

# KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

## UHCC STRATEGIC PLAN 2002-2010

"The overall focus for the Community Colleges for the next eight years, 2002-2010, is to provide total quality education. This means that each member of the Community Colleges will provide quality work and quality services at all times in working with students and the community. Total quality education means that the programs we offer, how we deal with others, and how we promote ourselves will be of high quality and meet professional standards. Total quality education also means that faculty and staff are committed to the mission of the Community Colleges, are well-prepared and up-to-date in their areas of specialization, and are supportive of their students and colleagues in promoting a quality learning environment that classrooms will be clean, safe, and amply lighted for conducting learning; that classrooms and laboratories will be appropriately equipped and supplied for instruction' and that the overall learning environment and infrastructure will be well maintained and enhanced" (p. 6 UHCC Strategic Plan 2002-2010)

The following pages contain the Key Performance Indicators contained in the UHCC Strategic Plan 2002-2010.

## A. Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success

### A.1. (a) Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the term-to-term persistence rate of under prepared students

Definition:

Percentage of students enrolled in remedial/developmental English, Math, PCC, or PCM courses (courses numbered less than 100) in Fall term who persist (re-enroll) in the following spring term

Measurement:

Use Banner fall versus spring data

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	72.9	71.6	70.9	70.3	70.9	70.4				
HAW	78.1	75.0	73.0	73.5	70.5	74.0				
HON	75.4	70.6	66.8	70.3	67.6	68.0				
KAP	78.4	71.4	72.7	70.3	70.3	71.6				
KAU	70.0	76.2	72.5	72.0	69.6	69.9				
LEE	74.0	72.1	70.5	67.8	75.4	71.0				
MAU	68.5	70.4	71.3	72.	70.8	72.6				
WIN	72.9	69.5	71.1	67.4	69.2	61.6				

### A.1. (b) Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the term-to-term persistence rate of students with disabilities

Definition: Percentage of students with a documented disability/sought accommodation in accordance with ADA Section 504 enrolled in fall term who persist (reenroll) in the following spring term.

Measurement: Banner cohort flag for disability and fall enrollment data as of census date matched against spring enrollment data

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	75.0	71.5	70.7	73.1	71.6	69.7				
HAW	74.6	71.7	63.8	77.0	71.4	75.2				
HON	68.4	73.0	68.0	67.8	72.0	69.0				
KAP	85.3	76.1	74.7	73.3	78.8	59.3				
KAU	79.0	71.4	87.0	79.7	69.1	71.4				
LEE	61.4	51.3	42.4	74.1	56.5	71.4				
MAU	72.5	68.4	75.3	72.7	72.3	70.6				
WIN	81.2	73.7	73.5	52.6	55.6	72.7				

## A. Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success

### A.2. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the number of students participating in service learning and other community based learning activities

Definition: CCSSE Question "Participated in a community based project as part of a regular course." (Same measure used in UH System *Measuring our Progress*)

Measurement: Percent students responding "Very Often," "Often," or "Sometimes"  
The seven community colleges participate in CCSSE in the even numbered years.  
Individual colleges may participate in odd numbered years.

	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
UHCC	35	N/a	31		
HAW	50	53	41		
HON	27	N/a	32		
KAP	36	31	33		
KAU	38	20	31		
LEE	26	N/a	18		
MAU	41	34	36		
WIN	31	20	24		

## **A. Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success**

### **A.3. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Increase the number of regular term students who pay non-resident tuition **by 280 by 2010**

Definition: Student enrolled in the credit program of a community college

Measurement: Regular term students paying non-resident tuition –  
MAPS Fall Enrollment Table 3

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	867	909	990	1110	1290	1297				1147
HAW	49	48	65	78	93	107				
HON	97	83	81	112	115	108				
KAP	473	491	581	614	718	731				
KAU	26	23	26	35	43	31				
LEE	70	99	72	102	120	112				
MAU	123	124	127	137	157	159				
WIN	29	41	38	32	44	52				

## A. Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success

### A.4. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase rate of graduation or continued enrollment of degree seeking students **to** 45% by 2010

#### Definition:

Graduation rates represent the proportion of students in a given cohort who started at a UH community college and who were subsequently awarded a degree or certificate at that institution. Continued enrollment is enrollment in the same institution.

