under the Excess Credit Policy at Mānoa if “A student who by the end of any semester has earned 24 credit hours beyond those required for graduation and has fulfilled all specific program and UH requirements may be graduated by action of the student’s college or school.” (UHM undergraduate catalog; 2010-11)

After reviewing the data provided by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and discussing the issue of students at Mānoa who have an excess of 24 credits beyond their major/graduation requirements, and the number of students who have been “graduated” by their schools and colleges, CAPP determined that very few students are affected by the excess credit policy.

Further, although the Schools/Colleges may graduate the students, in practice it has rarely been done – but the threat remains and is used intermittently and unevenly. Finally then, based on the data provided by the office of the VCAA and to reflect clear and accurate academic policies in the UHM undergraduate Catalog, CAPP made the following motion and recommends the Faculty Senate to support its motion.

CAPP’s Motion on 148 Credits or Excess Credit Policy was approved by the full Senate on February 16, 2011.

“CAPP judges that the goal of providing undergraduates with educational opportunities overrides the goal of improving graduation rates, and for this reason recommends the abolition of the policy of permitting administrative graduation and removing it from the UHM catalog.”

5. Freshman Colloquium – Evolved to Collaborative Academic Offering

Charge from SEC

Freshman Seminar/Retention (CAPP/GEC/CSA): Several years ago the Senate approved, in principle, a proposal by a Senate working group on undergraduate education to support freshman seminars as a way of retaining undergraduate students. A member of that original committee has prepared a White Paper and provided it to the Senate for review. CAPP, GEC and CSA are asked to form a joint working group to review the White Paper and the issue of freshman seminars and make a recommendation to the Senate on or before April 2011.

Two members from CAPP were appointed to work with GEC and CSA and make a recommendation to the Senate. A White Paper, “The Freshman Colloquium: Strategy for Reducing First-Year Attrition,” written by Ken Kipnis was provided to all groups as a

basis for discussion. Members of CAPP had hoped that the sub-committee would be recommending an alternative academic solution to Freshmen retention at the Mānoa Campus while using the white paper as one example.

It was clear from the onset that GEC, CSA, and CAPP were not in favor of the white paper for various reasons. For example, the Freshmen colloquium calls for a 9-credit hour course offering for Freshmen only, led by five senior faculty members from different departments/colleges and 20 graduate students to support the seminar and discussions. There would be 3 hours of lecture, 3 hours of small group meeting, and 3 hours of plenary session each week. Thematic connections would be made among lectures/topics by various faculty members from different departments/colleges.

While it is a worthwhile project, research has indicated that Freshmen do not do very well in large lecture style classes. The additional cost in implementing the course is fairly high. A 9-credit optional elective for STEM may not be feasible. On the other hand an academic retention example is that English 100 has implemented limited enrollment of 20 students per class – which has provided close faculty contact and mentoring. The result has been successful.

A positive idea evolved out of the discussions, whereby faculty would like to collaboratively teach across campus. Yet there are barriers that seem insurmountable and prohibit such cross-discipline and cross college collaborations. If faculty collaborate in teaching and are provided with equal student semester hours it would benefit the students and the university.

As a result, all three committees (CAPP, CSA, and GEC) support the following resolution. We bring forward the resolution to the senate at its May 4th meeting for approval and transmittal to the administration.

Resolution in Support of Collaborative Academic Offerings

- Whereas: The Mānoa Faculty Senate, in 1998, approved recommendations from the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (UGE) that, in part, called for interdisciplinary collaboration for freshman only courses; AND
- Whereas: The University administration has mounted a variety of strategies to address the special academic needs of incoming Freshmen, many of whom are the first in their families to be exposed to higher education. Notable efforts include the College Opportunities Program (COP) and Access to College Excellence; AND
- Whereas: Faculty too have endeavored to meet the special needs of incoming Freshmen. Notable here is English 100 with its small class sections that are reserved for Freshmen; AND

