Principles, Prerequisites, Criteria, and Instructions
for the UHM Prioritization Process
and Review of the UHM Strategic Plan
February 2009

Background and Overview

The University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UHM) is a land-sea-space grant research institution with a mission of teaching, scholarship and service. The vision directs the institution to achieve excellence and pre-eminence in a select number of areas of scholarship while delivering world-class undergraduate and graduate degree programs and making significant contributions to the economic vitality of the state. The university must use existing resources in the most efficient manner possible and needs a prioritization roadmap for reallocation and investment over time.

The Process Committee, appointed by the Chancellor based upon recommendations from the Mānoa Faculty Senate and the Mānoa Executive Team, was charged with developing a process by which to determine campus-wide priorities. The charge to the committee and background on its work can be found at http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/index.html. The process recommended by the committee and described here is not designed to be used in isolation or in place of other review processes in the university, such as academic program review, the academic planning process, or accreditation reviews by external agencies. While the finding and data used in these other review activities may be considered during prioritization, the intent of the prioritization process is to make strategic decisions about investments for the future in order to build a strong and sustainable university. The prioritization process described here is viewed as a periodic process that occurs throughout the institution and considers all academic and non-academic components of the campus. Such prioritization would occur as deemed necessary by the Chancellor and results would be used to inform future strategic planning. Given our current context, the Committee recommends implementation of the process described here during the Spring 2009 semester.

Feedback Requested

This proposed prioritization framework along with its overarching principles, prerequisites, criteria, and instructions was widely disseminated throughout the campus and to the public through the web site and by discussions with relevant stakeholders, including the Vice Chancellors, the WASC Committee, the Mānoa Faculty Senate (MFS) and the Mānoa Executive Team (MET). A campus-wide email was distributed directing all members of the campus community to the online feedback site (http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/BudgetPlanningUpdate.pdf). Comments, suggestions, and feedback received via the online form, as well as through campus administrators and Process Committee members, were used to further refine this document. The following questions guided the feedback process.

- Do the principles/prerequisites/criteria appear to be fair and reasonable? If not, please explain your perspective.
- Are there specific principles/prerequisites/criteria that you would be unwilling to live with?
- Are there other principles/prerequisites/criteria that you believe are essential and should be added?
- Is the process for implementation understandable and does it seem reasonable?
- Are there other constructive comments you would like to make?

Following implementation of the process, we suggest the Chancellor appoint a committee to conduct a review and determine areas for improvement in future implementations of such a task.

Guiding Documents

In developing the UHM Prioritization Process, the Process Committee has been cognizant of two specific documents that guided our work. The *Mānoa Strategic Plan* and the *Mānoa Institutional Proposal* developed for *WASC*. Two particular elements from these documents are woven throughout this proposal

UHM Vision (from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Strategic Plan: Defining Our Destiny, 2002)
http://manoa.hawaii.edu/vision/
Mānoa is a premier research institution whose scholars are leaders in their disciplines and whose students are prepared for leadership roles in society. Mānoa strives for excellence in teaching, research, and public service. Mānoa is an innovative institution, comfortable with change. Mānoa celebrates its diversity and uniqueness as a

Hawaiian place of learning. We build on our strengths including our unparalleled natural environment and tradition of outstanding Asia-Pacific scholarship.

WASC Institutional Proposal Themes
http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/proposal/
Theme 1: Building a Mānoa Community in Support of Student Success
Theme 2: Campus Renewal to Support the Mānoa Experience
Theme 3: Reform Campus Governance to Promote Communication and Student Success.

The Chancellor's priorities articulated for the Mānoa campus
http://manoa.hawaii.edu/chancellor/pdf/steps_to_greatness.pdf
- *A destination of choice for great students, faculty and staff, the citizens of Hawaiʻi and beyond.*
- *A leading, global research university that meets society's needs around the world.*
- *A respectful, inclusive community that welcomes and nurtures diversity.*

In addition, the *University of Hawaiʻi System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015* provides guidance on overarching elements and can be viewed at *http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/uhplan/SOPM_web.html*

Principles, Prerequisites, and Criteria
As part of the prioritization process, the committee developed several overarching principles and prerequisites and a set of core criteria as described here:

Overarching Principles
- Ensure transparency and openness at all stages of the process.
- Ensure adequate feedback loops in the process and that feedback actually occurs.
- Build for flexibility, responsiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.
- Strategic cuts are preferable to across-the-board cuts.
- Eliminate duplication.
- All programs and units, without exception, will be examined objectively.

Prerequisites
- Ensure that the core needs of students are met.
- Preserve the health and safety of all members of the campus community.
- Continue facilities repair, maintenance, and investments in cost-saving initiatives.
- Enhance the integrity and quality of academic programs, research infrastructure and capacity in areas highly aligned to the UHM vision.
- Enhance programs that serve the current and future needs of the state and/or nation.

Criteria
- Centrality and Alignment
- Quality/Integrity
- Critical Mass
- External Demand
- Internal Demand
- Costs/Revenue Generation (Productivity)
- Specialized Niche/Competitive Advantage

Data Sources

It is not the intent of this prioritization process to ask programs or administrative units to gather additional data. Rather, the goal is to have data considered during regular program reviews, academic planning and accreditation processes, and the recommendations and findings from such reviews, be used as integral parts in the prioritization process. These regular review processes, in combination with accessible data at the system, university, college, or administrative unit level, should inform the ratings applied to the rubrics described here. If institutional data are incomplete or outdated, it is acceptable to use other data, but be prepared to identify the source to your Dean/Director. In addition to findings from program reviews, academic plans, and accreditation results, data accessible through the campus systems (OHR, FMIS, STAR, Banner, etc.) can be used.

Some data are available on the Institutional Research Office (IRO) website **http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/** which includes a link to the IRO Dynamic Reporting module. The IRO site also provides the MAPS (Management and Planning Support) reports **http://www.iro.hawaii.edu/maps/mstitles.asp**. These include:

- Applications processed (aggregate for UHM, 2003-2007)
- Course registration report (aggregate for UHM 1996-2008)
- Degrees and certificates earned (Table 3 is sorted by department, 1985-2007)
- Distribution of grades, credits earned ratios, and course completion ratios (aggregate by school 1996-2007)
- Fall enrollment report/spring enrollment report (distribution of majors) by department (1996-2007)
- Summer enrollment report (discontinued in 2000)
- Graduation and persistence rates by campus (1987-1995)
- Headcount enrollment by major (Table 2 by department 1986-2007)
- Peer and benchmark comparison groups by campus (2006)
- Professional/clerical ratio report by department (1997-2008)

Some data are available from the Mānoa Institutional Research Office at **http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/mir/**. These data are continually being updated and enhanced and can be reviewed and used to inform decisions. **Highlighted information was available on February 1, 2009.** Other data are being added continuously. Questions regarding these data or requests for additional specific information can be directed to the Mānoa Institutional Research Office at the above website.

Enrollments
Historical enrollments
Headcount (1996-2006)
FTE (1996-2006)
Retention (2003-2006)
2004 Cohort (2004 by program data)
Attrition by Department
Majors Headcount (1995-2005 dept. data)
Top 10 majors (Fall 2006)
Distribution of Majors (Fall 2007)
High School going rates (2002-2006)
Ethnicity (Fall 2006)
Hawaiian students (Fall 2007)
Class size by College/Department

Fiscal/Financial
Tuition and fees (1999-2007)
Revenue by source (college and department)
Expenditure by function (college and department)
Grants by college/ department
Financial aid/scholarships (2002-2006)
Endowment (1998-2007 FY)
Funds distributed (2001-2006 FY)
Expenditures by College and per SSH
Staffing trends

Admissions (Not Disaggregated)
SAT/GRE scores (SAT 1997-2007)
Freshmen admissions (2002-2006)
Transfers (2002-2006)
Graduate admissions (2002-2006)
Top 10 states/countries (Fall 2007)
Historical rates (2003-2007)
Peer comparison rates

Academic Performance
Graduation rates (2002-2006)
GPA per attrition (2003-2006)
SATs of first time freshmen versus transfers

Probation counts by academic year (college and department)
Degrees awarded by college/department
Study abroad rates (Fall 2005)
PhD attrition (Spring 2008)

Faculty
Student-faculty ratio (2002-2007)
Ratio by college/ faculty type (2004)
SSH by college/department
Projected rates of faculty retirement (Fall 2007)
Instructional counts and historical data
Salary comparisons (2006)
Teaching load by college/department (historical)
Degree of origin/location PhD
Gender and ethnic breakdown by college/department
Countries of origin
FTE faculty (Fall 2008)

Surveys/National Data
IPEDS (external link)
NSSE (historical) (2007 & 2008)
US News
Student surveys (external link to VCS)

Peers/Global Comparisons
IPEDS (Fall 2006)
Measuring Up (excerpts from 2006 report)
OECD (2004 & 2007)

Resources (all external links)
State census data
State of Hawai'i Workforce Informer:
http://www.hiwi.org/article.asp?ARTICLEID=1770&PAGEID=94&SUBID=128
VCS student surveys
UH consultant reports
WICHE
STAR

The Graduate Division has provided data on the following variables accessible via links provided:
http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/GDContents.pdf

SED – Survey of Earned Doctorates. Distribution of PhDs awarded at Mānoa and Nationally by broad discipline. Data are three year averages. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/SEDSurveyEarnedDegrees.pdf
GF Work – Graduate Faculty Workload, by faculty unit of hire and major unit. Data for both current students and recent graduates. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/GFWork.pdf
Graduate Courses – Number of graduate courses offered last year, enrollment, and SSH, by semester, department and college. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/GraduateCourses.pdf
Grads – Number of graduates this century, by year, degree, field, and college. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/Grads.pdf
Retention Masters - Masters students completing in 5 years or less, more than 5 years, and dropping out, by field and college. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/RetentionMasters.pdf
Retention Doctoral - Doctoral students completing in 10 years or less, more than 10 years, leaving with only a Masters, and dropping out, by field and college. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/RetentionDoctoral.pdf
GAs by Locus of Hire - GA FTE, type of appointment, and sources of funds, by hiring unit and major unit, as of Jan 2009. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/GAsLocusHire.pdf
Fall 08 - Enrollment data for last fall, number; number of new, part-time, foreign, and non-residents; GA FTE and source of funds; number of fellowships and achievement scholarships; number in the program < = 3 years, <=7 years, and > 7 years, by degree, field, department, and college. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/Fall08.pdf
Enroll – Annual enrollments from 2004-5 to present, by degree, field, department, and college.
http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/Enroll.pdf
Applications - Annual data from 2004-5 to 2008-9, number of complete graduate applications received, number accepted, and number of applicants who enrolled, by specialization, degree, field, department, and college. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/Applications.pdf

UH Mānoa budget and expenditure data can be found on the OVCAFO Budget & Finance website: http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newbudget/index.html

Available data are to be used by the units in their discussions and decision-making. Individual colleges and other units may have access to additional data that could be useful in this prioritization exercise. Use your best judgment in determining data sources and accuracy.

It is important to remember that programs and units may be asked by their dean or director to provide supporting data when submitting their prioritization reviews. As part of this prioritization process it is important to gather information on missing data pieces so that we can address these needs in the future. When comparisons are asked for, programs should use data where available and use their best judgment as to which comparison group is most appropriate.

Breadth of the Prioritization Review

All areas of the campus are included in this review, academic and non-academic. This process encompasses academic programs, research programs, student services areas, administrative offices, outreach and extension programs, athletics, executive areas, and all other areas of the UHM campus community. No program or area is exempt. Members of the campus community should keep in mind that this initiative is not simply a response to the current fiscal context, but rather an effort to focus and define our future in preparation for potential investments.

Definitions

The Process Committee developed a set of definitions that are important to consider in conducting the prioritization process. These are listed here:

Land/Sea/Space Grant University: Land-grant colleges (Morrill Act of 1862) focus on a liberal, practical education, with an emphasis on agriculture, the environment, human health and well-being, and communities (**http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land-grant_universities and https://www.nasulgc.org/**). Sea grant colleges (1966 Act) are involved in scientific research and training geared toward conservation, sustainability and the use of marine areas and coasts **(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sea_grant_colleges and http://www.sga.seagrant.org/**). Space grant colleges (1988 Act) focus on aeronautics, space, and related fields and support STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) education, especially at the higher education levels (undergraduate and graduate) but extends from elementary and secondary levels as well (**http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space_grant_colleges, http://www.spacegrant.org/, and http://www.nasa.gov/offices/education/programs/national/spacegrant/home/index.html**).

Statutory or Government Regulation: Programs or services that are based on state or federal law or rules that require the institution to maintain or support particular activities or that are essential in ensuring that the institution is in compliance with statues and regulations. As an example, federal law requires that the institution use e-verify to document that employees meet requirements for working in the United States. A particular program or office would be responsible for ensuring that this occurs.

