DRAFT **– 9-11-12**

**Retention and Graduation Committee**

Report

*Background*

Institution: **UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII – MAUI COLLEGE**

Organizational Type: **Public** \_\_ Private, non-profit \_\_ For-profit \_\_

Accreditation status/date:

Eligible granted \_\_\_\_\_\_

Candidacy granted \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Last accredited/reaccredited **8-14-2009 LAST ACCREDITED**

Notice of Concern \_\_

Sanction: Warning \_\_ Probation\_\_ Show Cause\_\_

Date of next WASC interaction:

 Interim Report \_\_\_\_\_\_

 Special Visit \_\_\_\_\_\_

 Off-site Review **MAY 2, 2013**

 Reaccreditation Visit **FALL 2013**

Institutions used for comparison (list):

**Great Basin Nevada, Northern New Mexico College, Peninsula College, Washington**

*Findings and Recommendations*

Findings:

\_\_\_ Template(s) Completed properly? **-\_\_\_\_YES** \_\_\_No

IF NOT: Please explain why no,

 **COMMENT, NOT A CONCERN: Associate Degree Students transferring into the Bachelor’s Degree program, might better be captured via the NON-TRADITIONAL Template, since these students are CONTINUING their education within the same institution. Template completion directions were not clear on this point, so this not a criticism of the institution. “Transfer student” usually refers to those “transferring” from an external institution rather than *continuing on* within the same institution.**

\_\_\_ Narrative is responsive to WASC requirements? -\_\_\_**\_**Yes **\_\_\_NO**

IF NOT: Please explain why not:

**Narrative doesn’t address the possibility, especially given their very low graduation rates, that a significant percentage of the students they have included as seeking an Associate’s Degree, are not in fact actually “degree seeking students”. The reason is this is important is that this lack of understanding of their students motivations does not allow them to identify the “types of students for whom completion of the degree might be better facilitated by campus initiatives. There needs to be an analysis of student motivations with respect to the degree to determine in fact which of their students are degree seeking. One possible approach is to examine student enrollment behavior and contrast it with their declared educational goal. Bottom line: Of those included in the WASC Associate Degree Template table, how many are actually degree seeking?**

\_\_\_Appropriate Comparison campuses? -\_\_\_\_Yes **\_\_\_NO**

 IF NOT: Please explain why not:  **Can’t Determine from Narrative why the particular comparison schools were selected. Wondered why no Hawaiian peers were selected for the comparison of the Associate’s Degree.**

Retention and graduation and analysis are within acceptable ranges.

 For the whole \_\_\_Yes \_\_\_**NO**

Please comment if “No”: *Bachelor Degree rates are ok, or based too small a population to evaluate. Bachelor degree programs are new and need to be closely monitored. Associate Degree rates are too low unless one considers that not all of the students in the cohorts are actually “seeking degrees”.*

within specific subpopulations? \_\_\_Yes\_\_\_**NO**

Please comment if “No”: **Male retention and Hawiian-Pacific Islander retention is lower than average. Goal set for improving Native Hawaiian achievement (does this mean “graduation rates”), but no goals or analysis about retention of “Males”.**

Other concerns arose in the review ? \_\_\_ **YES\_\_\_**No

 Please comment if “Yes”:

**100+ Page Appendix adds little to the arguments made in the narrative. Little connection between the materials in the Appendix and the Narrative.**

**RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING INSTITUTIONAL TEMPLATES AND NARRATIVE**

| **INITIAL** | **EMERGING** | **DEVELOPED** | **HIGHLY DEVELOPED** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partially completed templates or did not complete them for all groups. Explanations in narrative may be Spartan or do adequately assess the data in the templates.** | Completed templates properly for all groups but narrative does not fully explain or examine the trends in the data. | Completed templates properly and narrative provides an adequate, though “basic” understanding and interpretation of the data therein. | Completed templates properly. Analyses and contextualization in narrative thoroughly explain the trends in the data. Additional statistics may be brought to bear to buttress arguments made in the narrative. Institution is thoroughly committed to understanding its retention, graduation rates, and time-to-degree at all levels. |

Recommendation(s):

\_\_ Review in three years:

\_\_Review in six years

\_\_Refer to next interaction with WASC as noted at the top of the previous page

\_\_Request to be included in next Interim Report

\_\_Request Special Visit

**\_\_Request next re-accreditation cycle *in May 2013***

Areas of concern for next peer review:

1. **Overall completion rates within the Associate Degree program.**
2. **REPEATED BUT IMPORTANT POINT: There is a question of whether they understand which members of their population are truly degree seeking. Graduation rates reported may be artificially lowered by including students who have little intention of getting degree. Moreover, may mean that sufficient resources are not placed into advising and guiding students who ARE truly seeking a degree.**