- Whereas: Although several strategies have been used to permit groups of faculty to collaborate in teaching single courses at UHM, these arrangements have been built upon administrative work-arounds (as in LLL 150, four separately listed coordinated sections as one) or un-credited pro-bono instructional contributions by faculty. Both strategies have significant shortcomings and limitations; AND
- Whereas: Although Mānoa offers both freshman-only courses and courses that exceed the standard 3-credit formula, it has become evident that barriers still stand in the way of collaboratively taught courses; AND
- Whereas: The existing course approval and course listing system, in imposing the requirement that every student semester-hour (SSH) be wholly credited to a single department, effectively prohibits on-the-books instructional collaboration involving faculty from different departments and colleges; AND
- Whereas: Team taught courses may also serve the needs of non-Freshmen; AND
- Whereas: The Community Colleges have formulas for shared recognition and acknowledgment when colleagues from different departments collaborate on interdisciplinary offerings; AND
- Whereas: The increasing focus upon SSHs necessitates the creation of a Mānoa standard for sharing credit where instructional collaboration occurs across departmental and collegial borders; AND
- Whereas: Collegial deliberation and cooperation on how best to meet the academic needs of incoming Freshmen may well, over time, improve the quality of lower-division courses, reduce freshman attrition, and, by improving the quality of instruction that students receive when they enter, improve the performance of Mānoa sophomores, juniors and seniors; AND
- Whereas: Any new courses conceived under this rubric would have to clear standard review at the department and college levels and would have to receive the standard approvals when claiming to satisfy Foundations and General Education requirements; AND
- Whereas: The Mānoa Faculty Senate has a salient responsibility for the character of our academic program, which responsibility includes overseeing the academic experience of incoming Freshmen;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

That the Mānoa Faculty Senate urges the Administration to alter the course approval and course listing systems so as to facilitate interdepartmental and inter-collegial collaboration on team-taught courses.

That the Departments and Deans work out formulas for collaboration that fairly recognize the contributions of faculty, departments, and colleges when such collaborations take place.

6. UHM General Classroom Policy

Charge from SEC

Classroom Use Policy (CAB, CAPP): The issue of “general use” v. “department owned” classrooms has been addressed by a written policy promulgated by the VCAA that has been accepted by Deans. CAB and CAPP are asked to form a joint working group to review the proposed policy and report to the full Senate on the matter on or before November 2010.

Both CAB and CAPP have worked on the General Classroom Use policy since Fall 2010. VCAA presented a policy whereby departmentally controlled classroom space would be relinquished to central control for the purpose of general classroom use so that classroom scheduling could be addressed in a timely manner.

CAB and CAPP finally presented its joint recommendations and report for full Senate approval. Both the report and recommendations were approved by the Senate on April 20, 2011.

Motion to Accept the March 13, 2011 Joint CAB and CAPP Report and Recommendations on UHM General Classroom Use Policy and Forward the Motion and the Report to the Mānoa Administration and Department Chairs

The Mānoa Faculty Senate accepts the March 13, 2011 Joint CAB and CAPP Report and Recommendations on UHM General Classroom Policy for a two-year trial period effective Fall 2011, with the proviso that each department retains at least one conference room or has access to one. At the end of the trial period the administration must return to the Senate and report on the impact of centrally available general use classroom space. If the new trial policy is deemed unworkable it will be rescinded.

The Senate further urges departments to work with the Campus Administration to achieve the five items listed in the recommendation section to ease classroom scheduling difficulties.

7. High Failure Courses

Charge from SEC

High fail courses (CAPP, MAC, GEC): Certain undergraduate courses at Manoa have disproportionately high (combined) F, I, and W rates. Some of these courses are part of the general education core. SEC asks CAPP, MAC and GEC to form a collaborative working group to review the problem of courses with high F, I and W rates and make a recommendation for action to the full Senate on or before the December 2010 meeting. CAPP appointed two subcommittee members to work with CAPP, MAC and GEC. CAPP was not the lead on this working group. Rather through our sub-committee members we provided input on the progress and the final report. The final report was presented on April 20th, 2011 and approved by the full Senate.