Measurement: IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) figures for graduation plus students from the cohort enrolled at the same institution as reported in the most recent spring GRS survey for the year listed in the table.

IPEDS measures the first time, full-time, degree-seeking students at each institution and counts whether or not they have been graduated within 150% of the time toward completion at full-time enrollment.

	2001 (97 Cohort)	2002 (98 Cohort)	2003 (99 Cohort)	2004 (00 Cohort)	2005 (01 Cohort)	2006 (02 cohort)	2007 (03 cohort)	2008 (04 cohort)	2009 (05 cohort)	2010 (06 cohort)
UHCC	34	33	34	34	34	35	35			
HAW	38	31	34	34	34	35	36			
HON	31	37	31	28	30	32	32			
KAP	34	34	35	39	34	37	37			
KAU	37	27	32	29	29	37	36			
LEE	34	33	35	39	39	37	36			
MAU	33	32	34	25	31	33	33			
WIN	26	24	32	38	27	29	29			

## **A. Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success**

### **A.5. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Increase number of students who participate annually in inter-cultural and multi-cultural programs

Definition: CCSSE Question "Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity other than yours." (same question used in UH System *Measuring Our Progress*)

Measurement: Percentage students responding, "Very Often," "Often," or "Sometimes."  
All seven colleges participated in CCSSE in the even numbered years. Individual colleges may participate in the odd numbered years.

	2002	2004	2005	2006	2008	2010
UHCC	84	N/a	N/a	82		
HAW	85	85	N/a	82		
HON	81	N/a	N/a	78		
KAP	83	81	N/a	79		
KAU	78	76	N/a	81		
LEE	86	N/a	82	80		
MAU	84	79	N/a	85		
WIN	90	76	N/a	87		

## A. Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success

### A.6. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the number of student registrations in distance education courses and programs **to 7,500** by Fall 2010

Definition: Basic reference - Executive Policy E5.204. Distance delivery includes off-site delivery, in which faculty drive or fly or are hired to teach at a site other than their home campus, and technology-assisted delivery. The breakdown by mode of technology-assisted delivery includes: ITV (2-way interactive video, which combines data for HITS and Skybridge), online (which includes Internet and WWW), cable television, and mixed modes, in which two or more modes, or new modes of technology such as DVD are used.

Count registrations in community college delivered courses

Measurement: IRO Frozen Census Data

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	5306	5722	not available <sup>1</sup>			3897				7,500
HAW	1014	1087				1186				
HON	2166	1653				811				
KAP	555	667				451				
KAU	114	114				19				
LEE	906	1226				1280				
MAU	509	1016				n/a <sup>2</sup>				
WIN	42	59				150				

<sup>1</sup> Banner source data does not accurately or consistently reflect DE courses

<sup>2</sup> Banner data incorrect for Maui CC

## A. Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success

### A.7. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the student course completion rates

Definition: Student Registrations at the end of the semester excluding those with "W" Grades divided by total registrations.

Measurement: UH IRO end of semester and frozen end of semester data

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	91.5	n/a	92.4	91.5	91.0	92.4				
HAW	94.6		95.6	95.0	93.8	93.6				
HON	94.4		94.3	94.0	93.6	94.2				
KAP	88.8		89.0	88.8	88.0	87.6				
KAU	90.2		93.3	94.0	93.4	92.6				
LEE	89.7		92.1	88.6	88.8	89.2				
MAU	95.4		95.6	95.8	94.8	93.4				
WIN	91.9		92.3	92.0	92.4	91.6				

## A. Promote Learning and Teaching for Student Success

### A8. Key Performance Outcomes:

Maintain or increase the student reported rate of satisfaction with their educational experience

Definition: Percentage of students who on the Graduate and Leavers Survey respond, *Excellent* or *Good* on the overall quality of the academic experience. The UH system changed the question in 02-03. Previously students were asked how well did the education or training satisfy their personal interest with ratings of *Very Satisfied* or *Satisfied*.

