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B. Distance Education
SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Accreditation History

   Brigham Young University–Hawaii (BYUH) located in Laie, Hawaii, is a private, non-profit, undergraduate institution established as the Church College of Hawaii in 1955 by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church). It obtained initial accreditation as a two-year college in 1959 and accreditation as a four-year college in 1961. The institution changed its name to Brigham Young University–Hawaii in 1974 and now offers 27 Bachelor’s degree programs along with three Associate degree programs, with the Associate of Arts & Sciences being its only distance education program. BYUH serves about 2,700 students consisting of U.S. domestic and international students, from about 70 countries and territories, emphasizing countries along the eastern rim of Asia and in the Pacific. BYUH is part of the Church Education System (CES), which has campuses in Utah and Idaho, as well as online courses offered within a new organization called BYU-Pathway Worldwide.

   BYUH completed its most recent reaffirmation of accreditation in 2008. This resulted in a Special Visit during 2012 that focused on financial priorities, the assessment of learning, and faculty scholarship. Reports from the Special Visit indicated progress on assessment, but noted some unevenness between programs. Positive outcomes regarding scholarship were reported, though concerns regarding faculty workload remained. Concerns about financial priorities persisted prompting the Commission recommendation that BYUH undertake a careful analysis of the impact of resetting financial priorities and changes to assure the adequacy of support for its academic programs and the alignment of resources to promote student achievement. In addition, new concerns were raised about
the Bachelor of University Studies (BUS) degree. The Commission identified numerous issues to be addressed. As a result of the concerns related to the BUS, general degree-level approval for bachelor’s degrees at BYUH was suspended until the Commission could review and approve the institutional response to the issues. The 2013 BYUH Interim Report focused on the BUS degree. Following the Interim Report, concerns about the BUS degree continued. A Special Visit in 2014 was conducted to address progress on all identified issues. The Special Visit report acknowledged progress in all areas, prompting the Commission to make four specific recommendations (discussed in Component 1). The suspension of general degree-granting approval was continued until the institution could demonstrate to WSCUC staff that appropriate measures were in place for data driven initiation of new degrees.

B. Description of Team’s Review Process

The WSCUC commission constituted the review team for the BYUH reaffirmation in late June 2016. An offsite review (OSR) was conducted in September of the same year. The team reviewed reports submitted for this review as well as those submitted for previous reviews. Examples of the materials reviewed included but was not limited to, annual reporting data, historical visit reports and findings, faculty vitae, student work samples, surveys, committee minutes. During the OSR, the team identified lines of inquiry for the March 2017 site visit and requested additional documents related to program review, learning outcomes, strategic planning processes, and financial goals. The team requested and gained access to Canvas, the online teaching and management platform, and the library online tools. The campus website was also used as means of learning about the institution and its programs. The team held conference calls prior to
each visit to discuss findings, establish visit priorities, assign team responsibilities and to
determine the lines of inquiry. Additional documents were provided as needed and
responses to questions were provided. The use of Box cloud storage facilitated document
sharing.

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

The visiting team appreciated the scope and quality of the reports submitted. The
information included reflected the institution’s commitment to the WSCUC standards and
guidelines. The team room was well organized and included binders with additional
information, such as student work samples, syllabi for on campus and online courses,
program reviews, committee and team meeting minutes, and assessment documents. The
team wishes to thank the campus, administration, and staff for their support and
hospitality. The team appreciated the detailed responses to the recommendations of
former visiting teams. Additional response to the materials provided in response to
previous visits and team recommendations is included in Section II, Component 1.
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

Much of the response to previous actions involved Standard 3, and is detailed in that section of this report. Below are seven issues (four specific recommendations from the 2014 Special Visit, two issues the institution had been encouraged to address, and the issue of general degree-granting approval) raised in the most recent reviews and Commission actions along with summaries of the institutional responses to said issues.

“1. Develop and Refine Policies Relating to the Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees. Specifically, the institution should consider establishing campus-wide minimal standards for upper-division credit hours. Those standards should meet degree requirements found within BYU sister institutions. Attention should likewise be given to a comprehensive review of the course numbering system.”

BYUH examined the requirements at the other CES institutions. As a result of this review, the BYUH Dean’s Council voted to establish graduation standards that require all bachelor’s degrees to include a minimum of 120 credit hours, including at least 30 credit hours of upper division credit. Of the 30 upper division credit hours, 6 must be General Education and at least 24 must be in the major. Faculty in the degree programs reviewed and revised course numbers to ensure that the numbering matched upper and lower division requirements for content and rigor. Review of syllabi and policies, as well as discussions with relevant faculty and administrators support the intention and successful outcome of this effort (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 3.10).

“2. Apply Policy to the BUS Degree. Parallel to the first recommendation, the institution should ensure that the BUS degree requirements conform to a newly
developed/further refined policy on upper-division coursework. As part of this application of policy, BYUH should align the BUS degree with the findings of the BUS Program Review document, or discontinue the degree.”

While reviewing the BUS degree to address this concern, the BYUH Curriculum Council and Dean’s Council proposed to the faculty that the BUS degree be discontinued. The faculty voted to discontinue the degree and the BYUH Board approved discontinuance (CFR 2.1, 3.9, 3.10).

“3. Clarify the Approval Process for New Degrees. This should include standards, rubrics, and protocols to ensure that faculty and students are fully aware of the accepted procedures for the establishment of new degree programs.”

The institution described the program approval process as evidenced in Exhibit 1-4a. The process indicated that proposals originate from individual faculty or from faculty groups. Accordingly, the proposal goes through a well-defined, evaluative sequence of faculty and administrative reviews with communication to and feedback from relevant stakeholders. During the visit, it was learned that rubrics are used to rate the policies and support is provided to departments that are in the developing stages of understanding of the processes (CFR 3.7, 3.10).

“4. Enhance the Coordination of Academic and Financial Planning. Drawing on its continuing experience with the nine semesters-in-residence policy, the institution should review ways to improve how programs are evaluated before they are implemented. As part of that review, consideration should be given to expanding and formalizing the roles of key faculty and student stakeholders, with an eye to increasing attention to and valuing these constituent voices.”
Per item 3 above, BYUH provided evidence of the inclusion of stakeholders in the new program approval process (CFR 4.5). Triangulation of documentation and interviews provided evidence demonstrating how financial planning is coordinated with academic planning (CFR 3.4).