Peer Institution/Comparison Unit: There are a group of institutions with which UHM typically compares itself (**http://www.hawaii.edu/iro/pbcg**). However, specific programs may have a peer or comparison group which they routinely use in benchmarking activities and it would be appropriate in some cases to use this for the purposes of this exercise.

Administrative Unit: An administrative unit is defined as an entity of the institution designated to manage the resources associated with the programs under its jurisdiction. A department thus is an administrative unit that may manage a number of programs. A college is an administrative unit that may manage several departments, centers, and other offices. A research center is a unit that may manage multiple research programs. An administrative office may be a unit that oversees several programs.

Unit Head: The unit head is the individual responsible for overseeing the management of the administrative unit. At various levels, this could be the Department Chair, the Center Director, the Dean, or the Vice Chancellor.

Program: Programs are not synonymous with departments. For the purposes of this prioritization exercise, "program" is **not** defined in the same way as it is defined under Executive Policy E5.201, http://www.hawaii.edu/apis/ep/e5/e5201.pdf. We view "program" as any subset of activities that requires the use of resources, including personnel, space, faculty time, staff time, funds, etc. Individual programs could include specializations, fields of study, sections, division, certificate programs, majors, minors, areas of concentration, tracks, areas, laboratories or clinics, offices, centers, or other labels. For example, an academic major (degree) with several specializations or tracks might need to consider each specialization or track as a separate "program." If the course requirements are very similar for two strands within a program, for example a B.A. and a B.S. degree with only one or two course requirements that differ, then they may be combined into one "program" called the undergraduate program. Minors and certificates would be separate programs if they require resources. General education courses could be a program as could service courses to other units. One way to identify a research program is whether there are staff employed or devoted to that program or whether there is space assigned. The goal is to disaggregate components in discrete enough ways to permit true analysis and prioritization to occur.

Examples are provided below, but may not be appropriate for all areas. Units should consult with their Dean or Director to identify programs for assessment.

Academic Department XXX has two degree programs (as master's and a doctoral program) with sub-tracks within them and provides service courses to several undergraduate and graduate programs. In addition, a graduate certificate is available, outreach services are provided to the community, a small center focused on international research has been established, a student support center operates to assist graduate students with research and writing, and a journal is published. In consultation with the chair and the dean, the department may determine that it has the following "programs" to prioritize: (1) master's degree track a, (2) master's degree track b, (3) master's degree track c, (4) doctoral track a, (5) doctoral track b, (6) undergraduate service, (7) graduate service, (8) graduate certificate, (9) outreach, (10) research center, (11) student support center, and (12) journal. Doctoral track b is an interdisciplinary program shared with another department. It is determined that it must be reviewed in consultation with that department. The department decides that it will use the Academic/Instructional Program Rubrics to review programs 1-8, the Research Program Rubrics to review program 10, the Student Services Rubrics for program 11, the Outreach/Extension Rubrics for program 9, and the Guide for Administrative and Other Service Functions for program 12.

Student Services Unit YYY manages (1) undergraduate advising, (2) tutoring programs, (3) admissions, (4) off-campus outreach activities, (5) international recruitment, (6) retention initiatives, (7) marketing and publications, and (8) data storage. It is decided in consultations between the directors and coordinators that each of these areas is a program and that programs 1-6 serve primarily students. These are evaluated using the Student Services Rubrics. The remaining programs use the Guide for Administrative and Other Service Functions.

Administrative Unit ZZZ has staff who work on(1) database development and (2) management of the unit's assessment system, (3) maintain the unit's servers, (4) provide web design services, (5) maintain technology in the classrooms, (6) provide faculty training on technology use, (7) provide trouble shooting assistance for faculty and students, (8) maintain the unit inventory, (9) operate a small resource center and (10) provide equipment checkout services available to students. The unit director in consultation with the dean decides to use the Guide for Administrative and Other Service Functions to review all these areas.

Rubrics

The Process Committee drafted a set of rubrics to be applied to programs and administrative units across the university. The rubrics are differentiated for academic programs, research programs, student services programs, and outreach and extension programs. In addition, a set of guiding questions was developed for prioritizing programs in administration and other operations. For programs or units that do not seem to fall neatly into the academic, research, student services, or outreach categories, we recommend use of the guiding questions identified for use in reviewing administrative and other operations.

Each "program" identified in academic, research, student services, and outreach/extension program areas would be rated using the appropriate rubric. Scores would be calculated for each criterion-related rubric (e.g. quality/integrity, critical mass, internal demand, etc.) and reported on the matrix form (found as a part of these instructions). The example here indicates how the score would be calculated. For official submission of program evaluations, an online system will be used.

Example:

In the following example, the rubric for *Academic Programs: Centrality and Alignment* shown has a maximum possible score of 20 (five ratings with the highest rating level of 4 on each). The "program" rates itself as having a direct link to advancing the UHM vision (4), some link to advancing an area in the WASC institutional proposal (3) no connection to areas typical in a land-sea-space grant institution (1), highly linked to efforts to meet statutory requirements (3), and having outstanding success at addressing a high priority in the state (4). The total score for Centrality and Alignment would be 15 (4+3+1+3+4) out of a total possible score of 20, which would translate to .75 or a score of 75.

If a program marks "**Not Applicable" on any of the scales, an asterisk is placed beside the final score** to indicate that a Not Applicable rating may have impacted the overall score for this criterion. Further reviewers would need to take this into account in the prioritization process. The score on each of the seven criterion rubrics would be reported on a matrix report form provided. Each "program" would have a score for each of the seven criteria: (1) Centrality and alignment, (2) Quality/integrity, (3) Critical mass, (4) External demand, (5) Internal demand, (6) Costs/revenue generation (productivity), (7) Specialized niche/competitive advantage. As the process continues, the pattern of scores, rather than a single score, would be reviewed as part of the decision-making process.

Academic Programs: Centrality and Alignment Sample Rubric

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Alignment					
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing the UHM vision (Hawaiian-place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	Can demonstrate some relation to or support of the UHM vision	Limited evidence of link to or support of the UHM vision.	No relation to the UHM vision.		4
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Can demonstrate some link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Limited evidence of a link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	No relation to an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal		3
Land-Sea-Space Grant					
Has a high quality reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution	Has a solid reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution.	Has only a limited reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution.	Has no connection to areas typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution		1
Statute or Regulation					
Is essential in meeting mandates based on statutory or government regulations	Is highly linked to efforts to meet statutory or government regulations	Has some connection to meeting statutory or government regulations	Has no connection to statutory or government regulations		3
State Needs					
Has outstanding success at addressing needs identified as high priority in the state	Addresses needs identified as high priority in the state	Little evidence of addressing needs identified as high priority in the state	Does not address any needs identified as high priority in the state		4

Next we describe the proposed timeline as well as the analysis and application process before presenting forms, rubrics, and guiding questions.

<u>**Timeline for Implementation**</u>

Next is a recommended timeline for implementation. Following the timeline, each of the steps is described in more detail.

Dates	Step	Action
JANUARY 2009		
	Step 1: Program Identification	Reviews are conducted in the units to identify all programs that will be reviewed
FEBRUARY		
1-28	Step 2: First Level Unit Review (Additional program identification as needed)	The lowest level administrative unit (e.g. department) reviews each of its programs using the appropriate rubrics.
MARCH		
1-15	Step 3: Second Level Unit Review and Ranking	Using the lower level unit reviews, the next level (e.g. college) ranks all programs under its purview and provides a matrix of prioritized actions
16-31	Step 4: Vice-Chancellor Level Review and Ranking	The appropriate Vice-Chancellor reviews all prioritization plans from units under their respective area and provides an overall ranking
APRIL		
1-7	Step 5: Refinement of Rankings	The Vice-Chancellors review all rankings together and refine their area's priorities based on feedback received
8-21	Step 6: Chancellor's Advisory Committee Review	The Chancellor's Advisory Committee reviews the plans from the Vice-Chancellor areas
22-30	Step 7: Campus-wide Feedback	Feedback is sought from stakeholder groups and campus constituents
MAY		
1-7	Step 7: Campus-wide Feedback continues	Feedback is sought from stakeholder groups and campus constituents
8-15	Step 8: Chancellor's Decision	Chancellor decides on proposed course of action and initiates consultation with UH System and collective bargaining groups
16-31	Step 8: Continued	Chancellor continues with consultation and initiating implementation actions
JUNE-JULY	Step 9: Implementation Actions	Implementation continues and stakeholders are informed of progress
FALL 2009	**Step 10: Initiation of Strategic Plan Update Process**	**Prioritization Process results are used to initiate a review and update of the strategic plan**

<u>**Process for Implementation**</u>

The following steps outline the process for prioritization as recommended by the committee.

Step 1: Program Identification. Each administrative unit must conduct a review to identify the "programs" within its purview. The determination of the appropriate level of analysis (programs) must occur prior to the prioritization process. Faculty and affected personnel should be consulted to ensure a common understanding of what "programs" will be reviewed. The unit head is responsible for overseeing this component of the process and for reporting the results to the unit head at the next level. The unit head at that level may seek clarification. For example, a department chair would work with faculty and staff to identify the "programs" in the department. The department chair would then report the list of programs to the dean. The dean may ask for clarification if necessary. The Dean would report the list of "programs" to the Vice Chancellor, who may ask for clarification.

Step 2: First Level Unit Review. The lowest level administrative unit (e.g. department) would review their "programs" using the appropriate rubrics. The rubrics ensure a uniform mechanism for review and provide common criteria. A separate rubric set would be completed for each identified program. The ratings on the rubrics would occur online with limited additional text information allowed. Once completed, data from the rubrics would be summarized on a matrix (example included in appendix) for the entire administrative unit (e.g. department) and forwarded to the next level (e.g. dean or director) along with the individual program rating rubrics. All faculty/staff in the administrative unit should be aware of what is being sent forward to the next level. The unit head (e.g. chair) is responsible for overseeing the first level unit review and forwarding the summary matrix and individual program rubrics.

Step 3: Second Level Unit Review and Ranking. The unit head at the next level (e.g. dean/director) would use the "program" rating rubrics from the "program" level and the summary matrix from the lower administrative unit (e.g. department) as the basis for establishing priorities. The unit head at this level (e.g. college) would form an appropriate advisory group to discuss unit-wide priorities. We suggest that representative unit heads from the lower units (e.g. department chairs and/or directors and/or coordinators) and representatives from faculty governance bodies might be involved, but the specific advisory group formed for the prioritization process at this level (e.g. college/school level) would be left to the discretion of the unit head. The advisory group should be made aware of the UH System Outcomes and Performance Measures, the Mānoa Strategic Plan, the Chancellor's priorities, and the WASC Institutional Proposal as well as any strategic plans or priorities articulated for that administrative unit. The advisory group should be cognizant of priorities articulated in those documents during the prioritization process. Where appropriate, the unit head may wish to provide additional data related to specific factors the unit head deems important. The unit head may also request supporting data from lower level units if deemed necessary. The unit head is responsible to inform and keep faculty and staff at lower levels aware of the prioritization outcome and the evaluations being forwarded at each level. If time permits, consultation and discussion with first level stakeholders is recommended.

All "programs" would be prioritized at this administrative unit level (e.g. college) using as a basis the categories described below. A summary of the prioritizations (see form included in these instructions) would be forwarded to the next level of administration with the process continuing until it reaches one of the four Vice Chancellor levels: academic affairs, research, student services, or administration. Thus, in the academic area, departments would rate programs using the rubrics and report their results on a matrix to be forwarded to the college; the college would prioritize using the six categories below and forward the results to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The following categories should be used to delineate the priorities of "programs" under the purview of the administrative unit.

- **New or In Transition – need to re-evaluate later**
- **Target for Growth and Investment**
- **Maintain As Is**
- **Reorganize, Restructure, Merge or Consolidate**
- **Reduce in Size or Scope**
- **Phase Out, Close, or Eliminate**

It is expected that only a few programs would be identified as New or In Transition and relatively few programs would be identified as candidates for Growth and Investment. If an administrative unit (e.g. college/school) identifies any programs for growth and investment, it is expected that at least some programs under that administrative unit would then be identified in the categories of Reorganize/Restructure/Consolidate or Reduce in Size/Scope or Phase Out/Close/Eliminate. Administrative units may not submit results that report all programs in the "Maintain As Is" category.

It may be difficult to differentiate between programs with high potential for achieving desired outcomes and programs with a strong record of delivering desired outcomes. Both may warrant additional investment. Similarly a strong existing program may warrant maintenance if additional investments will likely not expand capacity or level of outcome significantly.

