

**Responses to July 2012 WASC Progress Report Follow-Up Questions
University of Hawai'i System Office**

1. **The issues raised in the 2007 report included enrollment management and retention. Would it be possible to get the figures for the record in regard to retention and any description they have of their enrollment management efforts?**

UH System Office efforts around enrollment management include:

- **Revising a Board of Regents policy on UH's nonresident enrollment cap (2010).** Under the original policy, nonresident enrollment caps at four-year campuses were set at 30 percent and included undergraduate and graduate student populations. The policy revision increased the cap from 30 percent to 35 percent and excluded graduate students from the cap.

The goals of the policy revision were to continue the University's core mission of providing access to all qualified Hawai'i residents and to potentially increase revenues through higher nonresident tuition rates. UH administrators worked with a Board of Regents task group to increase the Board's understanding of the topic and to explore options.

- **Supporting campus efforts to develop UH credit programs through distance learning.** A priority of the UH System is to provide improved access to postsecondary education and training to residents throughout the state, particularly in remote geographic areas. The UH System Office partners with campuses in the development of selected degree programs, particularly those in workforce demand areas. The role of the System Office ranges from convening discussions to funding assistance.

Examples of programs include a UH West O'ahu health care administration degree that is available to the neighbor islands, a UH Hilo Masters of Arts in Teaching that is available to other parts of the Big Island and to other neighbor islands, and a UH Hilo marine sciences degree that is available to UH Maui College students. Such offerings enable residents, especially those on the neighbor islands, to enroll and graduate with credentials from campuses on other islands through distance learning. Approximately 50 programs (graduate, bachelor's, associate, and certificate) have been delivered to students in-state (and out-of-state).

The UH System Office also assists in the formation of multi-campus partnerships. Nursing, early childhood, and engineering are programs where campuses work together to offer a full array of classes within a program. These partnerships promote the efficient use of resources, including a way to offer additional sections when physical class spaces are limited. It also encourages campuses to work together for the benefit of students.

To emphasize the importance of distance learning as one of the UH System's priorities, Hawai'i Graduation Initiative (HGI) campus scorecards include a measure on the share of distance learning credits taken by undergraduate degree seeking students (see attached scorecards). The UH System Office is also exploring partnerships to further its core mission of access.

- **Shifting the UH System's focus from enrollment to outcomes.** In 2007, when the UH System Office proposed the UH System strategic outcomes to the UH community, it

deliberately chose performance measures that focused on outcomes such as degree attainment. Prior to the establishment of these strategic outcomes and performance measures, much of the emphasis tended to focus on enrollment growth.

However, with the adoption of clear, measurable system goals based on the University's public higher education agenda for the state of Hawai'i (<http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/msn/meetingstateneeds2007.pdf>), larger systemic goals, such as total degrees and certificates awarded, focused everyone on outcomes. The strategic outcomes and performance measures have been successful in setting the priorities of the UH System through 2015. Campuses' enrollment management strategies continue to have a critical role; however, they are now part of a larger discussion on how UH can achieve its system goals. Those discussions are significant as UH experiences all-time record high enrollments for the fifth consecutive year.

Like enrollment management, retention is another key area within the pipeline that contributes to graduation. The UH System Office has been working with campuses on retention strategies through its Hawai'i Graduation Initiative (HGI) (www.hawaii.edu/hawaiigradinitiative). Retention rates for the past two years are in the attached HGI campus scorecards. The intent behind the scorecards is to raise campuses' awareness of key levers that contribute to degree attainment and to promote the use of data for actionable decision making. In October, HGI, in partnership with Complete College America, is hosting a two-day workshop where campus teams will work on strategies focused on improving student success.

2. Have the “star hires” mentioned on page 2 of the progress report been made? Are they all at Mānoa?

No, we haven't made any hires formally, but we are initiating contacts with potential hires. We are requesting funding this legislative session in order to move forward. Most of the hires are likely to be at UH Mānoa, with the exception of STEM coordinators who may be located at the UH Community Colleges.

3. What are the steps the campuses are taking to implement the Hawai'i Graduation Initiative?

The Hawai'i Graduation Initiative (HGI) 4-Point Completion Plan organizes the steps taken by campuses into four parts aligned with statewide goals and action plans (see attached): i) preparation for higher education in middle through high school; ii and iii) participation and persistence in higher education through students' high school and college years; and iv) performance beyond college.

The 4-Point Completion Plan was developed in conjunction with a systemwide self assessment of completion activities conducted prior to Hawai'i's participation in a Complete College America state completion academy in 2010. This followed the launch of the Hawai'i Graduation Initiative in February 2010 and an HGI: Summit I in September 2010 that engaged campus, system, and external stakeholders in the completion discussion. Steps to implement HGI ensued.