“5. Oversight and Evaluation of Volunteer Staff. BYUH is strongly encouraged to assure it has in place campus-based professional staff charged with maintaining appropriate oversight of program volunteers. The panel suggests that student satisfaction surveys include an assessment of the accuracy, timeliness and guidance provided by the volunteers.”

The report did not directly address this issue. Interviews and review of available documentation provided evidence, supporting progress on this issue. Campus-based professional staff provide oversight for volunteers. A variety of student climate data have been collected and used. Each program and service unit has completed or has scheduled a program review. A central focus of the current round of program reviews has been customer service along several dimensions. The completed reviews resulted in improvement plans for the service unit reviewed.

“6. Support for Online Students. BYUH should assure that online students are receiving adequate support services. The panel suggests that student satisfaction surveys include an assessment of the accuracy, timeliness and guidance provided by the volunteers.”

The report did not directly address this issue. Interviews as well as review of available documentation and the BYUH website provided evidence of support of online students (CFR 2.13, 3.1). BYUH has an Online Support Center for technical support, a
Student Help Center for support in using the online environment, and a Center for Student Success. The Student Help Center is self-service with a variety of training modules available in the Canvas online environment. The Center for Student Success also has video modules directed at online learning.

“7. General Degree Granting Approval. With regard to suspended general degree-granting approval, BYUH must demonstrate that appropriate measures are in place for the initiation of new degrees. This must include that upper division requirements meet or exceed standards at other BYU campuses, that they be applied to the BUS degree, and that the degree approval process for new programs matures to conform transparently to WSCUC standards and practices.”

BYUH provided evidence via appendices and discussions with relevant stakeholders of a standard new degree program proposal and approval process that conform to WSCUC standards and requirements (CFR 2.1, 2.2a, 2.4). The faculty established minimum credit hour requirements for every bachelor’s degree as well as minimum upper division credit hour requirements that meet or exceed the requirements of other BYU institutions (CFR 3.7, 3.10). The university demonstrated appropriate faculty responsibility during development and approval of new degree programs (CFR 3.10).
Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

The sections below describe the results of the team’s review of each Standard. The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that BYUH has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with all four of the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

BYUH was reflective and analytical in its completion of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI). The IEEI shows that every program has developed formal learning outcomes, which are available in the BYUH catalog, on the website, and in most syllabi. The IEEI specifies the evidence that is used to determine that learning outcomes are achieved. Evidence is reviewed in annual reports by department faculty and the dean, as well as through the program review process.

Standard 1:

The mission of BYUH is to integrate both spiritual and secular learning, and to prepare students with character and integrity who can provide leadership in their families, their communities, their chosen fields, and in building the kingdom of God. The mission guides BYUH’s strategic focus and financial priorities, and informs decisions about degrees, learning objectives, and student experiences (CFR 1.1). The Board of Trustees is actively involved in the selection of new faculty to assure that the right faculty members are hired who fully support the mission of the university. Educational objectives are consistent with the institution’s purposes and are widely recognized throughout the institution. Institutional learning outcomes are aligned with program learning outcomes and student learning outcomes. Retention and graduation rates are
publicly available on the website (CFR 1.2). BYUH is recognized for its diverse international and intercultural priorities with a focus on Asia and the Pacific. The institution has a highly diverse student body, and acknowledges the need to increase faculty diversity (CFR 1.4).

BYUH publicly states its commitment to academic freedom, while also indicating that this freedom is within the framework of being a distinctively LDS university. BYUH has developed a thorough Academic Freedom Statement outlining the distinction between individual and institutional academic freedom. Faculty stated during the visit that they are fully supportive of the institution’s academic freedom policy and practices, and there is no record of any grievances or complaints against the institution for a violation of academic freedom (CFR 1.3). Education is the primary purpose of BYUH, with a focus on educating leaders for the Church. Seventy to eighty percent of the operating budget of BYUH is provided by the Church. The Board of Trustees and the LDS Church Commissioner of Education provide overall direction and oversight of the institution, but the operations are fully delegated to the president and his leadership team (CFR 1.5).

BYUH represents itself consistently through its website and admissions processes. The Policies website contains policies on the Honor Code (student conduct), grievances, and accommodations of persons with disabilities. The admissions website includes information about cost of attendance, housing, and financial aid. Academic programs are clearly described on the website. A procedure is in place to “Report a Concern” and records of student complaints are maintained. Grievance procedures for faculty and staff are outlined in the faculty and staff handbooks. The institution’s finances are regularly audited (CFR 1.6, 1.7).
The BYUH campus has taken the accreditation process seriously, with honest and open communication and with appreciation and enthusiasm to receive feedback. It was highly unusual, however, that no members of the Board of Trustees were present for the team visit. Instead, a conference call was scheduled for the team members and the Board of Trustees Executive Committee two weeks prior to the visit. It was not clear that the Board members were acquainted with theWSCUC standards, CFRs, and policies (CFR 1.8).

**Standard 2:**

“Update campus policies and procedures to align with educational quality and sound practice (CFR 2.2, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.10, 3.1, 3.2)”, (IR, 2016, pg.3) is listed as a BYUH priority. These activities were led by the Associate Academic Vice President for Assessment and Accreditation whose leadership and passion for the campus wide educational effectiveness process was clearly demonstrated in the detailed and intentional practices that the institution has undertaken to inform student learning and success. The institution shared documents that demonstrate evidence of the campus program review process (CFR 2.7) and the use of the program data obtained in revising, adapting (and in one case eliminating [BUS]), programs. Institutional, program, and student learning outcomes have been developed and are being implemented (CFR 2.1, 2.3). Evidence of this was reviewed in documents developed at the program and institutional levels, in syllabi, in online courses in Canvas, and validated in interviews with faculty, students and administrators. Tutoring services are available through the Reading/Writing Center and the library for students having difficulty meeting the learning outcomes in their courses.
In interviews with the supporting staff, Directors for English Language Learners, the Reading and Writing Center, and the Language Lab, it was explained that students have access to multiple tutoring options in addition to the EIL classes designed to support English language. Students have three semesters to demonstrate English skills necessary for college level work. If they do not reach this benchmark, they may be sent home. The engagement and participation clearly defines these expectations (CFR 2.1, 2.3).

Due to a time conflict, a teleconference with the Board of Trustees was held in early March prior to the site visit. During the teleconference, it was revealed that a new venture and potentially a fifth member of the Church Educational System (CES) system is in development, BYU-Pathway Worldwide (https://pathway.lds.org/Main/BYUPW). The purpose of this institution is to centralize the online program offerings of the current four-campus system. While still in the formative stages, BYUH faculty and administrators indicated that centralizing distance learning course offerings will eliminate redundancy, increase the ease by which potential students access information, and allow for improved quality of offering. BYUH faculty will continue as content developers for English Language Learning courses and modules (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4).