Step 4: Vice Chancellor Level Review and Ranking. The administrative unit level priorities would be forwarded to the appropriate Vice Chancellor levels (academic affairs, research, student services, administration) for review. Each Vice-Chancellor would assemble a suitable advisory group to establish priorities and assess opportunities for efficiencies and strategic growth within their area of responsibility. In doing so, they should take into account the Mānoa Strategic Plan, the Chancellor's priorities, the WASC Institutional Proposal, the UH Strategic Plan and other data at their disposal. Each Vice Chancellor would develop a prioritization proposal using the categories above to forward to the next level. Lower units should be apprised of the recommendations being forwarded. If time permits, we recommend consultation and discussion with the lower administrative units and the Faculty Senate or other governing groups where appropriate.

Step 5: Refinement of Rankings. The four (4) Vice Chancellors along with other representatives as they deem necessary would review the prioritization summaries from their respective administrative units (one from each Vice Chancellor) and refine their prioritization recommendations. During deliberations, interconnections between these administrative units should be taken into account as well as the UH Strategic Plan, the Mānoa Strategic Plan, the Chancellor's priorities, and the WASC Institutional Proposal. At the conclusion of this review, each administrative unit (Vice Chancellor) would provide a summary of priorities and recommendations to the Chancellor. We recommend consultation and discussion with the campus community, including the MET and the UHM Faculty Senate.

Step 6: Chancellor's Advisory Committee Recommendations. The chancellor would appoint an Advisory Committee, including representatives from the MET, the Faculty Senate, and other groups as determined appropriate by the Chancellor. The Advisory Committee may be a newly appointed committee or the chancellor may choose to identify an existing committee with representation inclusive of the relevant groups noted here. The committee would be charged to review the prioritization recommendations from the Vice Chancellors and propose strategies for implementing reallocation of resources or strategic investments as needed. This committee would develop a campus-wide plan for prioritization and allocation of resources. The recommendations emerging from the prioritization process would identify areas of continuing need, areas of academic strength, and emerging opportunities as well as areas for consolidation, reorganization, or elimination. During the final stages of the prioritization process, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee should summarize its recommendations for investment and maintenance in academic areas and compare these with the existing UHM strategic plan and the current UH system strategic plan. The final set of recommendations would be forwarded to the Chancellor for consideration.

Step 7: Campus-wide Feedback. The Chancellor, upon receipt of the recommendations from the committee should widely disseminate the information to stakeholder groups and invite feedback. If time permits, the final plan should be put out for public comment and feedback.

Step 8: Chancellor Decisions. Following receipt of feedback, the Chancellor would determine implementation actions. Appropriate consultation with unions and system level administration should occur prior to implementation of actions.

Step 9: Initiation of Action. Relevant individuals and groups would begin implementation of actions contained in the prioritization plan approved by the Chancellor. Stakeholders and the broader community should be consulted when necessary and routinely kept informed of progress.

Step 10: Initiation of Strategic Plan Update Process. The results from the prioritization process should be used as a starting point in Fall 2009 to initiate a review of the current Mānoa Strategic Plan (2002-2010) and recommend changes as necessary.

The Prioritization Process Role in Moving From Strategic Vision to Strategic Plan: Defining our Academic Priorities

Task

The first iteration of the prioritization process can be viewed as a way of revisiting the strategic vision set out in *Defining our Destiny* and as articulated in the WASC Institutional Proposal and as the first step in a process of refining those visions into a future plan. There are important strategic questions that the campus must consider that will not be directly addressed in this prioritization process, such as "What mix of students do we want to have on campus?" and "What should be our target student numbers?" However, we anticipate the prioritization process will produce data that can be used to inform responses to such questions and ultimately can provide information valuable in updating the next iteration of the UHM strategic plan, which should be completed by the conclusion of the 2009-2010 academic year.

As noted above, before completing the prioritization process, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee should summarize its recommendations for investment and maintenance in academic areas and compare these with the earlier strategic plans. These recommendations will identify areas of continuing need, academic strength, and emerging opportunity as revealed by the prioritization process and by consultation at the level of programs, colleges and other academic units. These data can then be used as input to another process, using a different group of people, to help answer more strategic questions, such as those referred to above as well as considering Mānoa's alignment with the new UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015.

This group would be charged with developing a refined, more specific academic plan for UH Mānoa, grounded in the data revealed by the prioritization process. In *Defining our Destiny,* there were many things we said we wanted to do and directions we said we wanted to go, but how many have we actually made a priority? How many have we actually made progress on? How many remain as identified priorities? The committee strongly recommends that the findings from this prioritization process be used to refine and update the UHM Strategic Plan, making it more focused, sustainable, and actionable.

While other information also will be part of continued strategic planning, the prioritization results can be used in three ways to inform the strategic planning process as UHM looks to refresh the *2002-2010 Entering the University's Second Century* document. First, some initiatives mentioned in earlier strategic plan documents may not emerge in the list of priority investments. In this case, consideration should be given to whether it is realistic to maintain an aspiration to develop in that direction. Second, some areas identified for priority investment may be well aligned with areas identified in the current strategic plan. In such cases, discussion could focus on how maintenance and development of those areas could provide the basis for a more focused articulation and implementation of the strategic vision. Third, some areas identified for priority investments may not be mentioned in the current strategic plan documents. In such cases, further evaluation may be needed, and a determination may be made that modification of the strategic plan is warranted and that this priority is worthy of inclusion. Thus the link from the outcomes of the prioritization process to initiation of a strategic planning discussion is made.

Implementation

Beginning next fall (2009), under the leadership of the Office of the VCAA, a new Strategic Planning Committee with representation from key stakeholder groups should be tasked with reviewing the results from the prioritization process along with the newest UH Strategic Plan and WASC review documents and initiating a campus discussion that will conclude with a more focused statement of campus academic priorities than is currently contained in the UHM Strategic Plan. Input from, and consultation with stakeholder groups should be encouraged with at least one open campus forum and one meeting of the faculty congress held for discussion of the proposed statement. A new UH Mānoa Strategic Plan for 2010-2016 should be completed by the conclusion of the spring semester (2010).

As we see the process of prioritization and strategic planning as iterative, at some point in the cycle, the revised strategic plan would become a reference point in the next prioritization review.

Forms

Included with this document are copies of the summary matrix and priority summary reporting forms, the cover page, the rubrics, and the guiding questions to be used during the prioritization process. It is intended that the process itself occur using electronic means that provide for automated aggregation of information. The link will be available on the Process Committee website. The rubrics are different for each of the following four (4) areas: academic affairs, student services, research, and outreach/extension. There are guiding questions for administrative and other operations.

Administrative Unit (e.g. Department) Summary Matrix of Rubric Scores

This form is to be used to provide a summary of ratings for each program within an administrative unit (e.g. department). For example, a department with a major that has three specializations or tracks would report on each here. Program A would be one track, program B a second track, and program C the third track. In addition, the department might have one undergraduate major with no additional tracks and one minor. Program D would be the undergraduate major and Program E the minor. For instructions on calculating the scores, see above.

For each program rated, please indicate the total points for each criteria category. Include an **asterisk** with the number in criteria categories where a **"not applicable"** rating was given.

	Centrality/ Alignment	Quality/ Integrity	Critical Mass	External Demand	Internal Demand	Costs/ Revenue	Specialized Niche
Program A							
Program B							
Program C							
Program D							
Program E							
Program F							
Program G							
Program H							

Summary of Other Comments (no more than 2 pages)

Administrative Unit (e.g. College) Prioritization Summary

This form is to be used to provide a summary of program priorities within an administrative unit (e.g. college).
Please list each program identified in the Summary Matrix forms in a priority category. This Prioritization Summary form should be forwarded, along with all self-review materials and the summary matrix rubric score forms, to the next level of review.

New/In Transition	Target for Growth or Investment	Maintenance	Reorganize/ Restructure/ Merge/ Consolidate	Reduce in Size or Scope	Phase Out Close Eliminate

Brief Summary (no more than 2 pages)
Please include a brief narrative with an overview of the rationale for placement of the components on the Prioritization Summary form and any supportive or explanatory text or data that will assist higher levels of review in determining the relative priority of each program. You may wish to comment on the program self-reviews.

Cover Page

Name of the Program _____

Program as used in this prioritization process can be a specialization, section, division, field of study, center, degree program, etc. The unit head, in collaboration with others as appropriate, must determine the level of analysis required.

How long has the program existed: _____

Department: _____

The department would fall under which of the following Vice Chancellor's offices?

_____   Academic Affairs
_____   Research and Graduate Education
_____   Student Services
_____   Administration, Finance, and Operations

How does the program fit into the larger administrative unit? (Describe in two or three sentences.)

Briefly describe the program (no more than half a page):

Academic/Instructional Program Prioritization Rubrics

These rubrics are to be used in the prioritization process for campus academic programs which may be labeled specializations, fields of study, section, certificate programs, degree programs, etc. As defined here, academic programs are organized to provide educational opportunities leading to an identified outcome. "Not applicable" should only be used rarely and only if the rating item truly does not apply. Each "program" should be rated separately.

Centrality and Alignment (24)

Program advances the characteristics and strategic areas identified in the UHM vision or chancellor's priorities; program reflects strengths identified in the institutional proposal (WASC); program is one that should be present in every land-sea-space grant institution; program necessity based on statute or government regulation; program meets public needs of the state.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Alignment					
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	Can demonstrate some link to or support of the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	Limited evidence of link to or support of the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	No link to the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)		
Can demonstrate a direct link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	Can demonstrate some link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	Limited evidence of a link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	No link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader		
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Can demonstrate some link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Limited evidence of a link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	No relation to an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal		
Land-Sea-Space Grant					
Has a high quality national reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution	Has a solid national reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution.	Has only a limited national reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution.	Has no connection to areas typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution		
Statute or Regulation					
Is essential in meeting mandates based on statutory or government regulations	Is highly linked to efforts to meet statutory or government regulations	Has some connection to meeting statutory or government regulations	Has no connection to statutory or government regulations		
State Needs					
Has outstanding success at addressing needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education)	Addresses needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education)	Little evidence of addressing needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education)	Does not address any needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education)		

Quality/Integrity (52)

Quality of the student experience; student retention/graduation; program review/accreditation status and findings; adequacy of facilities; faculty and staff achievements; collaborative environment.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Student Experience					
Offers extensive opportunities for student exposure to project-based learning, service learning, international experiences or research	Offers numerous opportunities for student exposure to project-based learning, service learning, international experiences or research	Offers limited opportunities for student exposure to project-based learning, service learning, international experiences or research	Offers no opportunities for student exposure to project-based learning, service learning, international experiences or research		
Conscientiously and routinely collects data to evaluate the quality of the student experience and uses it for program improvement	Sometimes collects data to evaluate the quality of the student experience and uses it for program improvement	Rarely collects data to evaluate the quality of the student experience and does not generally use it for program improvement	Does not collect data to evaluate the quality of the student experience		
Student evaluations of instruction using CAFÉ or a common departmental assessment show high ratings	Student evaluations of instruction using CAFÉ or a common departmental assessment show average or slightly above average ratings	Student evaluations of instruction using CAFÉ or a common departmental assessment show average or slightly below average ratings	Student evaluations of instruction using CAFÉ or a common departmental assessment consistently show low ratings		
Retention/Graduation					
Student graduation/ completion rates are above the UHM average (Undergraduate 54% within 6 yrs, Masters 73% within 5 yrs, PhDs 56.7% within 10 yrs)	Student graduation/ completion rates are equal to the UHM average (Undergraduate 54% within 6 yrs, Masters 73% within 5 yrs, PhDs 56.7% within 10 yrs)	Student graduation/ completion rates are below the UHM average (Undergraduate 54% within 6 yrs, Masters 73% within 5 yrs, PhDs 56.7% within 10 yrs)	Student graduation/ completion rates are far below the UHM average (Undergraduate 54% within 6 yrs, Masters 73% within 5 yrs, PhDs 56.7% within 10 yrs)		
Graduation and retention rates for Native Hawaiian and indigenous students are high	Graduation and retention rates for Native Hawaiian and indigenous students are average	Graduation and retention rates for Native Hawaiian and indigenous students are below average	Graduation and retention rates for Native Hawaiian and indigenous students are very low		
Accreditation/Assessment					
Has established and implemented a set of learning goals and accountability metrics and has used the process to make program improvements	Has established and implemented a set of learning goals and accountability metrics but no evidence of using results for improvement	Has established but not yet implemented a set of learning goals and accountability metrics	No learning goals or accountability metrics have been developed		
Is accredited for the full time period by its disciplinary accrediting body	Is accredited for less than the full time period by its disciplinary accrediting body	Is on probation or at risk of losing accreditation by its disciplinary accrediting body	Is eligible for accreditation by its disciplinary accrediting body but not accredited		
Quality Facilities					
Facilities and equipment needed by the program are in excellent condition	Facilities and equipment are in moderately good condition	Facilities and equipment are in need of improvement	Facilities and equipment are inadequate		

