

UH Hilo Long-Range Budget Planning Committee

Questions and Concerns Regarding *Serving the State of Hawai'i: UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015*

January 17, 2008

Summary Response

If we take seriously the goal of “serving the state of Hawai’i,” we must take seriously the major goal of increasing enrollment and enhancing student success. *Overall, sustained enrollment growth (both FTES and headcount) must be recognized as an essential component of strategic planning and tracked as a fundamental performance measure.* We know of no system of higher education nationwide that does not take campus enrollments into consideration in strategic planning and funding allocation.

The five strategic outcomes included in *Serving the State of Hawai’i* are incremental measures of improvement within the broader higher education mission of increasing student enrollment and success. There should be incentives and performance rewards for both increasing enrollment and achieving incremental outcomes.

In addition, the strategic planning process for the System must acknowledge and account for differing levels of infrastructure and related support services at each campus. Rising student enrollments and expansion of programs at an institution creates need for new buildings and repair of old buildings, furnishings, and equipment. We also need better support for research, including undergraduate research.

Similarly, student demand for services increases proportionally to enrollment growth. Administrative support to ensure efficient, effective operation must increase along with these other increasing campus needs. As such, the historical budgets allocated to each campus within the UH System have to be examined closely to assess capacity to take on new strategic outcomes and new performance measures.

As a System, we still need to address how enrollment growth will be accommodated in terms of fiscal, personnel, and facility resources so as to maximize student access and success. UH Hilo strongly requests that further discussion occur regarding *Serving the State of Hawai’i: UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015* and that we carefully examine best-practices used by other university systems nationwide in developing performance indicators and allocating resources.

Questions and Concerns

- What is the primary and/or fundamental purpose of this document? Is it to establish operational priorities? Assist with performance accountability? Guide future budget allocations? Provide a roadmap for taking UH System to the next level of quality and excellence?
- With respect to this document, are we still in the discussion stage?
- If so, what is the schedule for continued discussion, feedback, and revision? To ensure that meaningful faculty and staff input is incorporated into the planning, as well as garner broad constituency ownership for the plan, a structured, transparent process should be implemented. This feedback process would ensure that we develop a plan that best advances Hawaii's interests.
- What is the linkage between *Serving the State of Hawai'i: UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015* and the UH System Strategic Plan? How does it fit into the overall Strategic Plan update process?
- How were these five strategic priorities and related performance indicators decided upon? President McClain told legislators in committee hearings this month that these measures are "a selection" of outcomes that will be used to measure progress toward System strategic goals. Towards this end, what other measures were considered but ultimately discarded? In relation to System strategic goals, which criteria did these five meet that others didn't?
- Can we include a performance measure relating to institutional quality?
- How do these strategic outcomes relate to strategic goals for the State of Hawai'i? How do they acknowledge Hawai'i's unique position as an island state and its need to influence and respond to an increasingly global economy?
- How have the unique and diverse missions of our various campuses been taken into account in establishing these strategic priorities and performance indicators? UH Hilo's mission has evolved and expanded in recent years; we want to be sure that the System's Strategic Planning documents accurately reflect these changes. For example, UH Hilo has been successful in serving the entire state and the wider Pacific Basin with increasing numbers of badly needed four-year and professional graduates.

- *We caution against the use of a “one size fits all” set of performance indicators that will be applied to all campuses in the UH System.* Such a narrow process would inherently benefit some campuses and disadvantage others simply because our various campus missions are each unique, our student demographics diverse, and our existing infrastructure varying. What may be important to one campus may be less so to the rest of the UH System. Therefore, we suggest having 2-3 tiers of performance indicators – perhaps one tier of “base” indicators that will be universally measured, and then other tiers of “incremental” indicators that are customized to reflect and acknowledge the unique goals of each campus.
- How will past performance relative to these outcomes be measured in relationship to present and future performance? How were these specific target indicators (e.g., of 3-5% annual increases) determined and have their feasibility and relevance to institutional peers been discussed and confirmed?
- Are the performance measures UH system goals or individual campus goals? It is unclear what metric will ultimately be used to measure success, however defined. If the goals are for individual campuses, shouldn't the campuses have a say in the development of these goals? What happens if they are not met? What incentives are there to meet them?
- Will these be unfunded priorities, or will there be a funding process for allocating additional dollars so campuses can reasonably achieve these goals?

Need for Further Discussion

We feel strongly that there should be campus-based and system-wide discussions regarding:

- strategic outcomes in general
- specific campus measures
- linkage of strategic outcomes to campus measures
- baseline data and source years to be used
- target dates for measures
- implications for budget incentives, allocations, or reallocations
- relationship of measures to overall student enrollment growth and base funding