Policies were provided and reviewed related to faculty and students. Specifically, the faculty handbook, the faculty progressive discipline policy, and the University catalog were reviewed. These documents are clear and straightforward. Students also commented on the helpfulness from a 'learning to learn in the US' perspective. Interviews with faculty and student groups validated the use and effectiveness of the policies (CFR 2.4). Faculty and Program Directors described the process by which
English Language Learners begin English language learning through online support modules before they arrive on campus.

Student work samples were available in the team room during the visit. A review of the work samples supported the notion that student-learning outcomes are commensurate with required standards for upper and lower division bachelor degrees (CFR 2.7).

Faculty scholarship and creative activity is supported as noted in the faculty handbook. Faculty workload (36 credits per year) and responsibilities outside of teaching such as committee assignments, assessment, program review work, and service make it difficult to determine how scholarship activities are possible (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

The campus notes a 6-year graduation rate of 55%: above the national average but slightly below its peer institutions (CFR 2.10). The faculty noted that changes to General Education requirements are an attempt to improve graduation rates. Review of students who stopped out revealed that students may take a leave for mission work or to pursue military service.

Faculty provided evidence of student involvement in shared scholarship. Students indicated that they serve on internships and have been included in regional and national presentations. Clubs and campus activities provide opportunities for students to engage in co-curricular and leadership activities (CFR 2.11).

The team learned that a formal process for faculty advising does not currently exist. Advising is critical for timely graduation for all students but it is particularly important for first generation and international students who may not understand how to determine what to take next and who can help them navigate the university system.
While the MAPS system is designed to assist students in identifying course sequences, the team heard from alumni and students who reported that they encountered difficulty identifying the available options and the requirements of their majors. It is strongly suggested that the university develop a faculty advising process (CFR 2.13).

**Standard 3:**

In the institutional report, BYUH identified expanding the diversity of faculty and staff as important concerns to be addressed. The University notes (p.19-20) that of the 21 FT faculty hired in 2014-15, 43% were women and 29% were from ethnic or racial minorities; of the 119 adjuncts hired during the same period, 66% were women and 49% were from ethnic or racial minorities. Overall retention and turnover rates were provided but no breakdowns by gender or ethnicity were given. In the BYU-Hawaii Staff Planning for Growth dated 12-08-2016, increases in Faculty FTEs are included for 2016-17, 2018-19, and 2020 – beyond, yet the staffing plan makes no mention of intentionally targeting diversity by gender, race or ethnicity. The mission of BYUH identifies a diverse student body, however, this diversity is not reflected in the staff and faculty composition. It is recommended that the University establish a diversity policy and plan for ensuring a diverse faculty and staff representative of the students it serves (CFR 3.1, 1.4).

During interviews the Team heard about the heavy teaching load for faculty, coupled with substantial service obligations. Given faculty engagement in program review, assessment and service, and the intense faculty teaching load, coupled with a strategic plan calling for continued growth, sustaining a healthy faculty is at risk. It is recommended that the university review faculty workload and assignments to develop and implement an approach to and plan for a sustainable faculty work life (CFR 3.1).
Reportedly, the university has reviewed and updated all policies relating to faculty hiring, rank advancement, grievances, and discipline (CFR 3.2). An updated version of the Faculty Handbook (12-14-2016) was reviewed. Also provided were meeting minutes from faculty meetings. However, most minutes appeared to be PowerPoint agenda presentations, with little evidence of faculty dialogue. Conversations with the VP for Academics, the Deans, and the Faculty allayed team concerns regarding collaboration and dialogue around faculty affairs. It became evident that the creation of the updated handbook and policies was a collaborative endeavor (CFR 3.2).

The University provides course release procedures and traditional professional development leaves for faculty. At BYU all faculty members are expected to collaborate with their dean to develop individual professional development plans (p.19). The Center for Learning and Teaching (CLT) is a resource for faculty development to provide faculty coaches for individual work. The Faculty Handbook (p.9) prescribes the participation of all new faculty in a three-semester teaching and acculturation seminar series through the CLT. Through interviews with staff, it was learned that professional development opportunities are available for staff (CFR 3.3).

BYUH operates as an institution within the Church Educational System (CES), and is primarily funded by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). The team requested verification of sufficient ongoing resources from the supporting entity, but was informed via letter from the Board of Trustees that LDS does not release financial statements. Campus-based annual budget planning is clearly calendared, as evidenced by the Budget Planning Schedule provided, and evidence of a broad-based and participative budget development process was provided. Once finalized at the campus
level, the budget for the subsequent calendar year is submitted to the CES Commissioner and is then approved by the Board of Trustees. Audited financial statements for the previous three years were provided as required, providing evidence of a financially stable institution with appropriate allocation of resources and ongoing plans for repayment of debt incurred through capital projects. As requested, a five-year budget pro-forma was provided. It reflected a forecast for stable and adequate allocations from the Church. Minutes of the Board of Trustees’ approval of the annual budget, approval of facilities plans, and approval of fundraising plans were provided to the team upon request (CFR 3.4).

The University has undertaken a robust program of facilities construction and renewal since 2008. On September 14, 2016 the Board of Trustees approved a new construction plan, aligned with institutional strategic priorities that addresses: 1) academic space needs through a $39-$41M Church appropriation; 2) student and married student housing construction needs of $113M through loans; and 3) cafeteria renovation, at between $19-$21M, through local funding and a loan request. Provision and roll-out of technology resources are addressed in the institutional report, including standardized technology in each classroom, a laptop rental program, and faculty assistance through the Office of Information Technology for faculty assistance with Canvas. Team members heard from full-time and adjunct faculty that robust support is in place to support faculty use of Canvas. Through interviews and a visit to the facility, an impression of adequate library and learning resources support provided to the campus community was formed. (CFR 3.5).
Evidence was provided of a culture of leadership accountability and performance review at all levels at BYUH. The Board undertakes a review of the BYUH President on an annual basis. Administrators at each level are responsible for the effective use of resources. Faculty are reviewed by the appropriate Dean at least once per year. Central to the University’s ethos and institutional learning outcomes is the notion of stewardship, one that is repeated throughout the institutional report in the context of budget review and assessment (CFR 3.6).