Faculty Achievement					
Publications, works or performances are measurably superior (quality and quantity) to those of faculty in comparable units	Publications, works or performances are similar (quality and quantity) to those of faculty in comparable units	Publications, works or performances are below (quality and quantity) those of faculty in comparable units.	Publications, works or performances are far below (quality and quantity) those of faculty in comparable units		
Faculty members of the program are nationally recognized or are recipients of prestigious awards and designations	Faculty members of the program have been awarded some external academic recognition	Very few, if any, faculty have received external national recognition in the last 5-10 years	No external faculty recognition in the last 5-10 years		
All faculty are active participants in appropriate professional organizations	Most faculty are active participants in appropriate professional organizations	Only a few faculty are active participants in appropriate professional organizations	No faculty are active participants in appropriate professional organizations		
Collaborative/Collegial Environment					
All faculty participate effectively in department activities	Most faculty participate effectively in department activities	Few faculty participate effectively in department activities	No faculty participate effectively in department activities		
All faculty participate in governance activities at the college or university level	Most faculty participate in governance activities at the college or university level	Few faculty participate in governance activities at the college or university level	No faculty participate in governance activities at the college or university level		

Critical Mass (24)

Number of students (demand), faculty and staff; enrollment trends over time; ability to provide adequate depth and breadth of curricular offerings to meet student needs.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Faculty/Staff Adequacy					
The number of permanent faculty (tenure/tenure track) is more than adequate to deliver the program and to conduct ongoing business	The number of permanent faculty is adequate to deliver programs and conduct ongoing business	The number of permanent faculty is less than adequate to deliver the program and conduct ongoing business	The number of permanent faculty is very inadequate and routinely unable to adequately meet the needs of the program		
Non-faculty staff expertise and support is more than adequate to meet the needs of the program	Non-faculty staff expertise and support is adequate to meet the needs of the program	Non-faculty staff expertise and support is less than adequate to meet the needs of the program	Non-faculty staff expertise and support is very inadequate and unable to meet the needs of the program		
Demand/Enrollment					
As large or larger than similar programs at peer institutions	Similar in size to peer programs	Smaller in size than peer programs	Very small with limited viability		
The number of program majors/participants has been increasing in the last 5 years	The number of program majors/participants has been stable over the last 5 years	The number of program majors/participants has been declining in the last 5 years	The number of program majors/participants has been declining in the last 5 years to the point where there are concerns about viability		
Has been highly successful in increasing participation of Native Hawaiian students	Has been somewhat successful in increasing participation of Native Hawaiian students	Has been marginally successful in increasing participation of Native Hawaiian students	Has not been successful in increasing participation of Native Hawaiian students		
Curriculum Adequacy					
Required and elective courses are always scheduled and adequately meet the needs of majors/participants	Required and elective courses are usually scheduled, but some needs remain.	Required and elective courses are not scheduled regularly and when scheduled have low enrollment.	Required and elective courses are not scheduled regularly and when scheduled are frequently canceled		

External Demand (36)

Responsive to present and future needs of the local community, state, and nation; general market demand for graduates; partnerships with external stakeholders.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Market Demand					
Graduates are consistently offered top jobs in their field of study or a related field	Graduates consistently find employment in their field of study or a related field	Graduates are likely to find employment in their field of study or a related field	Graduates are very unlikely to find employment in their field of study or a related field		
Current trends indicate that demand for graduates will remain strong for the next 3-5 years	Demand for graduates has been generally constant with no predicted change in the next 3-5 years	Demand for graduates has been declining over time and indicators show that the trend will continue for the next 3-5 years	Demand for graduates has declined to the point of questionable viability		
Needs /Trends					
Within the past 3 years, nearly all faculty have been consulted by mass media, government, or other influential sources to provide expert opinions.	Within the past 3 years, a majority of faculty have been consulted by mass media, government, or other influential sources to provide expert opinions.	Within the past 3 years, some faculty has been consulted by mass media, government, or other influential sources to provide expert opinions.	Within the past 3 years, no faculty has been consulted by mass media, government, or other influential sources to provide expert opinions.		
Results of scholarship are incorporated into policy in the State and/or are used by commercial enterprises within the State	Published reports from within the state have called for additional scholarship in areas of program focus	Program does not directly impact policy or commerce within the state, but may support such programs	Program has little relationship to articulated needs of the state		
Has outstanding success meeting a key need of the state or nation	Has some success at meeting a key need of the state or nation	Limited evidence of meeting a key need of the state or nation	No evidence of meeting a key need of the state or nation		
Partnerships					
Nearly all faculty have active collaborations with colleagues at other universities	A majority of faculty have active collaborations with colleagues at other universities	Some faculty have active collaborations with colleagues at other universities	No faculty have active collaborations with colleagues at other universities		
Is engaged in numerous partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is frequently a sought-after partner	Is engaged in some partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is sometimes a sought-after partner	Has limited partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is rarely sought after as a partner	No evidence of partnerships with key external stakeholder groups		
Very strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Moderately strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Weak partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	No partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians		
Program faculty have a high level of collaboration and/or interdisciplinary activity with faculty within other units	Program faculty have some collaboration and/or interdisciplinary activity with faculty from other units	Program faculty have little collaboration and/or interdisciplinary activity with faculty from other units	Program faculty have no collaboration and/or interdisciplinary activity with faculty from other units		

Internal Demand (24)

Degree to which other units rely on the program for instruction or support; general education offerings; core services.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Reliance of Others					
Demand for the program's courses is growing	Demand for the program's courses is steady	Demand for the program's courses has been steadily decreasing	Demand has decreased to the extent that courses are frequently cancelled		
Many courses offered by this program are required or considered essential for numerous other program areas within UHM	Some courses offered by this program are required or used by some other program areas routinely	Courses offered by this program are not part of the required curriculum in other programs and are used infrequently	Courses offered by this program have significant overlap with those of other programs and are not specifically required		
General Education					
The general education courses offered have high enrollments and sometimes there is excessive demand	The general education courses offered are generally fully subscribed but without excessive demand	The general education courses offered have significant variations in enrollment (high and low)	The general education courses offered by this unit are not in demand (typically low enrollment)		
A large number of general education courses are offered and taken primarily by non-majors relative to majors in the program	A sizable number of general education courses are offered and taken by a relatively even mix of majors and non-majors	Only a few general education courses are offered and are sometimes taken by non-majors	No general education courses offered are taken by non-majors		
Core Services					
Facilities (labs, specialized classrooms, athletic facilities, instrumentation, etc.) maintained by this program are considered essential for other program areas	Facilities (labs, specialized classrooms, athletic facilities, instrumentation, etc.) maintained by this program are used by some other program areas routinely	Facilities (labs, specialized classrooms, athletic facilities, instrumentation, etc.) maintained by this program are used infrequently by other program areas	Facilities (labs, specialized classrooms, athletic facilities, instrumentation, etc.) maintained by this program have significant overlap with those of other programs		
Collections or resources (journals, specimens, costumes, samples, etc.) maintained by this program are considered essential for numerous areas	Collections or resources (journals, specimens, costumes, samples, etc.) maintained by this program are used routinely by others	Collections or resources (journals, specimens, costumes, samples, etc.) maintained by this program are used infrequently by others	Collections or resources (journals, specimens, costumes, samples, etc.) maintained by this program are never used by others		

Costs/Revenue Generation (Productivity) (32)

Operational expenditures compared to comparable units; cost per credit hour generation; overall efficiency; proportion of administrative to total costs; self-sustaining and revenue generating activity (tuition generated, grants and contracts awarded, fundraising, technology or lab fees charged, ticket sales for performances, etc.).

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Operating Expenses					
Has favorable operating expense when compared with similar units at UHM	Costs are about average compared to similar units at UHM	Is more expensive to operate than similar units at UHM	Is much more expensive to operate than similar programs at UHM		
Credit Hours					
A larger number of SSH are generated relative to similarly sized programs at UHM	An average number of SSH are generated relative to similarly sized programs at UHM	Generates below average SSH relative to similarly sized programs at UHM	Generates far fewer SSH relative to similarly sized programs at UHM		
The cost per credit hour is lower when compared to similar programs at UHM	The cost per credit hour is at average compared to similar programs at UHM	The cost per credit hour is somewhat higher compared to similar programs at UHM	The cost per credit hour is much higher compared to similar programs at UHM		
Overall Efficiency					
Has outstanding success at delivering programs at a cost below those reported for similar UHM units	Demonstrated delivery of programs for less cost than reported for similar UHM units	Program delivery costs are significantly higher than those reported for similar UHM units	Program delivery costs far exceed those reported by similar UHM units		
Revenue Generation					
Generates more revenue than allocated state funds.	Program is revenue neutral – revenue generated generally matches allocation	Program is costly, perhaps inefficient, in its use of resources.	Program is chronically in fiscal trouble (account deficits growing).		
Outstanding success at receiving extramural funding	Demonstrates increasing capacity for receiving extramural funding	Extramural funding has been declining	Extramural funding is well below expectations for UHM programs		
Productivity					
Program has outstanding success at producing high quality scholarly products in appropriate numbers	Program has produced high quality scholarly products in appropriate numbers	Little evidence that the program has produced high quality scholarly products in appropriate numbers	Program fails to produce appropriate numbers of high quality scholarly products		
Program has outstanding success at reaching a significant public audience	Program has demonstrated some ability to reach a significant public audience	Public program participation is steadily declining	Public program participation is too small to justify continuation		

Specialized Niche/Competitive Advantage (20)

National and international reputation of the unit; ranking of the program compared to peers; uniqueness of the program; program provides a competitive advantage.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Uniqueness					
This is the only program of its kind in the state, with growing demand from students	The program, while not unique in the state, is popular with incoming students	The program offerings are redundant and overlap with those of one or more UHM units	The program offerings are redundant and overlap with both UHM units and other institutions, with little demand by students		
Has a strong record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a moderate record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a weak record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has no record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people		
Reputation/Ranking					
Has outstanding success at national or international recognition	Program has received some national or international recognition	Limited evidence that the program is recognized nationally or internationally	No evidence of national or international recognition of the program		
Nationally and/or internationally ranked above the 90th percentile of peers by recognized ratings groups	Ranked, but is between the 89th and 75th percentile of peers	Ranked, but is between the 50th and 74th percentile of peers	Ranked below the 50th percentile of peers		
Competitive Advantage					
Research/Scholarship has a measureable competitive advantage over similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Research/Scholarship is at or near levels of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Research/Scholarship is somewhat below levels expected of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Research/Scholarship is far below levels expected of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions		

Are there additional factors or considerations about this program that you believe should be considered in the prioritization process? (Please restrict responses to no more than one page, 10-point font)

These criteria are to be used to prioritize campus units which are designated centers, organized research units, and research programs. These programs are organized to enhance research, educational or public service activities and whose primary mission is not university instruction. Research programs may be organized to support activities that cut across several academic disciplines or may exist as a stand-alone entity. They provide structures that enhance UHM's ability to promote scholarship and research, to increase the impact of institutional funding though sharing of resources, and to leverage institutional resources to attract externally sponsored funding for activities. Research programs may enable research into new areas that provide scholars unique opportunities to explore concepts beyond the boundaries of traditional departments and schools. Such interdisciplinary collaborations are essential in the search for solutions to significant global and societal problems.