8. Grade Replacement Policy: Repeated Course Grading Options

Charge from SEC

Repeated course grading options (CAPP): Historically when students retake a class to try and earn a higher grade both grades are factored into their overall GPA. Some campuses replace a lower grade with a higher grade and some campuses even allow students to have a 'semester forgiveness' policy that eliminates all grades (high and low) for one semester at a student's request. The SEC asks CAPP to consider whether Manoa should develop a "replace" grade rule for courses taken twice by students who did poorly the first time they took a course (e.g., the C Chem prereq req.) and report on the result of their efforts at the November 2010 Senate meeting.

CAPP formed a sub-committee to review the issue of repeated course grading option. There are several different categories at UHM whereby students can re-take a course. These categories are repeating past courses, repeating failed courses, duplicate credits, and backtracking. The current UHM policy appears to be confusing and cumbersome and should be simplified to bring clarity on the matter for all concerned. The sub-committee's report is attached.

CAPP's recommendation is a departure from the current policy and therefore would like to present the recommended changes for discussion. Provided that SEC and the Senate agree, we would then move that the policy be accepted.

CAPP presented the Grade Replacement Policy to the Senate at its December 8th meeting to familiarize the faculty about this new concept. CAPP acknowledges that the Council of Advisors does not support this new policy. However, other Advisors who work with students (non-traditional students, minority/disadvantaged/first generation college bound students, etc.) are in support of this policy. These advisors are not included in the Council of Advisors group. CAPP has researched extensively on the issue for grade replacement policy and urges the Senate to adopt the new policy.

The new policy is student centered and is designed to help students who are floundering in their first year in college. Studies have shown that developmentally, 18

and 19-year-olds are not prepared to transition from young adults to adulthood. This is why we have Freshmen and Sophomore programs to keep them on track and to help support them to succeed. The policy designed to help this population provides a viable option to improve their grade point averages without penalizing them with the burden of carrying over bad grades throughout their academic life. Further, the current UHM policy prohibits and penalizes these students when they attempt to retake classes by either averaging all grades; and/or by not taking the new higher grade into consideration.

If UHM is considering being on track with 4-or 6-year graduation timelines, then this policy will certainly help rather than hinder graduation. For example, many majors require a higher GPA or course grades (2.0 – 3.0) before students are allowed to be accepted in selected majors and/or graduate from that major. However, since UHM currently does not have a grade replacement policy, students must repeatedly to raise their cumulative GPA. This policy would enable the students to replace a higher grade three times without carrying the burden of poor grades and to raise their cumulative grade point average. If students were to take 40 courses to graduate with a BA, then replacing three grades would only represent 7.5 percent of the course-work.

A detailed CAPP report on this specific issue is available on the Senate's website. Since December 8, 2010 CAPP has again brought forward the new policy on grade replacement with revisions and consideration of all parties concerned. CAPP discussed this issue with the VCAA and was told at CAPP's meeting that he did not have a position on this issue. However, when it was presented to the Senate on April 20th both the VCAA and the Council of Advisors objected to this new policy.

CAPP is an academic policy-making body of the Senate. While it routinely takes input from others outside of the Senate, it also makes policy that may not reflect the sentiments of the groups providing input.

As a result, CAPP will once again present its new policy set forth for the full Senate's consideration on May 4, 2011. The motion for the policy is as follows: CAPP voted on the new "Grade Replacement Policy" at its March 9, 2011 meeting. The vote was unanimous. The policy is included below.

University of Hawai'i Mānoa Undergraduate students may repeat up to three (3) Mānoa courses for grade replacement. Both grades will be reflected on the transcript. However, only the higher of the two grades will be used in the calculation of the cumulative grade point average. Degree credit for any repeated course is given only once.

Policy Details

1. This policy applies to courses first taken in the Fall of 2011 and beyond at University of Hawai'i Mānoa.

2. All courses taken for A, B, C, D, F, including plus and minus grades, may be repeated for grade replacement under this policy.
3. Students re-taking a class under the Grade Replacement Policy must take it for a letter grade; grades cannot be replaced by NC or W.
4. All grades for courses repeated beyond the three (3) allowed under the Grade Replacement Policy will be calculated in the cumulative grade point average.
5. Replaced grade(s) will not affect academic actions already recorded on the transcript, such as probation, suspension, eligibility for financial aid, scholarships, deans' lists, honors status, and graduation with high academic achievements.
6. Students must indicate at the time of registration that they are choosing to exercise a Grade Replacement option.