A culmination of these efforts is the HGI: Summit II scheduled for October 11-12, 2012. In preparation, each campus has conducted a self assessment in three areas: structure; transfer and time/credits-to-degree; and financial aid. During the summit, teams from each campus will receive

technical assistance and two days of intensive working time to focus on their own institutional data and strategies in order to recalibrate or further develop actionable plans.

In addition to the ones shown in the 4-Point Completion Plan, examples of steps that campuses have already taken to implement HGI are:

- The *Do it in Two* and *Do it in Four* campaigns that complement *15 to Finish*.
- Campus chancellors report to the Board of Regents on the performance indicators.
- Block scheduling for freshman students with English and math scheduled in the first year is in varying stages of implementation.
- UH Mānoa provided free 3 credits of summer school tuition for incoming freshman.
- Expansion of dual admission and enrollment between UH Mānoa and the community colleges is in different stages of implementation.
- Achieving the Dream for the community colleges for 5 years has demonstrated positive impact on HGI goals
- Implementation of auto admission for students earning their AA degrees. Those students have high persistence rates. First class not yet at 2 year mark so graduation rates not yet known
- Reverse credit transfer is in early stages of implementation. The first pilot group of 32 students were awarded AA degrees. Students uniformly were pleased; no one declined the degree.
- UH Mānoa is looking at the super seniors data.

Also tied to the Hawai'i Graduation Initiative and K-12 preparation, campuses will be engaged in *Aligning our Efforts* on Sept. 21, 2012, to define college and career readiness and develop higher education's role in the implementation of the Common Core State Standards and Smarter Balanced Assessments for students at the Hawai'i Department of Education.

4. Can we see the scorecards mentioned on page 4 and a summary of the financial data analysis that is cited there?

- Scorecards attached: UH Mānoa; UH Hilo; UH West O'ahu; UH Maui College
- Financial aid data attached; analysis ongoing.

5. Who is on the RCAC noted on page 9 and what has been the turnover in BOR members since 2007?

Current members of the Regents Candidates Advisory Council:

<https://www.hawaii.edu/rcac/members.php>

1. Karl Fujii, term ends 2015; executive vice president, Hawaiian Building Maintenance
2. Neil Bellinger, term ends 2013; private consultant
3. L. Thomas Ramsey, term ends 2015; professor, mathematics, UH Mānoa
4. Nelsen B. Befitel, term ends 2013; corporate counsel, ProService Hawai'i
5. Joseph F. Blanco, term ends 2015; real estate and government consultant
6. Kathryn Matayoshi, term ends 2013; superintendent, Hawai'i Department of Education
7. Shanna Clinton, term ends 2013; student member, doctoral student UH Mānoa

Board of Regents terms since 2007 in order of initial appointment:

1. 2003-2008 Byron Bender
2. 2003-2008 Kitty Lagareta
3. 2003-2007 Alvin A. Tanaka
4. 2003-2008 Jane B. Tatibouet
5. 2003-2011 James J.C. Haynes II
6. 2004-2008 Andres Albano Jr.
7. 2004-2012 Ramon de la Peña
8. 2005-2009 Ronald K. Migita
9. 2005-2009 Allan R. Landon
- 10. 2005-current Michael A. Dahilig (student regent; regent)**
11. 2006-2008 Marlene M. Hapai
12. 2008-2012 Teena M. Rasmussen
13. 2008-2010 Harvey Tajiri
- 14. 2008-current Carl A. Carlson, Jr.**
- 15. 2008-current Artemio C. Baxa**
16. 2008-2011 Howard H. Karr
17. 2008-2012 Dennis I. Hirota
18. 2008-2011 Mark H. Fukunaga
- 19. 2008-current Chuck Y. Gee**
- 20. 2008-current Eric K. Martinson**
21. 2008-2010 Grant Teichman (student regent)
- 22. 2009-current John C. Holzman**
- 23. 2009-current James H.Q. Lee**
24. 2010-2012 Matthew R. Williams (student regent)
25. 2010-2011 Clifford C. Dias (interim appointment)
- 26. 2011-current Coralie C. Matayoshi**
- 27. 2011-current Jan N. Sullivan**
- 28. 2011-current Saedene K. Ota**
- 29. 2011-current Barry T. Mizuno**
- 30. 2012-current Jeffrey T. Acido (student regent)**
- 31. 2012-current John C. Dean**
- 32. 2012-current Benjamin A. Kudo**
- 33. 2012-current Tom H. Shigemoto**

6. Could someone describe the data governance initiative noted on page 11?

The University began a data governance initiative last year following the recommendations of two consultants' reports on where the University should be with its student data and reporting. The first report looked at reinventing the role of the Institutional Research Office and provided a roadmap of how UH could achieve its long-term goal of cross-functional reporting (i.e., the ability to merge student, finance, and human resource data) to expand its analytical capabilities and provide executives with new kinds of information for decision making. The second report considered UH and its partners' challenges in meeting the state's State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) requirements. Both reports recommended setting up a data governance structure at the University to change its longstanding culture of data use which was largely based on local solutions. The focus of both reports was on student data.