Centrality and Alignment (28)

ORU advances the characteristics and strategic areas identified in the UHM vision, Chancellor's priorities, and WASC proposal; is one that should be present in every land-sea-space grant institution; necessity based on statute or government regulation.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Alignment					
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	Can demonstrate some link to or support of the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	Limited evidence of link to or support of the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	No link to the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)		
Can demonstrate a direct link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	Can demonstrate some link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	Limited evidence of a link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	No link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader		
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Can demonstrate some link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Limited evidence of a link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	No relation to an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal		
Land-Sea-Space Grant					
Has a high quality reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution	Has a solid reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution.	Has only a limited reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution.	Has no connection to areas typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution		
Statute or Regulation					
Is essential in meeting mandates based on statutory or government regulations	Is highly linked to efforts to meet statutory or government regulations	Has some connection to meeting statutory or government regulations	Has no connection to statutory or government regulations		
State Needs					
Has outstanding success at addressing needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. health, energy, STEM, education)	Addresses needs identified as high priority in the state	Little evidence of addressing needs identified as high priority in the state	Does not address any needs identified as high priority in the state		
Has outstanding success at engaging stakeholders that are UHM highest priority	Engages stakeholders that are a priority to UHM	Largely fails to engage stakeholders that are a priority to UHM	Does not engage stakeholders that are a priority to UHM		

Quality/Integrity (44)

Quality of the research; quality of educational and public service activities; adequacy of facilities; faculty and staff achievements.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Quality Activities					
Training and/or public service work is in high demand in the state and beyond	Training and/or public service work is in demand in the state	Training and/or public service work is only in demand locally	There is little demand for training and/or public service work provided by the ORU		
Has established and implemented accountability metrics and routinely uses them in self-review	Has established and implemented a set of accountability metrics but does not routinely use them in self-review	Has established but not yet implemented a set of accountability metrics	No accountability metrics have been developed		
Quality Facilities					
There is a well developed and implemented plan to ensure adequate investment in facilities necessary for the program	There is a plan but no implementation to date to ensure adequate investment in facilities necessary for the program	There are limited plans for investing in facilities necessary for the program	There is no plan for investment in facilities necessary for the program		
Critical facilities and equipment needed are available and in excellent condition	Facilities and equipment are in moderately good condition	Facilities and equipment are in need of improvement	Facilities and equipment are inadequate to meet the needs of the ORU		
Quality Research					
Has been very successful in obtaining highly competitive contracts and grants	Has been moderately successful in obtaining highly competitive contracts and grants	Has only occasionally been successful in obtaining highly competitive contracts and grants	Is rarely successful in obtaining highly competitive contracts and grants		
High quality research is routinely conducted collaboratively with prestigious national and international research universities/centers	High quality research is conducted often with prestigious national and international research universities/centers	Research is conducted occasionally with prestigious international or national research universities/centers	Research is rarely if ever conducted collaboratively with prestigious international or national research universities/centers		
Research/Scholarship have a demonstrated positive impact on UHM reputation as a research university	Research/Scholarship has the potential to have a measurable positive impact on UHM research reputation	Research/Scholarship supports areas which have a positive impact on UHM research reputation	Program's reputation for research/ scholarship has negative impact on UHM research reputation		
Quality Faculty/Staff					
Faculty/staff are nationally recognized or are recipients of prestigious awards and designations	Faculty/staff have been awarded some external academic recognition	Very few, if any, faculty/staff have received external national recognition in the last 5-10 years	No external recognition of faculty/staff in the last 5-10 years		
Research publications are routinely jointly authored with nationally/ internationally respected scholars	Research publications are often jointly authored with nationally/ internationally respected scholars	Research publications are occasionally jointly authored with internationally or nationally respected scholars	Research publications are seldom or ever jointly authored with internationally or nationally respected scholars		
Faculty/staff publish a high number of externally refereed research/materials	Faculty/staff publish moderate numbers of externally refereed research/materials	Faculty/staff publish low numbers of externally refereed research/materials	Faculty/staff publish little or no externally refereed research/materials		
There has been a steady increase in citations related to the work, demonstrating broad impact	There has been some increase in citations related to the work, demonstrating some impact	There have been few citations related to the work, demonstrating limited impact	There are rarely citations related to the work, demonstrating little if any impact		

Critical Mass (16)

Number of faculty and staff; trends over time in continuation of funding; peer comparisons; and ability to deliver.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Peer Comparisons					
Nationally and internationally recognized as a leader	Has a solid national reputation	Is not well recognized among peers	Has limited viability with no peer recognition		
Funding Trends					
The award amounts and number of grants and contracts received has been increasing in the last five years	The award amounts and number of grants and contracts has been stable over the last five years	The award amounts and number of contracts and grants has been declining in the last five years	The award amounts and number of contracts and grants has been declining in the last five years to the point where there are concerns about continuing viability		
Faculty/Staff Size					
The number of faculty/staff is adequate to be competitive nationally/internationally	The number of faculty/staff is below its optimum to be able to be competitive nationally/internationally	The number of faculty/staff is inadequate to be competitive internationally, but still competitive nationally	The number of faculty/staff is so inadequate as to jeopardize competitiveness at any level		
Ability to Deliver					
Staff expertise and support is more than adequate to meet program needs	Staff expertise and support is adequate to meet program needs	Staff expertise and support is less than adequate to meet program needs	Staff expertise and support is very inadequate and unable to meet program needs		

External Demand (48)

Responsive to present and future needs of the local community, state, and nation; responsive to economic, scientific, and social trends; partnerships with external stakeholders.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Needs/Trends					
Current trends indicate that demand for research program will remain strong into the foreseeable future	Demand for research program has been generally constant with no predicted change	Demand for this research program has been declining over time and indicators are this trend will continue	Demand for research program has declined to the point of little interest		
Within the past 3 years, nearly all faculty/staff have been called on to provide expert opinions.	Within the past 3 years, a majority of faculty/staff have been called on to provide expert opinions.	Within the past 3 years, some faculty/staff have been called on to provide expert opinions.	Within the past 3 years, no faculty/staff have been called on to provide expert opinions.		
Results of scholarship are incorporated into policy in the state/nation	Published reports have called for additional scholarship in policy areas of ORU focus	ORU does not directly impact policy within the state/nation, but has some indirect impact	Program has little relationship to articulated policy needs of the state/nation		
Has outstanding success at increasing the economic well-being of the state or nation	Program results in increased economic well-being of the state or nation	Little evidence that program has created economic benefits to the state or nation	No evidence that the program generates any economic benefits		
Has outstanding success at enriching training and public service for the state or nation	Has demonstrated training and public service needed by the state	Little evidence that program has led to training or public service enrichment for the state or nation	No evidence that program has led to training or public service enrichment for the state or nation		
Has outstanding success at responding to scientific needs of the state or nation	Has some success responding to scientific needs of the state or nation	Limited success responding to scientific needs of the state or nation	No evidence of success responding to scientific needs of the state or nation		
Work has routinely resulted in software, materials or other products in high demand from external audiences	Work has sometimes resulted in software, materials or other products in high demand from external audiences	Work has only infrequently resulted in software, materials or other products in high demand from external audiences	Work has never resulted in software, materials or other products in high demand from external audiences		
Work has routinely resulted in technology commercialization or patents	Work has sometimes resulted in technology commercialization or patents	Work has only infrequently resulted in technology commercialization or patents	Work has never resulted in technology commercialization or patents		
Partnerships					
Is engaged in numerous partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is frequently a sought after partner	Is engaged in some partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is sometimes a sought after partner	Has limited partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is rarely sought after as a partner	No evidence of partnerships with key external stakeholder groups		
Very strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Moderately strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Weak partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	No partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians		
Results of work are routinely used by corporate/business interests	Results of work are often used by corporate/business interests	Results of work are sometimes used by corporate/business interests	Results of work are rarely used by corporate/business interests		
Results of work are routinely used by government interests	Results of work are often used by government interests	Results of work are sometimes used by government interests	Results of work are rarely used by government interests		

Internal Demand (28)

Degree to which other units rely on the ORU; core laboratory and services provided to other units; ability to enhance campus infrastructure; ability to enhance research and scholarship within the university.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Reliance of Others					
Faculty/staff have a high level of collaboration with faculty/staff from other units at UHM	Faculty/staff have some collaboration with faculty/staff from other units at UHM	Faculty/staff have little collaboration with faculty/staff from other units at UHM.	Faculty/staff have no collaboration with faculty/staff from other units at UHM		
Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored are highly valued and attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored are valued and attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored are sometimes valued and attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored are not valued and not attended		
Offers extensive opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and/or research	Offers numerous opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and/or research	Offers limited opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and/or research	Offers no opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and/or research		
Facilities and Services					
Facilities, tools and laboratories maintained and supported are considered essential for other areas	Facilities, tools and laboratories maintained and supported are used by some other areas routinely	Facilities, tools and laboratories maintained and supported are used infrequently by other areas	Facilities, tools and laboratories maintained and supported have significant overlap with those of other areas		
Enhance Research					
Routinely provides opportunities for faculty/staff in other units to participate in projects and/or or authorship	Sometimes provides opportunities for faculty/staff in other units to participate in projects and/or or authorship	Only sporadically provides opportunities for faculty/staff in other units to participate in projects and/or or authorship	Rarely, if ever, provides opportunities for faculty/staff in other units to participate in projects and/or or authorship		
Supports large numbers of graduate students and post docs	Supports some graduate students and post docs	Supports a few graduate students and post docs	Does not support graduate students and post docs		
Several new academic areas of expertise at UHM have grown from the work	At least one new academic area of expertise at UHM have grown from the work	No new academic areas of expertise at UHM have grown from the work, but existing areas have benefited	No new academic areas of expertise at UHM have grown from the work and existing areas of expertise have not benefitted		

Costs/Revenue Generation (Productivity) (36)

Operational expenditures compared to comparable units; overall efficiency; proportion of administrative to total costs; self-sustaining and revenue generating activity; ability to bring in resources needed by the institution.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Revenue Generation					
Generates more revenue than expense	Is revenue neutral – revenue generally matches expenses	Is costly, perhaps inefficient, in its use of resources	Is chronically in fiscal trouble (account deficits growing)		
Has been very successful in leveraging existing resources	Has been moderately successful in leveraging existing resources	Has had limited success in leveraging existing resources	Has had very little, if any, success in leveraging existing resources		
Operating Expenses					
Has favorable operating expense compared to similar units at UHM	Costs are about average compared to similar units at UHM	Is somewhat more expensive to operate than similar units at UHM	Is much more expensive to operate than similar units at UHM		
Core infrastructure (laboratories, facilities, and equipment) is fully supported by external funds	Core infrastructure is substantially, but not fully, supported by external funds	Core infrastructure is only partially supported by external funds	Core infrastructure is not generally supported by external funds		
Administrative Costs					
The ORU is typically funded by agencies with higher approved indirect rates	The ORU is funded by a mix of agencies with both higher and lower approved indirect rates	The ORU typically is funded by agencies with low approved indirect rates	The ORU does not recover sufficient indirect funds to support its existence		
Efficiency/Productivity					
Research and scholarship are at levels above similar units at UHM	Research and scholarship are at levels comparable to similar units at UHM	Research and scholarship are at levels below similar units at UHM	Research and scholarship are at or near the bottom compared to similar units at UHM		
Has outstanding success at reaching an appropriate number of persons through educational and public service programs	Has demonstrated ability to reach a significant audience through educational and public service programs	Participation in educational and public service programming is steadily declining	Participation in educational and public service programming is too small to justify continuation		
The amount and number of awards received exceeds that of units of similar size	The amount and number of awards received generally matches that of units of similar size	The amount and number of awards received is lower than that of units of similar size	The amount and number of awards received is far lower than that of units of similar size		
Supports a substantial number of graduate students	Supports some graduate students	Supports only a few graduate students	Supports no graduate students		

Specialized Niche/Competitive Advantage (20)

National and international reputation of the unit; ranking of the unit compared to peers; uniqueness of the unit; unit provides a competitive advantage.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Uniqueness					
This is the only program of its kind in the state, with growing demand for its services	The program, while not unique in the state, is highly regarded	The program is redundant with one or more others in the state, and has lesser regard	The program is redundant with units in the state and is not highly regarded		
Is an identified "area of excellence" or "signature program"	Has been identified as an emerging area of excellence or is closely aligned with an area of excellence	Is not an area of excellence or an emerging area of excellence, but may be aligned with such a unit	Is not an area of excellence or an emerging area of excellence		
Has a strong record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a moderate record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a weak record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has no record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people		
Reputation/Peers					
Has had outstanding success at national or international recognition	Has received some national or international recognition	Limited evidence that the ORU is recognized nationally or internationally	No evidence of national or international recognition		
Competitive Advantage					
Scholarship has a measureable competitive advantage over similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Scholarship is at or near levels of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Scholarship is somewhat below levels expected of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Scholarship is far below levels expected of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions		

Are there additional factors or considerations about this unit that you believe should be considered in the prioritization process? (Please restrict responses to no more than one page, 10-point font)

Student Services Program Prioritization Rubrics

These criteria are to be used to prioritize non-academic or student services programs, defined as a service or an activity, or collection of activities that consume resources (dollars, people, space, equipment, time). Note that some non-academic or service programs are embedded within academic units. For instance, technical or advising services may be at a department, college, or campus level. A department may support academic programs as well as non-academic programs, and it *might* duplicate services provided elsewhere on campus. Some non-academic or service areas would be considered essential to the operation of any university. In those instances, there should be a focus on efficiency, effectiveness, quality, and cost. Other non-academic or service areas may be considered less essential or even non-essential to the operation of a major research university. In those instances, the focus should be on centrality to the vision, program quality, and factors such as uniqueness and cost relative to benefits provided.