Effectively communicating decision-making and governance (CFR 3.7, 3.10) was self-identified by the University as an important concern that needed to be addressed. The institution brought forward its proposal approval process as the way they have developed to enhance communication and governance. As an example it was noted that the institution revised the implementation of a new calendar initiative, once evidence of unintended negative consequences for students was identified. Interviews revealed purposeful effort by the President and the administration to empower faculty through delegating curriculum and resource planning and resource decisions to the deans and departments. University councils and committees are documented; however, it is not clear which of these bodies are committees of the faculty and which are administrative committees. In conversation with the Board of Trustees, the Board acknowledged that no formal Faculty Senate is in operation at BYUH, but only a Faculty Council. It was noted that BYUH lacks a faculty governance system grounded in leading practices. While there is faculty satisfaction with the current administration’s leadership and the recent changes made to include faculty input, a structured system appears to be needed for long-term sustainability of faculty governance. It is recommended that the institution investigate
models of faculty governance, determine what issues should be under the purview of the faculty, and codify the role of faculty leadership in shared governance (CFR 3.7, 3.10).

The Organizational Chart gives evidence of appropriate administrative structure, including a full-time CEO and CFO. Qualifications/Vitae of administrators were not provided to Team members (CFR 3.8).

BYUH is governed by a Board of Trustees, which consists of nine key leaders of the LDS church. This board functions as a single Board within the CES system. The Board has both legal and fiduciary authority over the institution that includes both hiring and firing the University President (CFR 3.9) and a notably broad array of reserve powers. The Amended and Restated Bylaws of BYUH, dated 2002, were provided to team members on request, but the Board acknowledged that the Bylaws have not been updated since 2002 and that the Board did not systematically engage in formal board development activities. Under the direction of its Board of Trustees, BYUH is administered by the Church Education System (CES) coordinated by the LDS church’s Commissioner of Education. When asked how the Board ensures that it abides by WSCUC Commission standards, policies and procedures with regard to board governance, interviewees responded that “We actually leave that to the University to bring to us any concerns they have got with the standards of the accreditation body. Thus far, they have not brought anything to us.” Members of the team acknowledged that BYUH functions as an institution within a system. However, it was concerning that the BYUH Board engaged marginally with the WSCUC accreditation process, manifested a lack of awareness of WSCUC standards, CFRs, and policies, and did not provide compelling evidence of compliance with CFR 1.8. Examples include the Board’s
inability to meet with the team onsite despite at least twelve months of advanced notice, the Board’s refusal to provide individual, signed conflict of interest statements, as required under the Independent Governing Board Policy, the lack of updated Board Bylaws after 15 years, the lack of systematic Board development, and the lack of a discernable Board Committee structure (e.g., no Academic Affairs Committee of the Board) that comports to WSCUC requirements. A review of Board operating policies, procedures and communication practices to ensure its commitment to open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to undertake the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, and to assure institutional compliance with all WSCUC standards, CFRs, and relevant policies is recommended (CFR 1.8, 3.9).

**Standard 4:**

The University has demonstrated evidence of organizational structures and processes that support a framework for systematic, ongoing, and integrated review and evaluation of student learning. In addition to program review guidelines that align with WSCUC standards, annual assessment and other forms of ongoing evaluation were shared (CFR 4.1).

The review team found that the program review process was described in detail in the guidelines and that this was followed across programs. Programs are reviewed on a regular schedule, and this includes both academic and non-academic units, reviewed by at least one external reviewer. The program review process includes evaluation of program quality, sustainability, and improvement. The guidelines were updated in 2016 and detailed sections for each of these themes, closely paralleling the sections required for WSCUC reaffirmation self-study documentation. The data required and review team
report also mirror WSCUC expectations, and outlined wide participation across stakeholders as well as review by administration. In addition to support from the Institutional Research Office, each department receives ongoing support and coaching from the Associate Academic Vice President for Assessment and Accreditation. Following a site visit, the report from each review team is codified into a Department Quality Improvement Plan (DQIP), which includes the recommendations, budget required, projected action date, update status, and completion date and is used to document the improvement plan agreed upon by the department and the administration. The DQIP informs the annual stewardship, planning, and budgeting process and the midpoint review. The institution created guidelines, templates, and processes to facilitate a reflective, evidence-based process with future focused planning (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.7).

The Associate Academic Vice President for Assessment and Accreditation facilitated the development of three committees to support the program review, assessment, and institutional effectiveness processes. Faculty involved reported that committees meet regularly and continue to improve in the years since their inception, building a culture of quality improvement, involving administration, faculty, and staff (CFR 4.1). The missions of the IEAC (Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee), the Assessment Committee, and the Evaluation of Learning and Effectiveness Group (ELEG) are described in the faculty handbook. Each committee has a purpose statement (stewardship) and measurable objectives to gauge progress and evaluate success toward the assessment plan. Committee work includes learning effectiveness review, review of reports under the program review process, internal and
external surveys, course evaluation, testing, and comparison of outcomes with data from peer institutions (CFR 4.4, 4.6).

The institution has developed a robust institutional research office that is actively engaged with administration, faculty, and students (CFR 4.2). The office collects, analyzes, and regularly reports on student enrollment and surveys of students, alumni, and faculty (CFR 4.5). The institutional research office supported the evaluation of institutional learning outcomes by providing analysis of rubric data across the three comparable areas. The key performance indicator report is another ad hoc document produced by the institutional research office. This study disaggregated retention and graduation data by race and ethnicity, gender, home area, college, and key comparison groups that have been important to BYUH. The analysis included findings with the potential to inform future funding and policy decisions for the institution. The institutional research website also provided a set of peer groups for benchmark purposes. It is unclear to the team, however, how the office and the established committees have used and plan to use peer group data to benchmark BYUH to monitor progress or set targets.

**Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees**

BYUH offers degrees administered by 18 departments housed within four colleges. The faculty handbook outlines the educational commitments that faculty are expected to make to students, including: enlighten their minds and spirits, enlarge their intellect, provide an intercultural learning environment, train individuals with productive work skills, and instill a sense of stewardship. Evidence provided by the institution, including reports of surveys, as well as information provided during the site visit,
reflected the statements outlined in the handbook. Each of these goals included detailed objectives that aligned with the mission, core values, required core competencies, and institutional learning outcomes.