Percentage of students who on CCSSE respond *Good* or *Excellent*

Survey of students who were Graduated or left following Academic Year:

	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	2010
UHCC	94	93	86	86	86	94				
HAW	94	91	89	89	89	95				
HON	92	95	88	88	88	94				
KAP	97	96	87	87	87	91				
KAU	92	92	91	93	93	100				
LEE	92	92	84	84	84	88				
MAU	78	94	100	100	100	100				
WIN	95	100	100	100	100	97				

CCSSE survey Spring of:

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	n/a	85	n/a	n/a	n/a	85	n/a			
HAW		82	n/a	87		82				
HON		83	n/a	n/a		88				
KAP		82	n/a	87		84				
KAU		85	n/a	87		82				
LEE		86	n/a	n/a		84				
MAU		89	n/a	89		85				
WIN		89	n/a	87		89				

## GOAL B: FUNCTION AS A SEAMLESS STATE SYSTEM

### B.1. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the Community College “going rate” of Hawaii public high school graduates **to** 40% by Fall 2010

Definition: going rate: Public Hawaii high school graduates who enroll in a community college in the fall semester immediately following graduation from high school divided by the total number of public Hawaii high school graduates.

#### Source:

MAPS High School Background First-time Students University of Hawaii, Fall, Table 4 Individual college percentages represent the college’s market share of the full UHCC going rate.

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	22.6	22.4	23.1	22.7	23.1	23.9				
HAW	1.9	2.1	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.0				
HON	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.7	3.8	3.5				
KAP	5.5	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.8	5.3				
KAU	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.7				
LEE	6.8	6.6	7.2	7.0	6.8	6.8				
MAU	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.2				
WIN	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6				

## GOAL B: FUNCTION AS A SEAMLESS STATE SYSTEM

### B.2. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the **annual number** of students from the Community Colleges who transfer to a UH baccalaureate granting college **to 2,500** by 2010

Definition: An undergraduate enrolling at a UH baccalaureate granting college, having previously attend a UH community college or an undergraduate re-enrolling at a baccalaureate granting college after an absence of one or more fall or spring semesters, having attended a UH community college. (From MAPS Contents/Definitions)

#### Measurement:

MAPS Transfer Patterns of Undergraduate students, University of Hawaii, Fall. This MAPS report is under revision by UH system office to include a re-description of the definition of a transfer student. The following data, from the National Student Clearinghouse. As some students have attended multiple colleges, the first college attended was selected for this analysis.

Last Term Attended	Total Number of Records	Total Transfers		Transfers to UH 4-Year Institutions		Transfers to a UH Community College		Transfers to Hawaii Private Institutions		Transfers to Out of State Institutions	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fall 2002	5,975	2,324	38.9	615	26.5	1,109	47.7	86	3.7	514	22.1
Fall 2003	6,998	2,557	36.5	747	29.2	1,267	49.6	83	3.2	460	18.0
Fall 2004	7,366	2,697	36.6	827	30.7	1,330	49.3	70	2.6	470	17.4
Fall 2005	8,023	2,325	29.0	755	32.5	1,275	54.8	35	1.5	260	11.2
Spring 2003	7,507	2,774	37.0	869	31.3	1,077	38.8	80	2.9	748	27.0
Spring 2004	7,953	3,039	38.2	1,025	33.7	1,256	41.3	77	2.5	681	22.4
Spring 2005	8,919	3,075	34.5	1,111	36.1	1,277	41.5	77	2.5	610	19.8
Summer 2002	2,382	1,514	63.6	778	51.4	321	21.2	12	0.8	403	26.6
Summer 2003	2,253	1,461	64.8	761	52.1	329	22.5	13	0.9	358	24.5
Summer 2004	2,542	1,587	62.4	800	50.4	381	24.0	11	0.7	395	24.9
Summer 2005	2,817	1,660	58.9	818	49.3	452	27.2	9	0.5	381	23.0

## GOAL B: FUNCTION AS A SEAMLESS STATE SYSTEM

### B.3. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the **annual number** of Early Admission and "Running Start" students **to** 1,500 by Fall 2010

#### Definition:

Running Start --Partnership between the Department of Education and the University of Hawaii System which allow public high school juniors and seniors to attend college classes while earning both high school and college credits. \*Running Start was a pilot program in Fall 2001 and available only at Honolulu Community College.

Special Early Admission designation used to provide educational opportunity for academically superior and accomplished youth under 18 years of age who may be continuing high school students as well as certain youth who have left high school without graduating (BOR policy 5-21)

Measurement: Students major must be classified as Running Start and/or Early Admit. Annual unduplicated total.