Centrality and Alignment (28)

Program/service advances the characteristics and strategic areas identified in the UHM vision, the Chancellor's priorities, and WASC proposal; program/service is one that should be present in every land-sea-space grant institution; program/service necessity based on statute or government regulation.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Alignment					
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	Can demonstrate some link to or support of the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	Limited evidence of link to or support of the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)	No link to the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, focus on the natural environment)		
Can demonstrate a direct link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	Can demonstrate some link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	Limited evidence of a link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	No link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader		
Need for the program is rapidly expanding due to commitments articulated in WASC institutional plans	Need for the program is expanding due to commitments articulated in WASC institutional plans	Need for the program is continuing, though not anticipated to expand, and is aligned with WASC institutional plans	The program is inconsistent with articulated WASC commitments for the future		
Land-Sea-Space Grant					
Has demonstrated outstanding success at addressing high priority student issues present in similar institutions	Addresses high priority student issues present in similar institutions	Little evidence of addressing high priority student issues present in similar institutions	Does not address any high priority student issues present in similar institutions		
Has outstanding success at addressing high priority faculty/staff issues present in similar institutions	Addresses high priority faculty/staff issues present in similar institutions	Little evidence of addressing high priority faculty/staff issues present in similar institutions	Does not address any high priority faculty/staff issues present in similar institutions		
Statute or Regulation					
Is essential in meeting mandates based on statutory or government regulations	Is highly linked to efforts to meet statutory or government regulations	Has some connection to meeting statutory or government regulations	Has no connection to statutory or government regulations		
Need for the program is rapidly expanding due to regulatory issues	Need for the program is expanding steadily due to regulatory issues	Need for the program is not expanding, but is steady due to regulatory issues	Need for the program is not connected to any regulatory issues		

Quality/Integrity (32)

Quality of the services provided; adequacy of facilities; faculty and staff quality.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Quality Services					
Can demonstrate high demand	Can demonstrate moderate demand	Is in low, but steady demand	Is rarely or infrequently used		
Consistently delivers high quality programs/services	Usually delivers high quality programs/ services	Sometime delivers high quality programs/services	Rarely delivers high quality programs/services		
Programs are generally assessed to be highly effective	Programs are generally assessed to be moderately effective	Programs are generally assessed to be less effective than optimal	Programs are generally assessed to be ineffective		
Accreditation/Review					
All staff actively support and participate in accreditation and program review efforts	Most staff actively support and participate in accreditation and program review efforts	Only a few staff actively support and participate in accreditation and program review efforts	No staff actively support and participate in accreditation and program review efforts		
Has established and implemented a set of goals and accountability metrics and use the process to make improvements	Has established and implemented a set of goals and accountability metrics but no evidence of using results for improvement	Has established but not yet implemented a set of goals and accountability metrics	No goals or accountability metrics have been developed		
Is accredited for the full time period by its accrediting body	Is accredited for less than the full time period by its accrediting body	Is on probation or at risk of losing accreditation by its accrediting body	Is eligible for accreditation by its accrediting body but not accredited		
Quality Facilities					
Technologies, facilities, and equipment needed for the program are in excellent condition	Technologies, facilities, and equipment are in moderately good condition	Technologies, facilities, and equipment are in need of improvement	Technologies, facilities, and equipment are inadequate to meet the needs of the program		
Quality Staff					
Faculty/staff are frequently recognized for their excellence by external groups/entities	Faculty/staff are often recognized for their excellence by external groups/agencies	Faculty/staff are sometimes recognized for their excellence by external groups/agencies	Faculty/staff are seldom, if ever, recognized for their excellence by external groups/agencies		

Critical Mass (16)

Number of faculty and staff; trends over time; peer comparisons; ability to deliver.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Peer Comparisons					
Faculty and staff is larger than similar programs at peer institutions	Faculty and staff is similar in size to programs at peer institutions	Faculty and staff is smaller in size compared to programs at peer institutions	Faculty and staff is very small with limited viability		
Ability to Deliver					
Consistently able to provide the breadth and depth of services typically expected of similar programs in peer institutions	Generally able to provide the breadth and depth of services typically expected of similar programs in peer institutions	Not able to provide both the breadth and depth of services typically expected of similar programs in peer institutions	Is inadequate in depth and breadth and not able to effectively deliver		
Staff Adequacy					
The number of faculty/staff is optimum for working effectively and efficiently	The number of faculty/staff is below its optimum, but still adequate, to be able to work effectively and efficiently	The number of faculty/staff is inadequate to work both effectively and efficiently	The number of faculty/staff is so inadequate as to be ineffective and inefficient		
Staff expertise and support is more than adequate to meet the needs of the program	Staff expertise and support is adequate to meet the needs of the program	Staff expertise and support is less than adequate to meet the needs of the program	Staff expertise and support is very inadequate and unable to meet the needs of the program		

External Demand (16)

Responsive to present and future needs of the local community or the state; partnerships with external stakeholders.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Responsiveness					
Has demonstrated outstanding success at enriching education and public service for the state	Has demonstrated educational and public service needed by the state	Little evidence that program has led to educational or public service enrichment for the state	No evidence that program has led to educational or public service enrichment for the state		
Partnerships					
Is engaged in numerous partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is frequently a sought after partner	Is engaged in some partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is sometimes a sought after partner	Has limited partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is rarely sought after as a partner	No evidence of partnerships with key external stakeholder groups		
Very strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Moderately strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Weak partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	No partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians		
Does not duplicate other services in the community in any way	Has some overlap with other services available in the community	Has substantial overlap with other services available in the community	Duplicate other services that are available in the community		

Internal Demand (36)

Degree to which other units rely on the program; core services provided to other units; ability to enhance student experience.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Support of Others					
Need for the program is rapidly expanding due to substantial growth of the units it supports	Need for the program is expanding steadily due to growth in the units it supports	Need for the program is not expanding, but is constant in terms of the units it supports	Need for the program is contracting due to decrease in terms of the units it supports		
Campus constituents are highly supportive of the goals and objectives of the program	Campus constituents are supportive of the goals and objectives of the program	Campus constituents question some of the goals and objectives of the program	Campus constituents are not supportive of the goals and objectives of the program		
Faculty/staff have a high level of collaboration with faculty/staff from other units at UHM	Faculty/staff have some collaboration with faculty/staff from other units at UHM	Faculty/staff have little collaboration with faculty/staff from other units at UHM.	Faculty/staff have no collaboration with faculty/staff from other units at UHM		
Diverse members of the campus, including Native Hawaiians, are highly supportive of the program	Diverse members of the campus, including Native Hawaiians, are somewhat supportive of the program	Diverse members of the campus, including Native Hawaiians, are neutral about the program	Diverse members of the campus, including Native Hawaiians, are not supportive of the program		
Services provided are considered essential for other areas	Services provided are used by some other areas routinely	Services provided are used infrequently by other areas	Services provided have significant overlap with those of other areas		
Student Experience					
The program offers extensive opportunities for student engagement in the UHM community	The program offers numerous opportunities for student engagement in the UHM community	The program offers limited opportunities for student engagement in the UHM community	The program offers no opportunities for student engagement in the UHM community		
Provides services that directly serve the needs of Native Hawaiian students and are widely known	Provides services that directly serve the needs of Native Hawaiian students but are not well known	Provides services that indirectly serve the needs of Native Hawaiian students	Does not serve the needs of Native Hawaiian students		
The program is used to assist large numbers of students	The program is used to assist some students	The program is used to assist a few students	The program is not used to assist students		
Substantially contributes to positive ratings on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) or other external measures	Contributes some to positive ratings on the NSSE or other external measures	Only indirectly contributes to positive ratings on the NSSE or other external measures	No relationship to ratings on the NSSE or other external measures		

Costs/Revenue Generation (Productivity) (24)

Operational expenditures compared to comparable units; overall productivity and efficiency; self-sustaining and revenue generating activity; ability to bring in resources needed by the institution.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Operating Expenses					
Program has favorable operating expense when compared to peers	Program costs are about average compared to peers	Program is more expensive to operate than peers	Program is much more expensive to operate than peers		
Productivity/Efficiency					
Program has outstanding success at reaching an appropriate number of persons through its services	Program has demonstrated ability to reach a significant audience through its services	Participation in services is steadily declining	Participation in services is too small to justify continuation		
Program has developed and implemented cross training among faculty/staff to enhance efficiency	Program has committed to cross training but has not developed plans or implemented	Program has not considered cross training to enhance efficiency	Program is opposed to cross training as an efficiency measure		
Program has demonstrated outstanding success at delivering an appropriate number or amount of services	Program has demonstrated ability to deliver appropriate number or amount of services	Little evidence that the program is delivering adequate numbers or amount of services	Program fails to deliver adequate volume of services		
Resource Leveraging					
The program has been very successful in leveraging external funding (federal, state, other)	The program has been moderately successful in leveraging external funding (federal, state, other)	The program has had limited success in leveraging external funding (federal, state, other)	The program has had very little, if any, success in leveraging external funding (federal, state, other)		
Program staff very efficiently use systems and technologies to conduct work	Program staff somewhat efficiently use systems and technologies to conduct work	Program staff are somewhat inefficient in using systems and technologies to conduct work	Program staff are very inefficient in using systems and technologies to conduct work		

Specialized Niche/Competitive Advantage (12)

Reputation of the unit; ranking of the unit compared to peers; uniqueness of the unit; unit provides a competitive advantage.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Uniqueness/Niche					
This is the only program of its kind in the institution or state with growing demand for its services	The program, while not unique in the institution or state, is highly regarded	The program is redundant with one or more others in the institution or state, and has lesser regard	The program is redundant with other units in the institution or state and is not highly regarded		
Has a strong record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a moderate record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a weak record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has no record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people		
Recognition/Peers					
Has had outstanding success at national or international recognition	Has received some national or international recognition	Limited evidence that the program is recognized nationally or internationally as being of high quality	No evidence of national or international recognition of the program as high quality		

Are there additional factors or considerations about this unit that you believe should be considered in the prioritization process? (Please restrict responses to no more than one page, 10-point font)

Outreach/Extension Program Prioritization Rubrics

These criteria are to be used to prioritize specialized campus units which are usually designated centers or organized extension units (hereafter referred to as OEUs). OEUs as defined here are organized to enhance and coordinate outreach, provide non-traditional educational opportunities, and other public service activities. An OEU may be organized to support activities that cut across several academic disciplines or as a stand-alone entity. OEUs provide structures that enhance UHM's ability to promote scholarship and research, to increase the impact of institutional funding though sharing of resources, and to leverage institutional resources to attract externally sponsored funding for these activities. OEUs may enable outreach activities into new areas that provide scholars unique opportunities to explore concepts beyond the boundaries of traditional departments and schools. Such interdisciplinary collaborations are essential in the search for solutions to significant global and societal problems.

COLLEGE:	
UNIT(DEPT):	
EXTENSION PROGRAM AREA (1-7):	
SUBPROGRAM:	

Centrality and Alignment (28)

Organized Extension Unit (OEU) advances the characteristics and strategic areas identified in the UHM vision and WASC proposal; is one that should be present in every land-sea-space grant institution; necessity based on statute or government regulation.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Alignment					
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, natural environment)	Can demonstrate some link to or support of the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, natural environment)	Limited evidence of link to or support of the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, natural environment)	No link to the UHM vision (Hawaiian place of learning, Asia-Pacific scholarship, natural environment)		
Can demonstrate a direct link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	Can demonstrate some link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	Limited link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader	No link to strengthening the institution as a global research leader		
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Can demonstrate some link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Limited evidence of a link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	No relation to an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal		
Land-Sea-Space Grant					
Has a high quality reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution	Has a solid reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution	Has only a limited reputation in addressing an area typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution	Has no connection to areas typically expected in a land-sea-space grant institution		
Statute or Regulation					
Is essential in meeting mandates based on statutory or government regulations	Is highly linked to efforts to meet statutory or government regulations	Has some connection to meeting statutory or government regulations	Has no connection to statutory or government regulations		

State Needs					
Has outstanding success at addressing needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education)	Addresses needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education)	Little evidence of addressing needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education)	Does not address any needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education)		
Has outstanding success at engaging stakeholders that are UHM's highest priority	Engages stakeholders that are a priority to UHM	Largely fails to engage stakeholders that are a priority to UHM	Does not engage stakeholders that are a priority to UHM		

Quality/Integrity (36)