The program review process requires that each degree program articulate the multiple ways that it measures, evaluates, and ensures quality. As evidenced in the DQIP reports, programs have used major field and nationally standardized tests, capstone projects, presentations, and field practicum to evaluate student learning. During the institutional visit, faculty discussed the ways that data informed practice, specifically related to methodology, reordering of courses, and faculty collaboration regarding effective teaching practices. Responding to a WSCUC recommendation (2014), a review of lower and upper division courses was completed (CFR 2.2). In addition to establishing a 30-hour minimum of upper division credits within the degree and renumbering many courses, faculty reported engagement in reflection and meaningful discussion within and across departments about standards for numbering (CFR 1.8). As a further quality measure, the campus clarified their approval process for a new degree (CFR 4.4).

Throughout its handbooks, website, publications, and during interviews, the team found evidence of the mission: delivering a curriculum that emphasized both secular and spiritual learning (CFR 2.12). The context of an international and widely diverse campus underscored the conversations with all constituent groups. Students reported a desire to study with and learn from diverse peers. Faculty discussed the calling to teach a diverse student population, and the administration noted efforts to create a more inclusive campus. However, the team was unable to find evidence that the campus is intentionally and systematically engaged in applying a lens of inclusivity to the structures, policies,
process, and approaches to teaching. In the material provided and throughout the conversations, the spiritual tenets were the main reference point for achieving a campus climate supportive of diversity (CFR 1.4). While the homogeneity of the faculty was acknowledged, the administration did not indicate that a plan existed to support the recruitment and retention of a more diverse faculty (CFR 1.4, 3.4). The team encourages BYUH to create a diversity plan and associated policies that continue improving the experience for this diverse campus.

BYUH reported several efforts in place to define the quality of the degree as well as monitor progress toward achieving a quality degree. A project began in 2009 to design a learning framework to reduce barriers to learning and improve the culture of learning at the institution. Multiple stakeholders were invited to discuss and contribute ideas to the end-product. The framework emphasized three domains: prepare, engage, and improve. These were supported by six principles that frame teaching and learning: motivated by faith, active involvement in the learning process, self-directed learning, meaningful reflection, openness to change, and constantly improving the capacity to study and learn effectively. The Center for Learning and Teaching (CLT) was recently expanded to better support this learning framework. In 2016, the existing director and two new staff members began developing a 3-year rolling model for faculty development that included awareness, education, mentoring, peer observation, and self-reflection. A cohort of new faculty will begin the program in fall 2017. The CLT is developing a modified version of the full program for adjunct faculty. The CLT is commended for adopting a theory based, engaging model of faculty development that encourages the staff to incorporate methods of program evaluation into the design components (CFR 2.1, 2.10, 2.13).
The alumni survey respondents (2014) strongly agreed that they acquired the target knowledge, skills, and abilities outlined in the institutional learning outcomes. Most alumni surveyed agreed that they acquired depth of knowledge in the discipline, effective leadership skills, spiritual knowledge, and the ability to associate with people of different cultures (88-97%). Additionally, 83% of alumni agreed that they were prepared for their future career and 61% reported that they were in a meaningful career after graduation (CFR 4.5).

BYUH completed a cycle of institutional learning outcome measurement and reported several key findings regarding the integrity of the degree. Over the past year, faculty and staff collaborated to collect student work, create scoring rubrics, and evaluate the student work to assess the extent that students achieved three of the five institutional learning outcomes. The ELEG gathered student work and calibrated faculty to the rating rubric (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

BYUH is committed to ensuring that its graduates develop leadership skills and this was consistently mentioned in the institutional report as well as during the campus visit. The faculty and staff who contribute to the assessment efforts across campus noted that Leadership as an institutional learning outcome would be measured within the coming year with a focus on integrity, stewardship, and service. During the site visit, several staff reported that leadership opportunities exist across student work, IWork, internship, and church related calling activities. The IWork program includes a companion online iLead class, with modules about responsibility, communication, customer service, integrity, duties, and being a good follower (CFR 2.5, 2.11). Faculty added that in class, group activities were structured to develop leadership skills, as were
research laboratory activities. The institutional strategic plan noted that developing additional internship opportunities was a priority. The review team encourages the campus to continue to define where and how students develop leadership skills intentionally, and for whom the opportunities are available. Finally, the assessment committee is encouraged to establish expectations around leadership learning outcomes to both support the development of degree programs and to clarify expectations for students (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4).

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation

The institution provided access to key data sets and to educational indicators that demonstrated student achievement and success. The team reviewed program level learning outcomes and student learning outcomes, syllabi, student work samples, graduation rate data, and met with students, faculty, and alumni to determine educational effectiveness (CFR 2.5). BYUH demonstrated its commitment to meeting the needs of its diverse student population and to adapting and developing programs to meet the needs of students. The key performance indicators report included data related to retention, graduation, bachelor’s degrees awarded, first semester GPAs and a disaggregated look at graduation rates. These data were informative but it is not immediately clear how they are being used to inform program modification and change to increase student outcomes and achievement, nor when the next analysis will be conducted (CFR 4.3).

A review of the documents provided, the campus website, the Canvas online teaching and learning management system, course syllabi and student work products reveal well-developed expectations (CFR 2.3). Further, the campus policies and
committee structure appear to set standards for review and use of data collected related to student learning outcomes and program effectiveness (CFR 2.2a). Faculty have engaged in the process of syllabi analysis and have set minimum standards for course level and program level expectations for student achievement (CFR 2.4). Data from the syllabi analysis and the learning outcomes assessment have been used to inform program development and to encourage the use of co-curricular support services, such as online tutoring (CFR 2.4, 4.3). Faculty involvement in the assessment process is detailed in Component 6.

In response to recommendations from WSCUC, the faculty evaluated and redesigned the general education curriculum. The revised format is intentionally student-centered and focused on career path preparation. For example, faculty asserted that enabling students to secure minors and certificates in addition to a major has international applications (CFR2.2a). Additionally, the calendar was changed to address student and faculty dissatisfaction.

The groups that were established to evaluate the three institutional learning outcomes for the general education core competencies met regularly, were trained and calibrated to use well established rubrics published by AAC&U, and engaged in rich dialogue about student learning (CFR 2.2, 2.7, 4.1, 4.2). The groups reviewed a large number of student artifacts from associate and bachelor’s degree seeking students across a range of courses at both mid and end points in the student career. Reflective reports included summaries of ratings in the aggregate as well as disaggregated by target groups that are important to the institution. For example, the report on oral communication included a review of 77 student presentations. Most students were rated as developed or
highly developed across the rating categories, except delivery (especially at the associate’s degree level). Further examination revealed that White/Caucasian students were scored consistently higher as compared to Asian and Asian-American students. Finally, EIL students received lower ratings across all categories, and some differences were statistically significant. The team noted that these findings present an important opportunity for institutional learning in the next cycle.