VI. Other Issues

1. Hospitality Major to be offered within the College of Business Administration

CAPP was informed by one of its members that the administration had asked Dean Vance Roley of CBA to propose a BBA in Hospitality. It appeared that the major was by way of circumventing the current School of Travel Industry Management's (TIM) expertise. It also did not make sense why CBA would offer such a major. As a result, the Chair of CAPP was asked to find out whether this was in fact the case, and if so, to report to SEC for further clarification.

On October 8, 2010, Interim Dean of TIM Juanita Liu confirmed that she attended a meeting with Chancellor Virginia Hinshaw, Ernest Nishizaki (Kyo-ya Hotel Sheraton Starwoods) and Vance Roley. Mr. Nishizaki is a member of the board of CBA and has promised to provide \$1K if and when the merger of TIM and CBA can be finalized. Given the current situation, the merger may not be realized and hence this alternative approach to a hospitality major under CBA appears the way to go. At the same time both entities are to provide core courses and give the option for students to major in hospitality. Currently, TIM does allow its students to get a minor in accounting, management, etc. Therefore it is unclear as to what the Chancellor is requesting.

John Butler, the current Associate Dean of CBA confirmed on October 11, that indeed the Chancellor has requested that CBA develop a new hospitality major within its college. Accordingly the Dean has requested the CBA faculty to study the feasibility of such a "duplicate" major and whether they would support it.

The question still remains as to why it is necessary to develop a major at another college, when TIM provides such a major at the current time. Is this an alternative strategy to let TIM "merge" with CBA despite its unwillingness to do so? The planning is proceeding and it may be timely to ask the Chancellor for clarification.

2. Associate VC for Students

The Associate VC for Students came to CAPP's meeting on November 3. He stated that the purpose of his visit was to increase communication between the Faculty Senate and the Office of Enrollment Management. Towards that end, he informed the committee that:

- The Office of Enrollment Management consists of Office of Admissions (recruitment and admissions). Office of the Registrar, Financial Aid Services, Information and Technology. The Office employs over 120 FTEs.
- The office of Admissions has re-done the undergraduate application process that will enable early admissions/initial admissions decisions based on self-reporting data by the applicants (gpa, courses, test scores). If admitted, the applicant will be required to submit official transcripts and test scores. The advantage is that they are able to turn around an application with two weeks instead of the original 6-8 weeks.
- The field admissions program has been implemented whereby Counselors attend various schools on the Islands and admit students, or if they are not eligible for Mānoa, they will make a referral to community colleges.
- The office subscribes to CAPPEX, a college and student matching service. Potential students create portfolios of themselves; universities create their own profiles/advertisements; UHM has highlighted programs such as Study Abroad and National Student Exchange to attract those local students who wish to attend Mainland universities. Over 2000 local Hawaii students are in the CAPPEX data base.
- The office is revising early admissions programs that will allow High School students to attend UHM for college credits. Outreach College has a successful program called the summer scholars program, and the two offices are collaborating on this issue.
- The office is also initiating new programs for early entry to nursing, business, medicine, etc.
- Retention is not the responsibility of Enrollment Management and thus the AVCS indicated that CAPP should inquire with Assistant VC for Undergraduate Education.

3. Other Guests

CAPP routinely invited guests who could provide information on new degree proposals, or any other person willing to give CAPP updates and reports on CAPP related

issues. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has been a routine guest at CAPP's Spring 2011 meetings.