Quality of the outreach/extension program; quality of educational and public service activities; adequacy of facilities; faculty and staff achievements.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Quality Activities					
Non-traditional education and public outreach work is in high demand in the state and beyond	Non-traditional education and public outreach work is in demand in the state	Non-traditional education and public outreach work is only in demand locally	There is little demand for non-traditional education and public outreach work provided by the OEU		
Conscientiously and routinely collects data to evaluate the quality of the student experience and uses it for program improvement	Sometimes collects data to evaluate the quality of the student experience and uses it for program improvement	Rarely collects data to evaluate the quality of the student experience and does not generally use it for program improvement	Does not collect data to evaluate the quality of the student experience		
Has established and implemented accountability metrics and routinely engages in self-review	Has established and implemented a set of accountability metrics but does not routinely engage in self-review	Has established a set of accountability metrics but have not yet implemented	No accountability metrics have been developed		
Quality Facilities					
Critical facilities and equipment needed are available and in excellent condition	Facilities and equipment are in moderately good condition	Facilities and equipment are in need of improvement	Facilities and equipment are inadequate to meet the needs		
Quality Outreach					
Has been very successful in obtaining highly competitive contracts and grants	Has been moderately successful in obtaining highly competitive contracts and grants	Has only occasionally been successful in obtaining highly competitive contracts and grants	Is rarely successful in obtaining highly competitive contracts and grants		
High quality outreach is routinely conducted collaboratively with prestigious land grant universities	High quality outreach is conducted often with prestigious land grant universities	Outreach is conducted occasional with prestigious land grant universities	Outreach is rarely if ever conducted collaboratively with prestigious land grant universities		
Has a demonstrated positive impact on UHM reputation as an outreach university	Has the potential to have a measurable positive impact on UHM outreach reputation	Supports areas which have a positive impact on UHM outreach reputation	Has no or negative impact on UHM outreach reputation		
Quality Faculty/Staff					
Faculty/staff are nationally recognized or are recipients of prestigious awards and designations	Faculty/staff have been awarded some external academic recognition	Very few, if any, faculty/staff have received external national recognition in the last 5-10 years	No external recognition of faculty/staff in the last 5-10 years		
Extension publications are routinely jointly authored with nationally respected scholars	Extension publications are often jointly authored with nationally respected scholars	Extension publications are occasionally jointly authored with nationally respected scholars	Extension publications are seldom or ever jointly authored with nationally respected scholars		

Critical Mass (16)

Number of faculty and staff; trends over time in continuation of funding; peer comparisons; ability to deliver.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Peer Comparisons					
OEU is nationally recognized as a leader	OEU has a solid national reputation	OEU is not well recognized among peers	OEU has limited viability with no peer recognition		
Funding Trends					
The award amounts and number of grants and contracts received has been increasing in the last 5 years	The award amounts and number of grants and contracts has been stable over the last 5 years	The award amounts and number of contracts and grants has been declining in the last 5 years	The award amounts and number of contracts and grants has been declining in the last 5 years to the point where there are concerns about continuing viability		
Faculty/Staff Size					
The number of faculty/staff associated with the OEU is adequate to fulfill the needs of the state stakeholders	The number of faculty/staff associated with the OEU is below its optimum to fulfill the needs of the state stakeholders	The number of faculty/staff is inadequate to fulfill the needs of the state stakeholders	The number of faculty/staff is so inadequate as to jeopardize its mission to serve the needs of the state stakeholders		
Ability to Deliver					
Staff expertise and support is more than adequate to meet the needs of the OEU	Staff expertise and support is adequate to meet the needs of the OEU	Staff expertise and support is less than adequate to meet the needs of the OEU	Staff expertise and support is very inadequate and unable to meet the needs of the OEU		

External Demand (48)

Responsive to present and future needs of the local community, state, and nation; responsive to economic, scientific, and social trends; partnerships with external stakeholders.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Needs/Trends					
Current trends indicate that demand for outreach/extension programs will remain strong into the foreseeable future	Demand for outreach/extension programs has been generally constant with no predicted change	Demand for this outreach/extension programs has been declining over time and indicators are this trend will continue	Demand for outreach/extension programs has declined to the point of little interest		
Within the past 3 years, nearly all faculty/staff have been called on to provide training or expert opinions	Within the past 3 years, a majority of faculty/staff have been called on to provide training or expert opinions	Within the past 3 years, some faculty/staff have been called on to provide training or expert opinions	Within the past 3 years, no faculty/staff have been called on to provide training or expert opinions		
Results of scholarship are incorporated into policy in the communities, state, or stakeholder organizations	Published reports have called for additional scholarship in policy areas of OEU focus	OEU does not directly impact policy within the community, state, or stakeholder organizations, but has some indirect impact	Program has little relationship to articulated policy needs of the communities, state, or stakeholder organizations		
Has outstanding success at increasing the economic and health well-being of the state	Program results in increased economic and health well-being of the state or nation	Little evidence that program has created economic and health benefits to the state	No evidence that the program generates any economic or health benefits		
Has outstanding success at enriching education and public service for the community, state or nation	Has demonstrated educational and public service needed by the community, state or nation	Little evidence that program has led to educational or public service enrichment for the community, state, or nation	No evidence that program has led to educational or public service enrichment for the community, state, or nation		
Has outstanding success at responding to scientific needs of the state	Has some success at responding to scientific needs of the state	Limited success responding to scientific needs of the state	No evidence of success responding to scientific needs of the state		
Is highly regarded for serving the needs of Native Hawaiian and indigenous people	Is somewhat positively regarded for serving the needs of Native Hawaiian and indigenous people	Is not known for serving the needs of Native Hawaiian and indigenous people	Is negatively regarded in terms of serving the needs of Native Hawaiian and indigenous people		
OEU has routinely participated in efforts which resulted in technology commercialization or patents	OEU has participated in efforts that resulted sometimes in technology commercialization or patents	OEU work has only infrequently resulted in technology commercialization or patents	OEU work has never resulted in technology commercialization or patents		

Partnerships					
Is engaged in numerous partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is frequently a sought after partner	Is engaged in some partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is sometimes a sought after partner	Has limited partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is rarely sought after as a partner	No evidence of partnerships with key external stakeholder groups		
Results of OEU work are routinely used by industry, community groups and NGO partners	Results of OEU work are moderately used by industry, community groups, and NGO partners	Results of OEU work are sometimes used by industry and community groups and NGO partners	Results of OEU work are not used by industry groups, community groups, and NGO partners		
Very strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Moderate partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Limited partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	No partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians		
Results of OEU work are routinely used by government partners	Results of OEU work are often used by government partners	Results of OEU work are sometimes used by government partners	Results of OEU work are rarely used by government partners		

Internal Demand (28)

Degree to which other units rely on the OEU; core laboratory and services provided to other units; ability to enhance campus infrastructure; ability to enhance research and scholarship within the university.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Reliance of Others					
OEU faculty/staff have a high level of collaboration with faculty/staff within other units at UHM	OEU faculty/staff have some collaboration with faculty/staff within other units at UHM	OEU faculty/staff have little collaboration with faculty/staff within other units at UHM	OEU faculty/staff have no collaboration with faculty/staff within other units at UHM		
Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored by the OEU are high valued and attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored by the OEU are valued and attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored by the OEU are sometimes valued and attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored by the OEU are not valued and not attended		
The OEU offers extensive opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and/or research	The OEU offers numerous opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and/or research	The OEU offers limited opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and/or research	The OEU offers no opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning and/or research		
Facilities and Services					
Facilities, tools and laboratories maintained and supported by the work of the OEU are considered essential for other areas	Facilities, tools and laboratories maintained and supported by the OEU are used by some other areas routinely	Facilities, tools and laboratories maintained and supported by the OEU are used infrequently by other areas	Facilities, tools and laboratories maintained and supported by the OEU have significant overlap with those of other areas		
Enhance Research					
The OEU routinely provides opportunities for faculty/staff in other units to participate in projects and/or authorship	The OEU sometimes provides opportunities for faculty/staff in other units to participate in projects and/or authorship	The OEU only sporadically provides opportunities for faculty/staff in other units to participate in projects and/or authorship	The OEU rarely, if ever, provides opportunities for faculty/staff in other units to participate in projects and/or authorship		
OEU supports large numbers of graduate students and post docs	OEU supports some numbers of graduate students and post docs	OEU supports a few graduate students and post docs	OEU does not support graduate students and post docs		
Several new academic areas of expertise at UHM have grown from the work of the OEU	At least one new academic area of expertise at UHM have grown from the work of the OEU	No new academic areas of expertise at UHM have grown from the work of the OEU, but existing areas have benefitted	No new academic areas of expertise at UHM have grown from the work of the OEU and existing areas of expertise have not benefitted		

Costs/Revenue Generation (Productivity) (28)

Operational expenditures compared to comparable units; overall efficiency; proportion of administrative to total costs; self-sustaining and revenue generating activity; ability to bring in resources needed by the institution.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Revenue Generation					
Generates more revenue than expense	Is revenue neutral - revenue generally matches expense	Is costly, perhaps inefficient, in its use of resources	Is chronically in fiscal trouble (account deficits growing)		
Has been very successful in leveraging existing resources	Has been moderately successful in leveraging existing resources	Has had limited success in leveraging existing resources	Has had very little, if any, success in leveraging existing resources		
Operating Expenses					
Has favorable operating expense compared to similar units at UHM	Costs are about average compared to similar units at UHM	Is somewhat more expensive to operate than similar units at UHM	Is much more expensive to operate than similar units at UHM		
Core infrastructure (offices, meeting rooms and other facilities and equipment) is fully supported by external funds	Core infrastructure (offices, meeting rooms and other facilities and equipment) is substantially, but not fully, supported by external funds	Core infrastructure (offices, meeting rooms and other facilities and equipment) is only partially supported by external funds	Core infrastructure (offices, meeting rooms and other facilities and equipment) is not generally supported by external funds		
Administrative Costs					
The OEU is typically funded by agencies with higher approved indirect rates	The OEU is funded by a mix of agencies with both higher and lower approved indirect rates	The OEU is typically funded by agencies with low approved indirect rates	The OEU does not recover sufficient indirect funds to support its existence		
Efficiency/Productivity					
Outreach and scholarship are at levels above similar units at UHM	Outreach and scholarship are at levels comparable to similar units at UHM	Outreach and scholarship are at levels below similar units at UHM	Outreach and scholarship are far below similar units at UHM		
OEU has outstanding success at reaching an appropriate number of persons through educational and public service programs	OEU has demonstrated ability to reach a significant audience through educational and public service programs	OEU participation in educational and public service programs is steadily declining	OEU participation educational and public service programming is too small to justify continuation		

Specialized Niche/Competitive Advantage (16)

National and international reputation of the unit; ranking of the unit compared to peers; uniqueness of the unit; unit provides a competitive advantage.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Uniqueness					
This is the only OEU of its kind in the nation, with growing demand for its services	The OEU, while not unique in the nation, is highly regarded	The OEU is redundant with one or more units in the nation, and has lesser regard	The OEU is redundant with units in the nation and is not highly regarded		
Has a strong record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a moderate record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a limited record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has no record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people		
Reputation/Peers					
Has had outstanding success at national or international recognition	Has received some national or international recognition	Limited evidence that the OEU is recognized nationally or internationally	No evidence of national or international recognition		
Competitive Advantage					
Scholarship has a measureable competitive advantage over similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Scholarship is at or near levels of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Scholarship is somewhat below levels expected of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Scholarship is far below levels expected of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions		

Are there additional factors or considerations about this unit that you believe should be considered in the prioritization process? (Please restrict responses to no more than one page, 10-point font)

Administrative & Operational Prioritization Rubrics

These rubrics are to be used in the prioritization process for administrative and operational programs and units. Programs and units are defined as an activity, or collection of activities, that consume resources (dollars, people, space, equipment, time) and organized to provide services leading to identified outcomes. "Not applicable" should only be used rarely and only if the rating item truly does not apply. Each program and unit should be rated separately.

