



UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII SYSTEM

Legislative Testimony

Testimony presented before the
House Committee on Finance
March 30, 2011 at 12:00 p.m.

By Linda K. Johnsrud
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost, University of Hawai'i

SB 244, HD1: RELATING TO THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee, and members of the House Committee on Finance:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on SB 244, HD1 that amends provisions in HRS 304A-2001 that address University of Hawai'i benchmarks, and also requires the Board of Regents to review sections of the state planning act (HRS 226-55 and HRS 226-107) to recommend revised priority guidelines and develop a functional plan.

The University of Hawai'i (UH) supported SB 244 in its original form because it revised and updated statutory language in HRS 304A-2001 and provided a clear system of accountability for public higher education in Hawai'i that would rely on a periodic review of state needs and subsequent revision of the University's strategic and performance targets. This reflects the methodology used to create the University's existing *Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures* that addresses goals, outcomes, and performance indicators to meet current state needs. Those measures were created after the University had conducted an in-depth *Second Decade* study of the higher education needs of the state. Planning is an important function for higher education and is a dynamic process that engages stakeholders and reviews educational attainment, workforce needs, geographic considerations, and access issues to be addressed by the University.

We are concerned about language in this amended bill that would seemingly require the University to develop a "functional" plan in addition to our current planning efforts. We are committed, as noted above, to a clear system of accountability and biennial reports to the legislature on our progress. It is not clear, however, how a "functional" plan would add value from either the University's or the legislature's perspective. Also, although we would be willing to revise the priority guidelines included in HRS 226-107 related to higher education, we must caution this committee to note that the language of HRS 226 refers broadly to education and includes early childhood, K-12, and special education within the overall context of state planning--not only higher education. We respectfully suggest that a revision of the state planning act will require a more comprehensive approach.

For these reasons, we cannot support SB 244, HD1 as written, although we would welcome the updates and revisions proposed by the earlier version, SB 244.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.