The core competency groups reports (information literacy and oral communication), indicated a need for adjustments and improvements concerning research and assessment methodology. While the use of the data, creation of reporting templates, and closing the loop will likely undergo changes, the reports on institutional learning outcomes indicated that the faculty had not come to conclusions about how the data informed curriculum, pedagogical, or other improvements. The faculty disagreed about the meaning of some of the findings and were open, both in their report and during the site visit, about their reflective discussions and the need to continue refining this process. The process to collect and score student work was strong. For example, the reports stated that “Interested stakeholders need to ask themselves if measuring the lower and higher level GE writing classes is the best way of conducting this study.” Strengths and weaknesses of this method were mentioned as “Direct evidence of student learning.” The Written Communication Group echoed the Information Literacy Group (IL) findings regarding the need to interpret and disaggregate the data further (CFR 4.2, 4.3). Additional options, such as evaluating capstone projects across campus, or the use of a portfolio system, were mentioned as next steps to consider as the committees continue to refine the evaluation process. Certainly, these methods require extra investigation into
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curriculum, coordination with a broader group of faculty, and more time and effort from assessment committee members. Whatever is done, the team noted that more and better data are necessary. The current study provided a baseline for future discussions and innovations in writing assessments. The faculty in the learning outcomes committees are encouraged to review, systematize, and structure the review process across the five outcomes before the next cycle begins. This process should include summative evaluation statements (CFR 2.2, 2.7).

Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

In 2016, BYU engaged in several key assessment projects to better understand the retention and graduation rates of students and across subgroups. From fall 2013 to fall 2014, 61% of full time and 50% of part time students were retained. Students who were undeclared were more likely to leave, as were domestic students. The completion rate for first time, full time freshmen at the six-year mark was 55%. This rate is greater than the national average but less than the average of the stated peer group (average 62%) (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 4.1). The report noted that the domestic student population constituted a greater percentage of the student body who completed, despite the lower percentage shown in a traditional calculation. Additionally, the BYU Graduation Rate Dashboard showed a greater completion rate (CFR 2.a, 2.b). When transfer students and others who were not first time full time freshman were included, the absolute graduation rate was 60% (CFR 2.14). The report did not include a discussion section about how the institution interprets these findings, nor were specific plans included to increase completion rate. Faculty noted that the program review process provided each program an opportunity to reflect on the data for their own program. However, it was noted that additional
discussion with their own department as well as across departments could yield benefits for student support, completion, and success.

The National Survey of Student Engagement Report (NSSE 2016), confirmed the information in the BYUH self-study and discussions during visit; students are engaged, develop relationships with others, and enjoy their learning experiences. BYUH has established institutional structures to support high impact and leading practices for students to be actively engaged in the curriculum and co-curriculum. Some students (11%) participated in a learning community, many completed a culminating student experience (44%), and nearly all courses included a community based service-learning project (91%). Further, most students provided a high rating for the quality of their interactions with peers (80%), including frequent discussions with people who expressed a different viewpoint (63%) and who came from a different economic background (83%) or a different race or ethnicity (90%) (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 4.1, 4.3). Additionally, the report provided from the faculty survey indicated that about half of the faculty engaged in a lecture format, whereas others integrated high impact practices.

Senior BYUH faculty stated that the institution steadily increased the range and depth of support services for students across the last decade. This included an optional orientation, academic support centers (e.g., The Reading Writing Center, The Center for English Language Learning), and Career Services (CFR 2.10, 2.13). The team heard from students and alumni that the English language course was invaluable to their success, but that additional and ongoing support was needed. In the context of the international population who have both different language and different cultural norms for learning in their home countries, these centers are positioned to provide important support for
student success (CFR 2.10, 2.13). However, the centers have been staffed by full time faculty with high workloads and supplemented in the English Language program with adjunct and ‘emergency’ staff. It is suggested that the institution further review the recommendation that additional faculty FTE be considered to ensure robust support for the international student population, especially considering the mission centric function this unit serves. The team also encourages the campus community members to continue evaluating the quality and satisfaction of these services through student surveys, program review, and other means (CFR 2.13). For example, fewer than half of the students gave a high rating to their interaction with their advisor (40% of seniors). The team has observed that the exclusively staff driven model of advising has not been common in higher education, especially in small institutions.

An International Work Opportunity program called IWork (or Kuleana, meaning responsibility in Hawaiian) enables students who return to their home country to do so debt free. This program was established to provide experience for international students and the opportunity to develop leadership skills, as well as earn an income. The students who decide not to return must repay half of their tuition. The expectation associated with the IWork program has been that students return to their country to serve. In an alumni survey (2014), more than half of the students reported that they currently reside in their home country (61%), and students who met with the team underscored that this was their intention. Additionally, the students who met with the team noted that they would not have had any opportunity to pursue higher education if the IWork program did not exist (CFR 2.11).
According to the alumni survey of students who completed their degree in 2010 and 2011, more than half of graduates (61%) were employed full time. Others were enrolled in graduate school (14%), became homemakers (14%), were entrepreneurs (11%), working part time (9%), were seeking employment (6%), on a mission (3%), or some other status. According to the categories prescribed by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) compiled in 2015 by the Office of Institutional Research, 69% of graduates indicated a career outcome destination after graduation. The sample included 497 graduates. The team heard from faculty that the departments communicate with alumni, largely during the program review process. However, this information was uneven and not collected systematically. BYUH reported that 87% of the graduates who completed their alumni survey (2014) were satisfied with their education overall, were satisfied with the quality of the education (80%), and were satisfied with the quality of instruction (85%) (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

**Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence**

BYUH has been developing quality assurance and improvement processes that use institutional data since 2009 (CFR 4.1, 4.3). The university has a dedicated institutional research office to support planning and decision-making (CFR 4.2), and has increased use of data for evaluation and improvement of teaching and learning (CFR 4.3). Interviews and documentation provided evidence that BYUH uses data for budgeting, strategic planning, change management and monitoring, or responding to a changing higher educational environment (CFR 4.6, 4.7).
The university provides a wide variety of student success and other institutional effectiveness data via their public website (CFR 1.6, 4.3). The institutional report provides several examples of how BYUH programs and units have used various assessments to make improvements (CFR 4.3). The improvements provided have included changes in program requirements, staffing, co-curricula, assessment instruments, and student support. The team noted informal practices that do not appear to be systematized, e.g., the use of the CCTST for examining differences in pedagogy across some programs with the goal of improving. More to the point, the team suggests that the developing nature of the Center for Learning and Teaching and its focus on pedagogy provides the opportunity for BYUH to develop systematic data-based evaluation and improvement of pedagogical practices.