AY	01-02	02 -3	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-90	09-10	2010
UHCC	235	522	937	1106	984	825				
HAW	10	18	75	159	143	165				
HON	23	84	262	238	260	116				
KAP	14	68	99	119	99	91				
KAU	31	51	43	66	83	66				
LEE	36	135	187	175	112	131				
MAU	80	132	218	281	230	236				
WIN	41	34	53	68	57	20				

## GOAL B: FUNCTION AS A SEAMLESS STATE SYSTEM

### B.4. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the **annual number** of Community College students who take courses from more than one University campus during the same semester **to 2,000** by 2010.

Definition: Students enrolled for credit classes at any community college and enrolled at any other University of Hawaii campuses.

Measurement:

Unduplicated Headcount Report computer printout 2001-2002. Beginning Fall 2003 ODS frozen census.

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	1359	1638	1834	2116	2167	2338				

**GOAL B: FUNCTION AS A SEAMLESS STATE SYSTEM**

**B.5. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Increase the percentage of Community College students residing in UH dormitories **to** 10% by 2010

Definition: Student enrolled in a community college and residing in a UH dormitory or affiliated housing divided by the fall headcount

Measurement: Students residing in a UH dormitory or affiliated housing divided by the number of community college students

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC Percent	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%				
UHCC Residing	104	148	148	148	44	44				
Fall Headcount	24,809	25,593	26,438	25,898	25,233	25,260				

## C. PROMOTE WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

### C.1. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the employability of UHCC graduates **to** 97% by 2010

Definition: CTE students who on graduate and leavers survey indicate that they are not employed and are seeking employment divided by the total number responses.

Measurement: Students who were graduated or left. Surveyed in following academic year. (100% minus "not employed-seeking" percent)

#### Outcomes in Percent

	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	2010
UHCC	89	93	90	94	92	93				
HAW	88	93	100	93	88	100				
HON	92	97	82	93	100	100				
KAP	85	86	88	96	94	93				
KAU	93	97	87	100	80	100				
LEE	94	97	92	92	96	96				
MAU	91	94	89	92	100	100				
WIN	93	87	93	100	86	86				

## C. PROMOTE WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

### C.2. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the annual Percentage-of-fit in occupational/technical programs to make more efficient use of facilities and faculty

Definition: At Fall census date, the percentage of seats filled compared to maximum enrollment.

Measurement: Number of seats filled (census enrollment field) for all occupational/technical programs divided by the number of seats available (maximum enrollment size) in all occupational/technical programs. Excludes courses numbered 93 and 99. Uses Perkins crosswalk table for occupational/ technical class designation.

Source: ODS frozen census

Note: Adjusted for concurrent and team-taught classes.

#### Outcomes in Percent

Fall	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	n/a	68.7	74.3	71.7	74.2	73.0				
HAW	n/a	69.8	79.0	77.3	68.0	64.1				
HON	n/a	64.0	71.9	71.8	74.3	74.9				
KAP	n/a	74.4	72.4	69.0	76.4	77.2				
KAU	n/a	59.0	75.5	66.6	69.7	73.7				
LEE	n/a	69.9	75.7	73.7	82.0	77.1				
MAU	n/a	69.8	77.4	72.6	72.9	66.7				
WIN	n/a	59.9	60.3	61.2	60.7	68.6				

## C. PROMOTE WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

### C.3. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase the annual non-credit student registrations **to** 90,000 by 2010

Definition: Student Registrations for the Academic year (fall semester + spring semester + summer term) Non credit numbers are reported as registration counts not unduplicated headcounts

Measurement: MAPS Continuing Education and Community Service Enrollment University of Hawai'i. Windward Enrollments include ETC.

AY	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	2010
UHCC	56,169	50252	50935	41889	42463					90,000
HAW	4639	4483	5546	4833	4588					
HON	9952	10212	9701	9170	8939					
KAP	11627	10340	9880	8205	8540					
KAU	3755	1937	2150	1421	2110					
LEE	10343	8782	6851	5875	5106					
MAU	12067	10786	12227	8681	8985					
WIN	3786	3748	4580	3704	4195					

## C. PROMOTE WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

### C.4. Key Performance Outcomes:

Maintain or increase the student reported rate of satisfaction with their preparation for work.

**Definition:**

Students answering *Well Prepared*, *Moderately Well Prepared*, and *Adequately Prepared* with preparation for work on campus annual Graduate and Leavers' Survey.

