

Process Committee

Chancellor's charge:

Recommend a process to update/refresh
*Manoa Strategic Plan: Defining our
Destiny 2002-2010*

Recommend a process to identify campus-
wide priorities to aid in decision making of
strategic investments & reallocation

Website:

<http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/newprocess/index.html>

Guiding Documents

- ✚ UHM Strategic Plan: Defining our Destiny, 2002-2010 *<http://www.uhm.hawaii.edu/vision/>*
- ✚ WASC Institutional Proposal *<http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/wasc/proposal/>*
- ✚ UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015 *http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/uhplan/SOPM_web.html*

Chancellor's Goals for UHM

- ✚ A destination of choice for great students, faculty & staff, the citizens of Hawai'i & beyond
- ✚ A leading, global research university that meets society's needs around the world
- ✚ A respectful, inclusive community that welcomes & nurtures diversity

Committee Composition

- ✚ Four Deans recommended by MET
- ✚ Five faculty recommended by Faculty Senate
- ✚ Two APTs
- ✚ ASUH President
- ✚ GSO President

Coming Up To Speed

- ✚ Examined process at other institutions:
University of Florida, Florida International University, University of Nevada Las Vegas, Iowa State University, University of Wisconsin System, Cornell University & Washington State University
- ✚ “Decision-making in an austere environment? From Theory to Practice” presentation by Prof Tung Bui, Information Technology Management, SCB
- ✚ Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services by Robert Dickeson (1999), John Wiley & Sons, 165 pp.

Overarching Principles

- ✚ Transparency & openness
- ✚ Adequate feedback & dialog with stakeholders
- ✚ Flexible, responsive & sustainable
- ✚ Strategic cuts preferable to across-the-board
- ✚ Eliminate duplication
- ✚ Examine all programs & units objectively

Prerequisites

- ✚ Meet core needs of students
- ✚ Ensure health & safety of campus community
- ✚ Continue facilities repair & maintenance
- ✚ Enhance integrity & quality of academic/research programs
- ✚ Enhance programs serving state/national needs

Seven Criteria

- + Centrality & alignment to UHM vision
- + Quality & integrity
- + Critical mass
- + External demand
- + Internal demand
- + Costs/revenue
- + Specialized niche/competitive advantage

Sample Rubric

Very High Rating (4)	High Rating (3)	Moderate Rating (2)	Low Rating (1)	Not Applicable
<i>Vision/WASC Alignment</i>				
Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing the UHM vision.	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.	
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	

What is Being Reviewed?

- ✚ Program: any activity requiring resources (e.g. personnel, space, time, funds)
- ✚ Departments have several/many programs (e.g. BA, BS, MA, MS, PhD, certificates, tracks, areas of specialization)
- ✚ Disaggregate individual programs to assess “program creep”
- ✚ Both academic & non-academic programs (student services, organized research & administration)

Program Review Matrix

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

College-level Ranking Categories

- + New/transition: need to evaluate later
- + Growth & investment
- + Maintain as is
- + Reorganize, restructure/consolidate
- + Reduce in size/scope
- + Phase out, close/eliminate

Prioritization Steps

- ✚ Step 1. Program identification
 - In consultation with Dean/Director
- ✚ Step 2. Departmental review of programs
 - Conducted by chair/unit head in consultation with faculty/staff
 - Program rankings made public**
- ✚ Step 3. Dean/Director review & ranking
 - In consultation with advisory group of stakeholders
 - Rankings made public**
- ✚ Step 4. Vice Chancellor level review & ranking
 - In consultation with advisory group of stakeholders
 - Rankings made public**

Prioritization Steps

- ✚ Step 5. Ranking refinement at Vice Chancellor level
VCs & advisory group reviews each others rankings
& make adjustments as necessary
- ✚ Step 6. Chancellor's Advisory Committee review
Proposes strategies for resource reallocation &
strategic investments

Recommendations made public

- ✚ Step 7. Campus-wide feedback
- ✚ Step 8. Chancellor's implementation decisions
- ✚ Step 9. Implementation of actions
Consultation with UH system & collective bargaining units
- ✚ Step 10. Strategic Plan updating process

Timeline

✚ January, 2009

5-23 Feedback on draft plan from VCs, MET & MFS

26-30 Identify programs to be reviewed

✚ February, 2009

2-13 Department review its programs

16-27 College/school/ORU priority assessment

✚ March, 2009

2-13 VC reviews & makes priority assessment

16-20 VC meet to refine priority assessment

23-31 Chancellor's Advisory Committee review

Timeline

- ✚ April, 2009
 - 1-10 Advisory committee recommendations
 - 13-24 Campus-wide feedback
 - 27-30 Chancellor announces decisions
- ✚ May, 2009
 - Consultation with UH system & collective bargaining units as implementation begins
- ✚ Fall, 2009
 - Initiate new strategic planning process