VII. Follow-up Items for 2011-12 Academic Year

CAPP must follow-up on the following items for the next academic year. These are:

- Shortened Academic Calendar – the system plan
- Undergraduate Enrollment Goals for UH Manoa – 4 Goals; Clarification on the 5th International Student Recruitment
- Enrollment Management: Student Retention at UHM and its status
- UHM General Classroom Policy –trial implementation
- Final report on Academic Action Pilot project
- Course-Alpha and Number language across the system campuses
- Electronic Wait Listing of Registration
- Collaborative Academic Offerings
- Follow-up on UH Undergraduate Catalog publishing of the
 1. 120 credits for minimum graduation requirement
 2. 45 Non-introductory credit requirement
 3. Excess credit policy is null and void
 4. Grade replacement policy
 5. Definition of Satisfactory Academic Progress, Maintaining Good Academic Standing and Minimum Mānoa Academic Standards (2.0)



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII
MĀNOA

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Office of the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education

MEMORANDUM

January 3, 2011

TO: Reed Dasenbrock
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

FROM: Ronald E. Cambra *Ronald E. Cambra*
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education

SUBJECT: Report on Status of Suspension of Academic Actions

This is the second year UHM has suspended academic actions at the end of fall semester. This report will explain the status of the suspension of academic actions, and will advance a future timeframe for a final recommendation. The report will be divided into four parts.

Part One will summarize the reasons for requesting the suspension of academic actions. Part Two will present data provided by the Manoa Institutional Research Office (MIRO), and summary feedback from various academic advising offices. Part Three will present preliminary conclusions based on what we know now. Finally, Part Four will present a timeline for our final recommendation.

If you have any questions regarding the content or structure of the report, I would be happy to respond.

Thank you.

Part One: Reasons for Requesting Suspension of Academic Actions

Traditionally, there are two types of academic actions taken twice a year at the end of fall and spring semesters. The actions are prompted by grades from the just completed semester. Depending on the college and the number of advisers available, academic actions usually begin between three and five days after the final day that faculty record grades. Of course, some grades are typically missing and the Registrar's Office spends days, weeks and sometimes longer trying to contact all faculty for final grades, but nonetheless, academic actions begin.

The two academic actions are graduation certification and academic performance evaluation. The first action is critical for students being accepted into advance graduate education programs, the military, and of course, many other jobs that require a degree as a minimum qualification for a job. All colleges now use STAR as their basic degree audit, so much of the work related to graduation certification is done before the end of a semester, beginning when a student applies for graduation. The names are shared with college advisers, so pre-checks can occur on the courses a student is taking and the grades necessary for a student to successfully graduate. Upon notification of final grades, the process, while time consuming, can be done and completed in a reasonable period of time, depending on the number of students applying for graduation and the number of advisers available to certify.

The second action, the academic performance evaluation, is an entire different matter. Traditionally, the process can take several days, or a week at times for colleges with late numbers. Most of the initial processing is done by computer, however, access to grades in a timely manner, and enough time to check each student's status is still very time consuming. Most of this work is done for fall, between Christmas and New Year's.

Before email and STAR, it was not unusual for a student, especially from the mainland, international or the neighbor islands to receive a postal notice a day or so before the start of the next semester. In the case of mainland, international or neighbor island students who had flown in to start the next semester without knowing whether they were suspended or dismissed, and had commitments in the dorms, the challenge becomes even more personal. In recent years, since the advent of STAR and "official" email, on xxx@hawaii.edu, this issue has been addressed. Still a continued concern is the intensity of work needing to get done, typically, while the rest of the campus is shut down.

The Office of Undergraduate Education and the Council of Academic Advisers has raised the issue of what is accomplished by taking academic action after fall semester. We know some higher education institutions take academic performance evaluation actions only once a year, at the end of spring semester, however, the occasion to test the impact of suspending academic performance evaluation had not presented itself until last year, when the campus administration chose to shut down the campus for furloughs. The staff responsible for generating the academic performance evaluation

of students' work would not be working, so academic graduation would be done on a case by case based on need in priority, and done as soon as possible; while academic performance evaluation would, in theory, be done at the end of December or early January when the campus re-opened. The campus shut down presented us with an excellent opportunity to test whether doing academic performance evaluation at mid-year had an impact on retention, and eventually graduation, thus the request last year for suspension of academic performance evaluation.