**Measurement:** Graduate and Leaver's Survey responses for students who left or were graduated in the previous year.

#### Outcomes in Percent

	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	2010
UHCC	90	91	95	92	95	94				
HAW	85	91	96	91	94	97				
HON	83	91	83	90	91	90				
KAP	99	89	97	97	100	96				
KAU	97	99	97	96	92	100				
LEE	82	78	98	78	96	95				
MAU	90	97	100	99	94	89				
WIN	89	100	94	89	97	96				

**D. DEVELOP OUR HUMAN RESOURCES: RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND RENEWAL**

**D.1. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Reduce the annual credits taught by teaching faculty to an average of 24 credits or equivalent **by July 2005**

Definition:

Measurement:

Needs:

**Departmental Activity & Instructional Workload Measures, University of Hawaii, has been discontinued by system IRO office.**

**--Recommend using workload module in Banner**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
UHCC					
HAW					
HON					
KAP					
KAU					
LEE					
MAU					
WIN					

## **D. DEVELOP OUR HUMAN RESOURCES: RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND RENEWAL**

### **D.2. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Bring faculty and administrative salary compensation up to a level comparable to the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile of public two-year institutions on the NEA and CUPA annual compensation surveys by July 2010

Definition and Measurement: The analysis of UH faculty salaries was done by consultants JBL Associates, Inc. who were contracted by the University of Hawai'i and UHPA.

In the 2001-2002 study, the Community Colleges were compared with four external peer groups: 1) similar institutions selected nationally, 2) a group of West coast institutions, 3) institutions selected by the UH administration, and 4) all institutions identified in the previous three peer groups. In the 2002-2003 study, peer groups representing similar colleges were selected for comparison to the Community Colleges.

In both years, the comparisons are reported in two ways: 1) The average peer-group salary weights the average institutional salary by the number of faculty members so that large institutions count more than small ones. 2) The second measure used is the median, which is the fiftieth percentile. Half the colleges are above and half are below, regardless of the number of faculty members in the college. The same measure is used to identify the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile of the peer institutions.

The peer comparisons are limited to full-time instructional faculty. Others who may have faculty appointments, but do not teach as a primary part of their workload, are not included. The reported salary does not represent any extra compensation or overload responsibilities for which individuals may receive extra compensation.

It is important to note that many community colleges in the peer group do not have academic ranks and call everyone an instructor or "no rank," therefore, the academic rank comparisons for the Community Colleges particularly at the Instructor rank are questionable.

The Executive/Managerial data is based on a list of Community College E/M employees compared against the annual CUPA salary survey. The 2002 data was based on all institutions that participate in the annual CUPA survey whereas the 2003 data is based on public institutions only. The 2002 data includes all E/M employees who were organizationally located in the former Chancellor's Office, whereas the 2003 data excludes some of these employees and data is not available for the remainder of them.

A six year collective bargaining agreement for faculty was approved effective July 1, 2003 and remains in effect until June 30, 2009. As part of that contract, the following salary adjustments were agreed upon: Effective July 1, 2003, base salaries increased by 1%; effective July 1, 2004, base salaries increased by 3%; effective July 1, 2005, base salaries will increase by 2%; effective July 1, 2006, base salaries will increase by 5%; effective July 1, 2007, base salaries will increase by 9%; effective July 1, 2008,

base salaries will increase by 11%. No further studies were done since those mentioned above, however the data below is a reflection of Community College faculty salaries compared to the 2003-2004 AAUP Salary Survey Report.

Effective July 1, 2004, some adjustments were made to executive and managerial employees' salaries. If the employee's salary fell below the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of the position's CUPA-HR comparable class, their salary was adjusted to the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile. If their salary fell between the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile and the median salary of the CUPA-HR comparable class, the employee received a 2% salary adjustment. The data below is a reflection of the Community Colleges executive/managerial salaries effective 1/7/05, which includes the adjustments mentioned above.

