MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-NIETH MEETING OF THE UH HILO STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: May 18th, 2011
Time: 8am-10am
Location: UCB 127, University Classroom Building, UH Hilo

Attendees:
Thora Abarca
Siân Millard (notes)
Kelly Burke (chair)
Karen Pellegrin
Jim Cromwell
Marcia Sakai
Mazen Hamad
Elizabeth Stacy
Maria Haws
Pila Wilson
Jackie Johnson
Harry Yada
Barry Mark

Apologies:
Kainoa Ariola
Dee Drozario
Gail Makuakane-Lundin
Tracey Niimi
Errol Yudko

Announcements/Questions from Stakeholders

Siân reported on overall results from the endorsement survey of faculty and staff. 193 respondents completed the survey in total, 172 of those were direct employees of UH Hilo. 88% of all respondent indicated that they endorsed the plan. The remainder did not endorse. The indications of endorsement split by broad respondent grouping were:

- Direct employees (172) 90%
- Tenured and tenure-track faculty (101) 91%
- Non-tenure track faculty (12) 83%
- Staff (59) (civil service, APT, E&M) 88%
- Other (21) (e.g. alumni, retired, RCUH) 76%

Members briefly considered the comments that some respondents made in the survey and noted the following:

- Several comments had been made about wanting to see explicit reference made to study-abroad opportunities and experiences. The committee noted that an action on study-abroad activities had been included in the draft strategic plan consultation and that the committee removed the action following comment that it was too specific and indeed related to the more general action on multicultural fluency.
The committee agreed though that although they would retain the implicit rather than explicit reference, they fully anticipated study-abroad to be one of the activities progressed to promote multicultural fluency within the student body.

- There was suggestion that the wording of actions 2.1 and 2.2 implied that research was of greater priority than research. The committee agreed that this was not the intention of the actions – indeed both teaching and research are meant to be conveyed as complementary and not competing. The committee therefore agreed to tweak the wording of actions 2.1 and 2.2 to better balance them.

- A few comments stated that the plan lacked specificity. The committee noted that these comments tended to come from respondents who had not endorsed the plan. The committee recognized that there is a fine balance between being too general and too specific and noted that the intention is for units to detail how they will progress the plan through implementation plans.

- The committee noted one comment that there had been lack of engagement with RCUH. Members noted that it had been difficult to contact RCUH employees at UH Hilo as there seemed to be no one email list or method of contacting them. Members also noted that the Chancellor made the decision early on in the process to have direct employees of UH Hilo on the committee.

- The committee noted that several comments made could be useful for action implementers to consider. It was also noted that similar implementation ideas had also been made in comments from the draft plan consultation. Siân agreed to pull out such references into a separate document that would be an annex to the general implementation recommendations paper.

- Some comments were made regarding uncertainty about how the plan will be implemented. The committee agreed that careful communication on how implementation will be supported should be carefully communicated during the launch of the strategic plan.

**Action 1:** Siân to tweak wording of actions 2.1 and 2.2

**Action 2:** Siân to pull out implementation recommendations/ideas from survey respondents (from draft plan consultation and endorsement).

**Action 3:** Siân to update implementation recommendations paper to include careful communication about how the plan will be implemented during the formal launch of the plan.

---

2 | *Minutes of the 28th SPC meeting (65/11)*
---

There were no additions or amendments to the minutes of the twenty-first meeting. The minutes were therefore approved.

3 | *Impact Indicators/Key Outcomes of the Strategic Plan (66/11)*
---

Siân introduced this paper and talked members through the proposed general indicators for the strategic plan. Members noted that two levels of indicators were proposed: overall and action/goal specific. The committee discussed what term the indicators should be referred by. The original term was ‘Key Performance Indicator’ but this was recognized as a not easily understandable term. Members discuss several other possible options including impact indicators, key outcomes, success indicators, scorecard, dashboard and progress indicators. Members agreed to use the term ‘progress indicator’ as it conveys a fluidity in measuring the indicator over time rather than just at the end point.

Members further noted that indicators can be qualitative and quantitative and that some may be process driven (e.g. conduct a review) and other results or target drive (e.g. improve X by Z amount).

Members focused on reviewing the proposed overall indicators for the strategic plan. Seven indicators were proposed:

Number of graduates
Number of graduates of Native Hawaiian ancestry (split by undergraduate and graduate degrees/certificates)
Six-year graduation rate
Freshman to sophomore retention rate
Level of academic challenge (NSSE)
Enriching educational experience (NSSE)
Supportive campus environment (NSSE)

The committee discussed these proposed indicators and made the following points:

- More graduates – can be facilitated by focusing on community college transfers
- Graduation rate – can be facilitated by attracting students who are better prepared and by providing support to students who need support.
- The committee noted that the indicator on more graduates and the indicator on graduate rate are not independent of each other. They further noted that it may be useful to include student transfers in the graduation, however it was also noted that the graduation rate is a standard national measure and although UH Hilo could include transfer student in the rate it won’t be possible to set a target for improvement as most other universities do not include transfers in their graduation rate calculation.
- The committee noted that the national average for graduation rate for public institutions is currently 47%. Members agreed that a target of improving UH Hilo’s graduation rate from 34% to 47% in five years was unrealistic, but they agreed that such an improvement could be achievable in five years. The committee therefore agreed to put a target of increasing the graduation rate by 1-2% per year until 2015 and then 3-4% per year until 2020. The latter target for the years from 2016-2020 is anticipation that many of the actions set out in the strategic plan that support graduation would be implemented by then and therefore the cohort of students starting in 2011 would have benefitted from them.
- The committee noted that UH Hilo’s retention rate has improved 10 points in the last decade and that it currently sits at 71%. The committee agreed that an appropriate target in this regard would be to aim for the national average retention rate by 2015 (the rate in 2008 for public universities was 77%).
- NSSE indicators. Members agreed that the broad NSSE benchmarks proposed were appropriate for assessing overall progress on the strategic plan and noted that some of the specific measures that go into forming the benchmarks may be useful indicators for unit-level implementation planning.

Members noted concern that in developing and articulating targets that an emphasis would be placed on reaching the ‘numbers’ rather than undertaking quality activities. It was noted however that the strategic plan sets out what needs to be achieved to reach the target, rather than setting the target and then determining what needs to be done. It was also noted that the term ‘target’ implies something to aim for to see how close you can get. Setting targets is risky in some respects, especially if they are not met, but they do offer something to ‘shoot for’ and something concrete to measure progress against.
| Action 4: Siân to update overall progress indicators on the basis of the committee’s discussions. |
|---|---|
| 4 | Summary and close |

Kelly closed the meeting and reminded members that the next meeting is Wednesday May 25th, 1-3pm in UCB 127