BYUH has a regularly scheduled assessment process that is undertaken within every department. This work is supported and reviewed across the institution by the University Assessment Committee, the Evaluation of Learning and Effectiveness Group, and the Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee, each of which has a clearly-defined role in assessment, program review, and academic planning. The faculty of each department have developed student learning outcomes along with means to assess those outcomes. The faculty across the institution have developed institutional learning outcomes and subsequently embedded them in their programs and courses. Each program conducts an annual assessment of a specified set of learning outcomes with a requirement to produce a defined means of assessment, to publish findings, and to take actions based on the findings. (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)
Furthermore, the provided evidence indicates that BYUH strives toward a solid program review process that is used for institutional decision-making and to improve student learning. Each degree program conducts regularly scheduled faculty-led program reviews that include self-studies, reflective essays, and review teams comprised of internal and external members. There are relevant guidelines with required components and activities as well as templates to assist in the program review process. The program review process results in a Department Quality Improvement Plan (DQIP) aimed at informing decision making and improving student learning. All of the relevant program review products, plus syllabi, sample student work, agendas, related reports, review team membership, and outcome matrices are maintained on a publicly available website. Review of publicly available documentation indicates all programs have conducted program reviews in the past seven years and that there is variation or flexibility in the degree to which all elements of these programs must be represented, thus making it difficult to determine: 1) whether all program reviews have been completely fulfilled as required; and 2) the extent to which the DQIPs have been used consistently for quality improvement and decision-making. (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4).

The program review process has been closely aligned with regular, systematic, continuous quality improvement. Faculty were enthusiastic about the opportunity to extend the program review findings into requests for additional funding. In the annual assessment plan, departments can provide a rationale for additional investment to extend teaching and learning practices (CFR 2.7).

Component 7: Sustainability, Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment
The institution has been focused by its Board of Trustees on three imperatives: to improve educational quality, reduce costs for students, and serve more students within its target area. Issues around Board governance, faculty governance, faculty workload and faculty diversity are addressed in Standard 3, above (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10). BYUH receives funding from LDS and is not solely dependent on tuition revenue for operations (CFR 3.4). The institution has developed a strategic plan focusing on enrollment growth, facilities, and financial support for students (CFR 3.4). The extent to which the institution explicitly sought broad input into the Strategic Plan from the academic division was unclear and it was noted during the team visit that the plan still needs work (CFR 4.4, 4.6). Initiatives to address the challenges of faculty recruitment and retention are amply described in documentation provided (CFR 3.2). The budget process systematically incorporates additional funding requests based on program review recommendations and serves to align decisions based on strategic priorities (CFR 3.4, 3.7, 3.10). The institution appears to have a growing philanthropic community, with able support from LDS Philanthropies as a shared service (CFR 3.4).

**Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes**

**N/A**

**Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement**

In the institutional report (pages 71-74) BYUH articulates seven areas of opportunity as the institution continues its forward motion. These include:

1. *Increase the focus on providing educational opportunities for individuals from the target area. Gradually raise the proportion of students from that geographic region.*
2. Likewise increase efforts among prospective domestic students who would also benefit from greater preparation and educational opportunities (first-generation, historically-marginalized populations, etc.).

3. Collaborate with other entities within the organization of the LDS church to provide means by which prospective students can become better prepared with English, writing, and quantitative skills to succeed at the university.

   Success in the areas of opportunity above is predicated upon additional funding for financial aid, improved admissions practices, better preparation of prospective students in English and other basic college-level skills, and the provision of adequate student housing on campus (CFR 2.11, 2.13). Conversation with members of the Board revealed that a new entity, BYU-Pathway Worldwide, is being developed at the system level to deal with online education, both specifically as a shared service for support of academic programs at system institutions and for the development of English and other basic college-level skills in entering students. An agreement was secured from the Board in September 2016 to support an increase in campus housing. Progress on increased enrollment of students from the Pacific Islands and more targeted enrollment of domestic students was less apparent. Targeted goals for recruitment in each category as these initiatives roll out is suggested.

4. Enhance openness and collaboration across campus on academic matters.

   Progress in this area of opportunity is acknowledged as a real need by the institution, especially given that shared governance and open communication with faculty were the topic of two previous Special Visits and an Interim Report. The institution avers that “curricular decisions are now firmly nested in faculty-led
committees” (IR, p.73). Team members met with institutional senior leaders, deans, and faculty and heard a consistent message of open dialogue, delegation of academic decisions to the level of deans and departments, and a positive climate of collaboration with the faculty (CFR 3.10); however, there is still a need for enduring faculty governance structures – see Standard 3, above.

5. **Improve the quality of instruction and learning, especially for English language learners.**

   BYUH places high reliance on its Center for Learning and Teaching (CLT) and qualified faculty coaches to play a leadership role in improving the quality of instruction and learning, and to develop content for the new BYU-Pathway Worldwide pre-college online instruction initiative. The CLT is staffed by four FTE faculty and an assistant. The Center offers support and assistance for Canvas, the campus LMS, for development of both online and classroom-based courses, and for pedagogical techniques for working with diverse learners. Faculty with expertise in English as an International Language (EIL) lead a faculty team in the development content for BYU-Pathway Worldwide coursework, in collaboration with instructional designers at BYU-Idaho (CFR 2.13, 2.8).

6. **Update the physical plant to accommodate the needs of future students.**

   This opportunity has already been brought to the Board and approved, in the form of a $175M facilities improvement plan to improve academic space needs, greatly expand student and married student housing, and renovate the cafeteria.

7. **Update campus policies and procedures to align with educational quality and sound practice.**
The team was provided with an updated Faculty Handbook, dated December 2016, as well as the policies alluded to in the institutional report (p.74) to better address educational quality and sound practice (CFR 2.3). During interviews it was noted that the development of the updated Handbook and policies had been a collaborative effort in which faculty members were deeply engaged.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations:

1. The team commends BYUH for its sustained commitment to WSCUC reviews. The documents and campus interviews provided evidence of a clear commitment to addressing the continuing issues from prior WSCUC reviews.

2. The team commends BYUH for its demonstrated commitment to its mission. This was evident in both the documentation and the interactions across students, staff, faculty, and administration on campus. A focus of the mission is serving a diverse student population. The number of countries represented in the student body exemplifies this. Students report that this diversity attracted them to BYUH and is responsible for their retention. The students reported that they benefited from the small campus atmosphere, learning opportunities, ability to build a strong network, and above all, to serve.