The 2004-2005 faculty salary data has been updated as of October 2005 and is compared to data from the 2004-2005 AAUP Salary Survey Report. The Executive/Managerial information reflects data currently in the system as of 08/30/05. Pay adjustments relating to performance are expected for some employees and are pending approval of the Board; these are anticipated to be effective retroactive to 07/01/05, however, are not currently reflected in the data. One of the factors that affected the executive/managerial data during this past year is that a couple of campuses, depending on their budget sizes, were placed on a different CUPA-HR survey table from the previous year, thereby affecting their comparable salaries. In addition, due to the recent reorganization of the Vice President for Community Colleges Office, the CUPA-HR survey table was again affected for those respective employees in that office.

The 2005-2006 faculty salary data has been updated as of October 2006 and the 2006-2007 faculty salary data has been updated as of September 2007, and is compared to data from the respective AAUP Salary Survey Report. In 2006, the classification and compensation policies governing executive/managerial employees were revised. The executive and managerial groups were combined under one category called executive employees. In addition, a new executive salary schedule was developed. The positions were grouped based on comparable scope, level, breadth, complexity of work and other classification criteria. The CUPA-HR comparable class or derived value was identified for each position. Within each grouping or "grade," the positions were sorted into "range widths" based on their CUPA-HR medians. The weighted average of all of the positions in a particular range width was determined using CUPA-HR medians, and this figure became the "control point" for that particular grade and range width. The control points were adjusted to achieve a 15-20% difference between range widths. Due to these changes in the executive compensation plan, it is recommended that the goals for administrative salaries be adjusted accordingly.

<b>2001-2002</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
UHCC	56,356	51,072	46,405	39,655
Carnegie Peers	61,998	60,634	52,132	53,088
Region Peers	-	-	-	67,213
Pre-selected Peers	70,593	57,844	51,416	59,781
All Peers	64,323	56,716	49,446	62,011
UHCC Avg salary	56,356	51,072	46,405	39,655
50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	66,291	56,125	46,480	54,368
80 <sup>th</sup> percentile	72,445	64,646	51,572	67,069

<b>2002-2003</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
UHCC	62,097	54,836	49,451	42,567
Peer Group Avg Salary	65,724	58,799	50,902	64,144
UHCC Avg salary	62,097	54,836	49,451	42,567
50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	68,569	56,927	48,969	55,057
80 <sup>th</sup> percentile	74,817	66,289	54,949	70,171

<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
UHCC	67,954	59,137	52,602	45,938
AAUP Avg salary	64,439	51,859	45,239	39,062
AAUP Avg salary By region	62,001	53,373	48,732	42,020

<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
UHCC	68,632	60,275	53,498	46,874
AAUP Avg salary	66,405	53,889	47,652	40,564
AAUP Avg salary By region	65,864	57,880	50,458	43,665

<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
UHCC	71,296	62,639	56,009	49,322
AAUP Avg salary	66,011	53,405	47,116	40,266
AAUP Avg salary By region	68,597	59,839	52,275	44,303

<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
UHCC	74,682	64,827	60,678	53,151
AAUP Avg salary	68,424	55,429	48,923	41,915
AAUP Avg salary By region	66,931	59,074	53,185	46,448

## COMMUNITY COLLEGES EXECUTIVE/MANAGERIAL SALARY COMPARISON WITH CUPA INDEX

Data as of 07/01/02:

There were a total of 15 executive employees.

- 5 employees were compensated less than the 20<sup>th</sup>%
- 6 employees were compensated less than the 40<sup>th</sup>%
- 1 employee was compensated less than the 60<sup>th</sup>%
- 2 employees were compensated less than the 80<sup>th</sup>%
- CUPA data was not available for 1 employee

There were a total of 50 managerial employees.

- 13 employees were compensated less than the 20<sup>th</sup>%
- 15 employees were compensated less than the 40<sup>th</sup>%
- 10 employees were compensated less than the 60<sup>th</sup>%
- 7 employees were compensated less than the 80<sup>th</sup>%
- 3 employees were compensated more than the 80<sup>th</sup>%
- CUPA data was not available for 2 employees

Data as of 10/01/03:

There were a total of 9 executive employees.

- 4 employees were compensated less than the 20<sup>th</sup>%
- 3 employees were compensated less than the 40<sup>th</sup>%
- 1 employee was compensated less than the 60<sup>th</sup>%
- 1 employee was compensated more than the 80<sup>th</sup>%

There were a total of 48 managerial employees.