After some discussion the Council of Academic Advisers realized simply not taking academic performance evaluation action would not be sufficient. Along with suspending academic action, each college advising office agreed to design an intervention strategy that included contacting all students identified for probation, suspension and dismissal at the end of the fall semester, and explaining to each student that while academic actions would not be taken as a result of fall grades, academic performance evaluation would nonetheless be taken at the end of spring and would also reflect fall grades. Essentially, the student's advising office contacted each student on email. Some offices requested students make appointments to discuss their academic status and strategies for improving academic performance. The basic strategy is to make students aware of the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) for tutoring services, the need to use the Student Success Center as a gathering for study groups, re-evaluating course taking patterns to balance schedules, signing up for study skills and time management workshops offered through the LAC, and finally a follow-up meeting later in the semester to discuss academic progress, and specific goals for graduation.

The strategy is seen as "intervention" with a heavy emphasis on the need to do academic preparation and make coursework a renewed priority. Each college was to report to the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Council of Academic Advisers on what they did and whether they felt it made a difference.

Part Two: Data Results and Anecdotal College Reports

Two things will be done in this section. One, an explanation of the attachment which presents data collected beginning in Fall 2006 will be reviewed, and secondly, a summary of college adviser reports regarding the suspension of academic action will be offered.

On page 3 of the attachment, the bar graph offers a clear picture of the recent history of academic performance evaluation actions. Prior to Fall 2007, academic performance evaluation actions had seen a steady increase in the number of actions, many resulting in students leaving the institution. (We will shortly detail a new study MIRO is doing on each cohort.) In Fall 2008, we instituted mandatory academic advising on the UHM campus. All incoming freshmen were required to see an academic adviser prior to registering for the next semester. The basic concept was to shift part of the academic

responsibility over to the student early in their academic experience and to force more academic engagement from the student, a development of an academic partnership with the advising office.

Please note again in the bar graph on the bottom of page 3 of the attachment, beginning in Fall 2008, a small but significant decrease in academic actions began, more dramatic in the Spring semesters. From Spring 2007 (831 actions) to Spring 2009 (692), it can be argued that a significant part of the drop in academic actions can be attributed to the institution of the mandatory academic advising policy. Thus, suspending academic performance actions in Fall 2009 while not without some risk, was a continuation of the mandatory involvement with students. It is critical to note, that the major decrease took place in Spring 2010, when not only mandatory advising was in place and we completed the first two years of a full cycle of a cohort, but a new active intervention with all advising offices calling in students identified as "could have been on action" in the fall were consulted and steered to academic assistance. The Spring 2010 action (357 actions) is the lowest number of student actions we have ever taken on this campus in a spring semester.

The overall feedback from most colleges was that they did not notice a significant difference in the overall impact on their programs. Indeed, most colleges candidly report that students who were doing very poorly, continued in many cases to do poorly and were eventually suspended or dismissed. However, in several important instances, students who were made aware of their academic difficulties at the end of fall semester, were able to successfully move themselves from probation to no probation. Thus, every college advising office recommended a second test of suspending academic actions and more systematic interventions in the Spring to determine whether more students would benefit from making better use of the academic resources on campus.

The most common intervention strategy employed was an individual email discussing what action would have been taken if academic action was done at the end of fall and what the student needed to do to avoid academic action at the end of spring semester. The overall consensus on the part of the advisers is that email notice is not enough. Holds and mandatory meetings are a commonly suggested strategy; however limited personnel and not enough support staff are commonly cited as deciding factors. Several offices like Engineering, the Manoa Advising Center, and Education had more aggressive intervention strategies with multiple emails, telephone calls and personal meetings with students, and were better able to account for improved results from their students.

While the initial impact of suspension of academic performance evaluation is positive, a great deal more needs to be done to develop a common, effective early intervention strategy to assist and direct student to existing campus resources.

I have also asked MIRO to develop a parallel study of academic performance evaluation actions tracking entering freshmen from Fall 2007 to Spring 2010. The MIRO study will require identifying first time freshmen and tracking their individual performance each semester.