3. The team commends BYUH for improved communication, transparency, and morale as a result of the leadership of the President and the Academic Vice President. Faculty appreciate the administration’s willingness to listen to the voice of faculty and to take action. The new leadership has focused on balancing
efficiency, effectiveness, and quality, as well as addressing issues that are important to stakeholders.

4. The team commends BYUH for its integrated assessment, program review, academic planning and budgeting processes. Evidence from written documents and interviews illustrated a clearly designed and well-followed process that Faculty, Department Chairs, Deans, and the Vice President for Academics use to identify potential program improvements and then make the case during the budget process for the resources necessary to implement said improvements.

Recommendations:

1. Aligned with the mission of the institution, BYUH consistently enrolls a diverse student body. However, this diversity is not reflected in the staff and faculty composition. To achieve the University’s objectives, the team recommends that the University establish a diversity policy and plan including goals, objectives, metrics, and targets for ensuring a diverse faculty representative of the students it serves (CFR 1.4, 1.8).

2. The BYUH Board engaged marginally with the WSCUC accreditation process, manifested a lack of awareness of WSCUC standards, CFRs, and policies, and did not provide compelling evidence of compliance with CFR 1.8. The team recommends a review of Board operating policies, procedures, and communication practices to ensure its commitment to open communication with the Commission, to undertake the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, and to assure institutional compliance with all WSCUC standards, CFRs, and relevant policies (CFR 1.8, 3.9).
3. The team found that BYUH lacks a faculty governance system grounded in leading practices. While there is faculty satisfaction with the current administration’s leadership and the recent changes made to include faculty input, it is important to have a system and a structure in place for long-term sustainability of faculty governance. The team recommends that the institution investigate models of faculty governance, determine what issues should be under the purview of the faculty, and codify the role of faculty leadership in shared governance (CFR 3.7, 3.10).

4. Given faculty engagement in program review, assessment, and service, and the intense faculty teaching load, coupled with the strategic plan calling for continued growth, sustaining a healthy faculty is at risk. The team recommends that BYUH review faculty workload and assignments to develop and implement an approach to and plan for a sustainable faculty work life. (CFR 3.1)
### APPENDIX A. Federal Compliance Forms

#### 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour</td>
<td>Is this policy easily accessible? X YES ☐ NO&lt;br&gt;Where is the policy located? Catalog (catalog.byuh.edu/content/registration)&lt;br&gt;Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES ☐ NO&lt;br&gt;Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ☐ NO&lt;br&gt;Comments: The credit hour is reviewed through the program review process, the new course approval process, and by the curriculum committee. Hours scheduled are audited each semester before registration starts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</td>
<td>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES ☐ NO&lt;br&gt;Comments: The schedule of standard class times is posted on the Registrar’s web page and adheres to the credit hour policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? 5&lt;br&gt;What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both&lt;br&gt;What degree level(s)? Bachelor’s degree&lt;br&gt;What discipline(s)? Accounting, History, Sociology, Business, EIL&lt;br&gt;Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ☐ NO&lt;br&gt;Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? 3&lt;br&gt;What kinds of courses? Labs&lt;br&gt;What degree level(s)? Bachelor’s degree&lt;br&gt;What discipline(s)? Chemistry, Biology, Physics&lt;br&gt;Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ☐ NO&lt;br&gt;Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials) | How many programs were reviewed? 5
| What kinds of programs were reviewed? Undergraduate, face-to-face programs
| What degree level(s)? Bachelor’s degree
| What discipline(s)? Business Management, Education, English & Theatre, Mathematics, Psychology
| Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? YES ☑ NO

Comments:

Review Completed By: Leanne Neilson
Date: March 15, 2017
**2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM**

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal regulations</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: BYUH is in compliance with Title IV regulations regarding recruitment of students. No incentives are provided to employees or third parties for success in recruiting students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree completion and cost</td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Information on degree completion and cost is provided on the website. The overall cost is found on the cost of attendance web page. The online catalog states that most students are allotted four calendar years to finish their degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers and employment</td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: BYUH has extensive data available on career outcome rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)*

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.**

Review Completed By: Leanne Neilson
Date: March 15, 2017
### 3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on student complaints</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? About.byuh.edu/reportaconcern or the Compliance Hotline on the BYUH website</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: The Complaints policy is located in the Catalog. A web form (“Report a Concern”) was developed in 2016. An anonymous Compliance Hotline administered by the Office of General Council of the LDS Church Educational System has been available to all BYU campuses since 2007 and is available through the BYUH website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/procedure</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: An academic grievance policy addresses student complaints about a course or faculty. All other complaints are handled through the “Report a Concern” web form or the Compliance Hotline.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution adhere to this procedure?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? The Vice President for Academic Affairs keeps academic grievance records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: Academic grievances are reported by department chairs through their deans to the Academic Vice President who retains records of these grievances. Complaints logged through the “Report a Concern” website are tallied using Maxient and are sent to various departments based on the category (e.g., Honor Code, Housing, Disruptive Behavior, Concern about an employee, etc).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*§602-16(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Leanne Neilson
Date: March 15, 2017
4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Policy(s)</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the policy publically available? If so, where? <strong>On the admissions website</strong> (admissions.byuh.edu/transfer_evaluation) and <strong>in the catalog</strong> (catalog.byuh.edu/content/grading-and-records)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

1. Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

2. Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.
Review Completed By: Leanne Neilson
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APPENDIX B. Distance Education

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

BYUH is approved to offer distance degree programs; however, they have no students enrolled in their approved distance education programs. By interview they stated they are no longer going to offer distance education programs. A small percentage of courses are offered as a supplement to on-ground programs.

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Per the information in #1 above, a formal review was not necessary. The team interviewed the VP for Academics, the Deans, most of the Department Chairs, numerous faculty, and the Director and staff from the Center for Learning and Teaching (which provides support for the development of online courses). The team had access to and reviewed online courses as well as document evidence related to online courses including numbers and kinds of courses taught, credits awarded, student satisfaction surveys, comparative performance metrics, and outcomes.

Observations and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with Mission.</strong> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</td>
<td>BYUH has decided to eliminate distance education programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution.</strong> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</td>
<td>No distance education program students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</strong> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services:</strong> What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?

**Faculty.** Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?

**Curriculum and Delivery.** Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)

**Retention and Graduation.** What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions’ online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?

**Student Learning.** How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?

**Contracts with Vendors.** Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?

**Quality Assurance Processes:** How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?