- 9 employees were compensated less than or at the 20<sup>th</sup>%
- 14 employees were compensated less than the 40<sup>th</sup>%
- 11 employees were compensated less than or at the 60<sup>th</sup>%
- 6 employees were compensated less than or at the 80<sup>th</sup>%
- CUPA data was not available for 8 employees

Data as of 01/07/05:

There were a total of 16 executive employees.

- 8 employees were compensated less than the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile
- 2 employees were compensated less than the median
- 5 employees were compensated less than the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile
- 1 employee was compensated less than the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile

There were a total of 34 managerial employees.

- 14 employees were compensated less than the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile
- 4 employees were compensated less than the median

8 employees were compensated less than the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile  
3 employees were compensated less than the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile  
5 employees were compensated more than the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile

Data as of 08/30/05:

There were a total of 19 executive employees.

6 employees were compensated less than or at the 20<sup>th</sup>%  
4 employees were compensated less than the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile  
2 employees were compensated less than the median  
1 employee was compensated less than the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile  
4 employees were compensated less than the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile  
2 employees were compensated more than the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile

There were a total of 40 managerial employees.

7 employees were compensated less than or at the 20<sup>th</sup>% percentile  
7 employees were compensated less than the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile  
5 employees were compensated less than the median  
6 employees were compensated less than the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile  
10 employees were compensated less than the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile  
5 employees were compensated more than the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile

## D. DEVELOP OUR HUMAN RESOURCES: RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND RENEWAL

### D.3. Key Performance Outcomes:

Increase opportunities for professional and staff development by budgeting 3% of personnel costs for this purpose **by 2010**

Definition: Sabbatical Leave expense (lecturer replacement cost for faculty on leave for professional development only; does not include curriculum development, discipline and campus management). Assigned Time expenses for Staff development (lecturer replacement cost for faculty on assigned time for personal development only; does not include curriculum development, discipline and campus management activities). Other expenses for Staff development (travel, conference fees, per diem, etc; does not include these costs for attending meetings).

Measurement: Actual professional and staff development expenditures (both appropriated and non-appropriated funds), as a percentage of actual General Fund and Tuition and Fees Special Funds (TFSF) personnel costs. All expenditure data provided by campuses. Personnel costs compiled by CCBPO.

#### Outcomes in Percent

FY	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Total UHCC <sup>1</sup>	2.26	1.53	1.46	1.77	1.82	1.66				
HAW	2.06	0.96	1.85	3.22	2.36	1.76				
HON	2.54	1.54	1.03	1.07	0.90	1.08				
KAP	2.94	2.13	1.31	1.84	2.80	2.71				
KAU	1.25	1.42	0.39	1.09	3.05	2.31				
LEE	1.14	0.96	0.97	1.34	1.27	1.18				
MAU	2.10	1.36	1.91	2.90	2.07	1.43				
WIN	1.87	1.21	2.36	1.08	0.43	0.93				
CCSWS	6.44	3.64	5.30	2.72	0.32	0.09				

**E. DEVELOP AN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT, AND SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT STUDENT LEARNING**

**E.1. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Increase the facilities repair and maintenance annual expenditures **to** \$7 Million by 2010

Definition: Facilities repair and maintenance (R&M) funding is measured by CIP R&M appropriations and general fund Operating R&M funding budgeted under CCSWS (UOH 906). CIP R&M appropriations vary considerably from year to year depending upon state economic conditions and priorities established by the Legislature. Under CIP policies, general obligation funded projects are allowed additional time for expenditure and encumbrance of funds (one year past the end of the fiscal biennium). The CIP and operating R&M funding is shared among all Community Colleges, with joint decisions made on campus distributions, the retention of reserves, coverage for emergency projects, etc. Therefore CIP R&M appropriations will be reported at the consolidated Community college level as appropriated by the Legislature and allocated by the University CIP Office. The CIP appropriations, rather than actual expenditures, reflects CIP R&M funding more closely associated with each fiscal year. General Fund operating budget R&M allocations under CCSWS (UOH 906) are added to the CIP R&M appropriation.