The first set of data on the Fall 2007 cohort is complete and reported below. The MIRO staff reports: "Of the 223 freshmen that returned on probation in Spring 2008; 53% did not continue on to Fall 08, 17% continued on probation, and 30.5% were removed from probation and continued on. As expected, students on probation are more likely to stop-out, but it appears that students that do continue on are likely to get off probation. Will be interesting to see how other cohorts compare."

*Fall 2007

1,843 First-Time Freshmen entered Mānoa

*Spring 2008

1,698 Returned in Spring 2008 (-7.9 % change from Fall 07)

1,475 returned in good standing

223 returned on probation (117 of these students did not continue on to Fall 2008)



*Fall 2008

1,413 Returned in Fall 2008 (-16.8% change from Spring 2008)

1,317 returned in good standing

95 returned on probation (57 new and 38 continuing probations; 39 out of 95 did not continue on to Spring 2009)

1 returned on suspension

*Spring 2009

1,350 Returned in Spring 2009

1315 returned in good standing

35 returned on probation (18 new and 17 continuing probations; 14 of the 35 did not continue on to Fall 2009)

***Fall 2009**

1,279 Returned in Fall 2009

1,238 Returned in Good Standing

41 returned on probation (30 new and 11 continuing probations; 4 of the 41 did not continue on to Spring 2010)

***Spring 2010**

1,264 Returned in Spring 2010

1,218 returned in good standing

46 returned on probation (21 new and 25 continuing probations)

We will include all of the MIRO freshmen cohort data with our complete analyses of academic performance evaluation data in our final report this summer.

Part Three: Conclusion Thus Far

Two points should be made before conclusions to date are offered. From the earliest discussions, OUE and CAA always envisioned that we would need to suspend academic actions at least twice to see if it made a difference, and if there was any benefit to moving in another direction or maintaining status quo. We believe that if removing academic performance evaluation action after fall semester allows more students to remain in school and effectively remove themselves from action by the end of Spring, then our academic policy should reflect academic performance evaluation be done once a year. The second point is just as critical, if there is not a significant difference between taking academic performance evaluation action and not taking academic performance evaluation action, what is the value of taking action at the end of fall, except to lose students?

The question of whether to take academic performance evaluation action should not be evaluated in isolation of other academic policies we have put in place. STAR was first put into official operation in early Spring 2007, and mandatory advising began in Fall 2008, with plans for requiring all students to declare a major by their junior year to start in Fall 2010. (Lack of staff was the deciding factor in postponing the start of Declaration of a Major.) It can be argued that our students are becoming better managers of their academic journey, more active participants in their academic experience, and more effective at signposting their progress to degree. Essentially, is dropping academic action mid-year, an extension of the first real steps in academic progress to degree and

student success? Is the record number of graduating seniors over the last two graduations, a testament to the transparency of placing useful information in student's hands through STAR? Are newer, more engaging academic advising strategies, including peer mentors, the wave of the future? Is dropping of academic performance evaluation another useful strategy for promoting our new active partnership with students? More data at the end of Spring 2011 will provide us with additional useful data to help answer some of these questions.

Part Four: Timeframe and Final Recommendations

The final academic actions for Spring 2011 will be completed five weeks after the grades are posted, or by late June. Comments and recommendations from advisers will take about two weeks, so the earliest a clear recommendation with analysis can be generated will be July 1, 2011. I suggest that date as the deadline for our final report to the VCAA. We hope a final decision on the status of suspending academic actions can be made no later than October 1, 2011. This will allow academic advising offices to work with students prior to registration in mid-November for Spring 2012. If that deadline can be reached, and if no future furloughs or Green Day shut downs are anticipated, academic performance actions can be planned for, providing that is the final decision.

On behalf of the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Council of Academic Advisors, I want to thank the VCAA and the Manoa Faculty Senate for their confidence that this change in academic structure can be attempted and studied. We realize requesting two years to study this action is a long period, but the stakes are high and the impact on retention and graduation is worth the demand that the process be studied carefully.

Mahalo.