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/](http://www.uhm.hawaii.edu/vision/)
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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision/WASC Alignment</th>
<th>Very High Rating (4)</th>
<th>High Rating (3)</th>
<th>Moderate Rating (2)</th>
<th>Low Rating (1)</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing the UHM vision.</td>
<td>Can demonstrate some relation to or support of the UHM vision.</td>
<td>Limited evidence of link to or support of the UHM vision.</td>
<td>No relation to the UHM vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can demonstrate a direct link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal</td>
<td>Can demonstrate some link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal</td>
<td>Limited evidence of a link to advancing an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal</td>
<td>No relation to an area of strength identified in the WASC institutional proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Centrality/Alignment</th>
<th>Quality/Integrity</th>
<th>Critical Mass</th>
<th>External Demand</th>
<th>Internal Demand</th>
<th>Costs/Benefits</th>
<th>Specialized Niche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New/In Transition</th>
<th>Target for Growth or Investment</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Reorganize/Restructure/Consolidate</th>
<th>Reduce in Size or Scope</th>
<th>Phase Out Close Eliminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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