Measurement: CCBPO compiled data from CIP R&M appropriation and operating fund allocations under CCSWS (UOH 906)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total UHCC	\$6,459,292	\$8,689,085	\$11,042,085	\$2,217,085	\$9,572,085

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Total UHCC	\$2,373,085	\$14,288,085			

## **E. DEVELOP AN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT, AND SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT STUDENT LEARNING**

### **E.2. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Increase the annual expenditures for equipment acquisition and replacement (including IT and distance learning equipment requirements) **to \$7 million by 2010**

Definition: Equipment is defined as tangible non-expendable personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. Certain items that are less than \$5,000 (such as theft sensitive items) are also inventoried and classified as equipment on expenditure reports. Appropriated funds are reported as reflected on the official expenditure report, Status of allotment (FHDR059A)

Measurement: Total of actual E&E as defined by the financial accounting system for equipment (both appropriated and non-appropriated funds). Foundation and other funding sources reported by the campuses. <sup>1</sup> CCSWS includes Banner SIS expenditures: FY2003- \$2,411,550 and FY2004- \$1,049,899 <sup>2</sup> Prior FY2005 VocEd in CCSWS

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total UHCC	\$3,723,924	\$3,587,746	\$5,372,339	\$4,179,878	\$3,531,027
HAW	194,123	249,329	277,531	208,974	258,897
HON	961,317	814,039	414,665	715,732	690,351
KAP	633,612	753,752	464,133	285,188	385,116
KAU	151,233	107,014	94,714	146,337	215,408
LEE	394,657	341,186	421,052	299,267	325,165
MAU	447,509	335,081	384,732	417,626	1,297,855
WIN	209,429	335,643	250,800	376,989	142,519
CCSWS <sup>1</sup>	732,044	651,702	3,064,712	1,729,765	215,716

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Total UHCC	\$2,882,548				
HAW	227,955				
HON	699,509				
KAP	704,094				
KAU	136,863				
LEE	313,555				
MAU	500,276				
WIN	229,489				
CCSWS <sup>1</sup>	70,807				

## **E. DEVELOP AN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT, AND SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT STUDENT LEARNING**

### **E.3. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Increase Community Colleges student housing units **to** 1,000 by 2010

**Definition:**

Student housing unit is defined as a bed space.

**Measurement:**

Community College unit in a facility for which the community college is responsible for the maintenance and operation.

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UHCC	119	119	119	48	44	44				
HAW	0	0	0	0	0	0				
HON	71	71	71	0	0	0				
KAP	0	0	0	0	0	0				
KAU	0	0	0	0	0	0				
LEE	0	0	0	0	0	0				
MAU	48	48	48	48	44	44				
WIN	0	0	0	0	0	0				

## **E. DEVELOP AN EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT, AND SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT STUDENT LEARNING**

### **E.4. Key Performance Outcomes:**

Increase the UHCC marketing and public information budget to \$1 Million by 2010

Definition: Marketing and public information expenditures include costs associated with direct advertising and marketing of the Community Colleges or the University system but does not include counseling (high school recruiting), costs for fund raising (UH Foundation personnel), or registration materials (college catalogs). Personnel with significant marketing/public information responsibilities in their position descriptions, as well as other costs (travel, advertising contracts, printing, etc) are reported.

Measurement: Costs as reported by campuses.

	2001 <sup>/1</sup>	2002 <sup>/1</sup>	2003 <sup>/1&amp;2</sup>	2004 <sup>/3</sup>	2005 <sup>/3</sup>	2006	2007	2010
Total UHCC	\$806,503	\$803,404	\$1,209,690	\$761,238	\$736,856	880,293		
HAW	50,180	50,508	71,221	41,477	38,600	57,797		
HON	79,491	168,737	205,800	134,234	79,336	94,800		
KAP	124,748	232,808	337,077	156,314	156,592	182,998		
KAU	36,828	55,586	90,677	57,605	64,938	43,875		
LEE	19,234	23,321	95,524	150,059	143,779	227,102		
MAU	197,718	177,678	182,209	43,218	130,649	134,903		
WIN	34,898	41,943	81,537	87,621	122,962	138,818		
CCSWS <sup>/4</sup>	263,406	52,823	145,645	90,710	0	0		

<sup>/1</sup> Includes CC assessment of 100,000 (FY01), 125,000 (FY02 & FY03)

<sup>/2</sup> Includes UH System marketing Assessment of 402,293 (FY03)

<sup>/3</sup> No central assessments were made for marketing in FY04 and FY05

<sup>/4</sup> Expenditures for centralized marketing no longer part of CCSWS in FY05