Centrality and Alignment (28)

Program/unit advances the characteristics and strategic areas identified in the UHM vision or chancellor's priorities; program/unit reflects strengths identified in the institutional proposal (WASC); program/unit is one that should be present in every land-sea-space grant institution; program/unit necessity based on statute or government regulation; program/unit meets public needs of the state.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Alignment					
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing the UHM vision in providing quality service to the campus community	Can demonstrate some link to or support of the UHM vision in providing quality service to the campus community	Limited evidence of link to or support of the UHM vision in providing quality service to the campus community	No link to the UHM vision in providing quality service to the campus community		
Can demonstrate a direct link to strengthening the institution as a global land-sea-grant research leader	Can demonstrate some link to strengthening the institution as a global land-sea-grant research leader	Limited evidence of a link to strengthening the institution as a global land-sea-grant research leader	No link to strengthening the institution as a global land-sea-grant research leader		
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Can demonstrate some link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	Limited evidence of a link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal	No relation to an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal		
Statute or Regulation					
Is essential in meeting mandates based on statutory or government regulations	Is highly linked to efforts to meet statutory or government regulations	Has some connection to meeting statutory or government regulations	Has no connection to statutory or government regulations		
Need for the program is rapidly expanding due to regulatory issues	Need for the program is expanding steadily due to regulatory issues	Need for the program is not expanding but is steady due to regulatory issues	Need for program is not connected to any regulatory issues		
State Needs					
Has outstanding success at addressing needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education, infrastructure)	Addresses needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education, infrastructure)	Little evidence of addressing needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education, infrastructure)	Does not address any needs identified as high priority in the state (e.g. nursing, STEM education, infrastructure)		
Has outstanding success at engaging stakeholders that are UHM's highest priority	Engages stakeholders that are a priority to UHM	Largely fails to engage stakeholders that are a priority to UHM	Does not engage stakeholders that are a priority to UHM		

Quality/Integrity (36)

Quality of the customer experience and reputation; program/unit review status and findings; adequacy of facilities; staff achievements; collaborative environment.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Quality Activities					
The service and work provided is in high demand on campus and in the state	The service and work provided is in demand on campus and in the state	The service and work provided is only in demand on campus	There is little demand for the service and work provided		
Conscientiously and routinely collects data to evaluate the quality of the customer experience and uses it for program improvement	Sometimes collects data to evaluate the quality of the customer experience and uses it for program improvement	Rarely collects data to evaluate the quality of the customer experience and does not generally use it for program improvement	Does not collect data to evaluate the quality of the customer experience		
Has established and implemented accountability metrics and routinely uses them in self-review	Has established and implemented a set of accountability metrics but does not routinely use them in self-review	Has established but not yet implemented a set of accountability metrics	No accountability metrics have been developed		
Quality Facilities					
Critical facilities and equipment needed to provide top-notch service and work are available and in excellent condition	Facilities and equipment to provide top-notch service and work are in moderately good condition	Facilities and equipment to provide top-notch service and work are in need of improvement	Facilities and equipment to provide top-notch service and work are inadequate to meet the needs of customers		
Quality Outreach					
Has demonstrated high measurable positive impact on UHM reputation as a quality service unit	Has demonstrated medium measurable positive impact on UHM reputation as a quality service unit	Has demonstrated little measurable positive impact on UHM reputation as a quality service unit	Has demonstrated no measurably positive impact on UHM reputation as a quality service unit		
Unit has outstanding success at reaching a significant public audience	Unit has demonstrated some ability to reach a significant public audience	Unit program participation is steadily declining	Unit program participation is too small to justify continuation		
Quality Staff/Unit					
Staff/unit are recognized by the University or state (recipients of prestigious awards and designations) for their service/work	Staff/unit have received some internal and external service recognition for their service/work	Very few, if any, staff/unit have received internal or external recognition in the last 5-10 years for their service/work	No internal or external recognition received by staff/unit in the last 5-10 years		
Productivity					
Unit has outstanding success at producing high quality products and/or services in appropriate numbers	Unit has success at producing high quality products and/or services in appropriate numbers	Unit has some success at producing high quality products and/or services in appropriate numbers	Program fails to produce appropriate numbers of high quality products and services		
Collaborative/Collegial Environment					
All staff participate effectively in department activities	Most staff participate effectively in department activities	Few staff participate effectively in department activities	No staff participate effectively in department activities		

Critical Mass (12)

Number of staff; ability to provide adequate depth and breadth of offerings to meet needs and services of unit.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Staff Adequacy					
The number of permanent staff is optimum to deliver quality customer service and to conduct daily business productively	The number of permanent staff is adequate to deliver quality customer service and to conduct daily business productively	The number of permanent staff is less than adequate to deliver quality customer service and to conduct daily business productively	The number of permanent staff is very inadequate and is routinely unable to meet the daily needs of the unit		
Staff expertise and support is more than adequate to meet the needs of the unit	Staff expertise and support is adequate to meet the needs of the unit	Staff expertise and support is less than adequate to meet the needs of the unit	Staff expertise and support is very inadequate and unable to meet the needs of the unit		
Ability to Deliver					
Consistently able to provide the breadth and depth of services required by the unit	Generally able to provide the breadth and depth of services required by the unit	Not able to provide the breadth and depth of services required by the unit	Is inadequate in depth and breadth and not able to effectively deliver		

External Demand (16)

Responsive to present and future needs of the University and local community; partnerships with external stakeholders.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Responsiveness					
Has demonstrated outstanding success at enriching education and public service for the University and state	Has demonstrated educational and public service for the University and state	Little evidence that program has led to educational and public service enrichment for the University and state	No evidence that program has led to educational and public service enrichment for the University and state		
Partnerships					
Is engaged in numerous partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is frequently a sought after program/unit	Is engaged in some partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is sometimes a sought after program/unit	Has limited partnerships with key external stakeholder groups and is a rarely sought after program/unit	No evidence of partnerships with key external stakeholder groups		
Very strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Moderately strong partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	Weak partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians	No partnerships with Native Hawaiian communities or organizations that extensively serve Native Hawaiians		
Program staff have a high level of collaboration and/or activity with other units on campus and in the community	Program staff have some collaboration and/or activity with other units on campus and in the community	Program staff have little collaboration and/or activity with other units on campus and in the community	Program staff have no collaboration and/or activity with other units on campus and in the community		

Internal Demand (20)

Degree to which other units rely on the program for instruction or support; general education offerings; core services.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Reliance of Others					
Demand for the program's services is growing	Demand for the program's services is steady	Demand for the program's services has been steadily decreasing	Demand has decreased to the extent that services are frequently cancelled or staff idle		
Many of the services offered by this unit are required or considered essential by numerous other campus groups at UHM	Some of the services offered by this unit are required or used by campus groups at UHM	Services offered by this unit are infrequently required or used by other campus groups at UHM	Services offered by this unit have significant overlap with other campus groups and are not specifically required		
General Education					
Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored or organized by this unit are highly valued and well attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored or organized by this unit are valued and attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored or organized by this unit are sometimes valued and attended	Symposia, workshops, and seminars sponsored or organized by this unit are not valued and not attended		
Resources					
Facilities maintained by this unit are considered essential for other program areas	Facilities maintained by this unit are used routinely by some program areas	Facilities maintained by this unit are used infrequently by other program areas	Facilities maintained by this unit have significant overlap with other program areas		
Collections or resources (journals, specimens, samples, etc.) maintained by this unit are considered essential for other program areas	Collections or resources (journals, specimens, samples, etc.) maintained by this unit are used routinely by others	Collections or resources (journals, specimens, samples, etc.) maintained by this unit are used infrequently by others	Collections or resources (journals, specimens, samples, etc.) maintained by this unit are never used by others		

Costs/Revenue Generation (Productivity) (16)

Self-sustaining and revenue generating activity: infrastructure.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Revenue Generation					
Generates more revenue than expense	Is revenue neutral – revenue generally matches expense	Is costly, perhaps inefficient, in its use of resources	Is chronically in fiscal trouble – account deficits growing		
Has been very successful in leveraging existing resources	Has been moderately successful in leveraging existing resources	Has had limited success in leveraging existing resources	Has had very little, if any, success in leveraging existing resources		
Operating Expenses					
Core infrastructure (offices, meeting rooms and other facilities and equipment) is fully or substantially supported (100% - 75%) by non-general state funds	Core infrastructure (offices, meeting rooms and other facilities and equipment) is greatly (74% to 50%) supported by non-general state funds	Core infrastructure (offices, meeting rooms and other facilities and equipment) is partially (49% - 25%) supported by non-general state funds	Core infrastructure (offices, meeting rooms and other facilities and equipment) is barely, or not, supported by non-general state funds		
Operating costs are fully or substantially supported (100% - 75%) by non-general state funds	Operating costs are greatly (74% to 50%) supported by non-general state funds	Operating costs are partially (49% - 25%) supported by non-general state funds	Operating costs are barely, or not, supported by non-general state funds		

Specialized Niche/Competitive Advantage (12)

Uniqueness of the program; program provides a competitive advantage.

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable	SCORE
Uniqueness					
This is the only program of its kind in the state, with growing demand from the campus community and state	The program, while not unique in the state, is popular with the campus community	The program offerings are somewhat popular and overlaps with one or more UHM units	The program offerings are redundant and overlap with both UHM units and other institutions, with little demand by the campus community		
Has a strong record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a moderate record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has a weak record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people	Has no record in meeting the needs of Hawai'i and its indigenous people		
Competitive Advantage					
Program has a measureable competitive advantage over similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Program is at or near levels of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Program is somewhat below levels expected of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions	Program is far below levels expected of similar programs at nationally recognized institutions		

Please complete the below questions in one or two sentences:

1. **What are the main goals and objectives of the program?**

2. **Is the whole unit aware of the goals and objectives of the program?   Yes_____   No_____**

3. **Are there needs and demands for services that the program cannot meet?**

4. **How is the program/unit's success reviewed? By whom? How often?**

5. **Are there efficiencies that could be gained through consolidation or other means?**

Are there additional factors or considerations about this program that you believe should be considered in the prioritization process? (Please restrict responses to no more than one page, 10-point font).

Optional Guide for Administrative and Other Operations

Program Definition
For purposes of this review, a program is defined as an activity, or collection of activities, that consume resources (dollars, people, space, equipment, time). All administrative operations should be reviewed using this guide.

Departments and programs are not necessarily synonymous – a department is not necessarily a single unit, but sometimes comprised of multiple programs. For instance, Facilities and Grounds is a department, but within the department, there are several programs: project management, architectural design, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, etc.

Categorizing Programs
As a starting point for the review process, programs will be categorized into one of three areas:

1. Program is essential to the operations of any university;
2. Program is less essential, but generally included at major research universities;
3. Program is non-essential to the operation of a university.

> **For Programs in Category 1**, the focus of the review will be on efficiency and effectiveness, quality, and cost;

> **For Programs in Categories 2 and 3**, the focus will be on centrality (how it meets the central mission of the University), program quality, program needs (both why the University needs the program and what the program needs from the University), other factors such as uniqueness, and program cost, relative to benefits provided.

Review and Analysis of Programs
After developing an inventory and categorization of all programs as outlined above, administrators of these programs will be asked to provide information to assist in the review and analysis process.

Outcome of Program Review
After review and analysis, programs will be identified for one of the following actions:
1. New/In transition
2. Target for growth or investment
3. Maintenance at stable resource levels
4. Reorganize, restructure, merge or consolidate
5. Reduce in size or scope
6. Phase out, close or eliminate

Guiding Questions for the Review Process:
- What are the main goals and objectives of the program?
- What are the services it provides, and to whom (students, faculty staff, donors, other)?
- What services does it receive from others?
- On what tasks/services does this program collaborate with others?
- Are these services elsewhere available at the University? In the surrounding community?
- What is the funding source(s) (state, self-sustaining, grants, etc)? At what level?
- Are there needs and demands for services that the program cannot meet? What are they, and how do they relate to the University's mission?
- How many, and what type of staff are employed?
- What are the basic responsibilities of each position? Which individuals are cross-trained and in what areas?
- What technologies are available? Are there technological improvements that could be made to save on labor, or to improve the product/service offered? How does the program get technological support?
- How is the program's success reviewed? By whom? How often?
- What data or evidence does the program have that reflects on its performance?
- Do our peers have a similar program? How do they differ?
- What opportunities exist for greater collaboration and team approaches in the delivery of services?
- Are there efficiencies that could be gained by consolidating with a similar entity? Have such opportunities been explored before? If so, what was the outcome?
- What strategies could result in better efficiencies in the program?

Guide for Prioritization (examples)

Criteria for New or In Transition
- The program was established within the past three years and is seen to be needed
- Establishment of the program was based on demonstrated need and it appears to be meeting the need

Criteria for Growth and Investment in Program
- Need for the program is increasing due to regulatory issues, growth of unit(s) being supported, or for other articulated reasons.
- The program has received state/regional/national recognition for services.
- The program is an integral part of the university mission.

Criteria for Maintenance of Program at Stable Resource Levels
- Demand for the program has been relatively constant; program able to meet objectives.
- The program is an integral part of the university mission.
- Similar services are otherwise unavailable, or inferior.

Criteria for Reorganization, Restructuring, or Merger
- The program offers services that are not necessary to the university, or that duplicate those of one or more other units.
- Program could be more efficiently delivered in concert with other programs or by reorganizing delivery in new ways

Criteria for Reduce in Size or Scope
- Program could meet most needs even if reduced in size or scope
- Program is not fully subscribed

Criteria for Elimination
- Demand for program is low, or declining at a rapid pace.
- Services are not essential to the central mission of the university.
- Activity or services provided by the unit are inconsistent with the future direction of the University.