Last year, UH began its data governance initiative by forming the Data Governance Committee (DGC), a systemwide group comprised of members from the UH System Office and campuses, and from across different functional areas (academic and student affairs; finance and administration, and human resources).

The committee's charges are to:

- a. revise, recommend, and develop policies and standards that govern the University's data and information management practices at the direction of UH leadership;
- b. define clear and consistent structures, models, and processes that promote the efficient use of resources to meet the information needs of the University community;
- c. provide guidance and recommendations concerning the University's Institutional Data, including expanding access, improving quality, assuring security, and improving performance;
- d. provide recommendations to UH leadership as part of a formal appeal process involving disputes around Institutional Data and Institutional Data Systems.

The attached Executive Policy E2.215, Institutional Data Governance was crafted by the DGC and is the foundational policy that establishes the data stewardship responsibilities of the University. The DGC is currently creating new procedures on data sharing (who has decision rights to approve data requests and what's the process) and role-based access (who can have access to what and what's the process). These two areas are the most ambiguous and require clarification of roles and responsibilities. UH's FERPA policy is also being updated to include the latest federal changes.

Consultants' reports:

<http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/hireviewandrecommendations.pdf>

http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/final_hawaii_data_governance_report_march_2011.pdf

7. Who in Hawai'i approves missions and programs?

The Board of Regents, upon recommendation of the President, approves the University system and campus missions. Programs are reviewed by the Council of Chief Academic Officers—a group comprised of vice chancellors of academic affairs from each campus and convened by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs—before they are brought to the Board of Regents for approval.

8. Do the CFO's meet with the budget VP the way other campus leaders meet with counterparts in the system office?

Yes, the Vice President for Budget and Finance and Chief Financial Officer meets with the vice chancellors for administration from each campus on a periodic basis (roughly quarterly).

9. Could someone describe the experience the university has had in its implementation of Kualii Financial System?

As expected, the implementation of the Kualii Financial System (KFS) was a significant effort and required coordination and cooperation between the system and campuses, especially given the aggressive timeframe we elected. The community of universities that participate in KFS were an

important resource and greatly assisted with the effort. The result was that we successfully implemented the system on July 1st, 2012, as planned.

10. Page 15 talks about the state general fund for the University being flat despite an increase in its revenue. Why is that? Also, the numbers on the page talk about a \$336 million reduction in state appropriation support and a \$96 million increase in tuition. Does that mean the university is spending \$240 million less per year than in the past?

The State's revenues are slowly rebounding, but there are still competing demands. For example, there is pressure to replenish state coffers that were tapped during the crisis and pressure to begin addressing the state's unfunded liabilities.

As for the figures provided on pages 15 and 16, we have revised them (attached) and apologize for the error. Between FY2009 and FY2012, the University's state appropriation was reduced by \$90m and our gross tuition revenue increased by \$64m during the same period. Our increased tuition revenues have partially offset the decline in state appropriations.

11. The BOR adopted a tuition plan for 2012-17. What are its rates and what are the revenue expectations associated with it?

- Tuition schedule attached
- Tuition and fee revenue projections attached

12. There is a line on page 16 that suggests that salaries may have to be raised. Will the university pay for that or the state?

Historically, the state has provided a "collective bargaining augmentation" that covers all negotiated raises. However, since the last faculty contract, UH has been supplementing faculty salary increases with tuition revenues. It is unclear in the future how much of the faculty raises will be funded by the legislature.

13. Page 17 hints at a new method for allocating general fund and tuition revenue. Could the change be explained more completely—and what the expected results are to be?

In the last biennium budget, the University proposed to institute outcomes-based funding. The goal was to provide incentives to campuses to make progress toward the strategic outcomes that have been in place since 2008 surrounding the need to increase the number degrees and certificates awarded. Although the University did not receive additional funding in the last biennium for outcomes based funding, we plan to continue pursuing the idea. Five outcomes are to be incentivized: the total number of degrees and certificates awarded, the total number of degrees and certificates awarded to Native Hawaiians, the total number of degrees and certificates awarded in STEM fields, the total number of degrees and certificates awarded to transfer students (within the system), and the number of PELL grant recipients. If campuses do not reach their goals then the funding is to be returned to the state. Senator Jill Tokuda, chair of the Senate Education Committee, supports outcomes-based funding.

14. On page 18, the report mentions that the state auditor will be looking into the university's compliance with the federal HEA. What is the issue that is precipitating that investigation?

The state of Hawai'i has no regulations governing private entities providing postsecondary education in the state. This is not a matter of the university's compliance, but rather the state needs to address the lack of "state authorization" for private providers. There is a fairly inactive Postsecondary Commission on Higher Education that is administratively attached to the Board of Regents, and there is some thought that this Commission should be charged with the authorization function.