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Executive Summary

During the weeks of August 23 – September 13, 2010, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) Strategic Planning Working Group (SPWG) conducted an online survey to gather input from the University’s stakeholder community. The responses are part of a larger strategic planning process to update the 2002-2010 strategic plan, Defining Our Destiny. More information on the planning process can be found at the planning website, http://manoa.hawaii.edu/vision

The final report covers findings in detail by question and through a synthesis of the findings. While each question asked for specific information that could be used in the planning process, the results are most useful when aggregated across response items. Many of the themes occur throughout. This summary provides a very brief overview, but the data to support the conclusions can be found in the body of the report.

Top values: Educational effectiveness, Excellence, Research & Sustainability

- Educational effectiveness is high on everyone’s list, but qualitative data suggest this terminology is not the best way to understand it; quality teaching, learning, programs and student support fits better.
- Excellence is most often equated with quality: this applies to people, programs, and place.
- Research ranked highly with everyone but students; need to address teaching quality so it is not equated with too much research (even if only a perception) and increase undergraduate interest and knowledge of the role of research.
- Sustainability was most popular with students although some solutions cross-cut demographics: highly valued were promoting a “green” campus and UHM’s role in solving issues in state and world.
- UHM as an important asset and partner is reflected through service to state and community.

Trends: Opportunities and Threats

- Revenues top the list as the major issue facing UHM, but comments show there is greater concern that this reflects declining public support. Strong sentiment that UHM must do a better job of public relations, both in terms of getting the word out and more obvious and expanded community partnering.
- A related trend is related to declining grant funding, also linked to public support of education.
- Affordability and access are huge concerns as funding is declining. A number of suggestions want non-resident tuition and enrollment to increase to help keep costs low for local students but not decrease local access. Faculty seem less aware of this issue.
- Education isn’t just higher education; comments indicate that there is a perceived need for UHM to be more actively involved in improving K-12 education and partnering with public schools.
- A related educational issue that is very important to faculty, staff and alumni is preparedness of students for college education, particularly at a quality research university which should have high expectations for student success. This is both related to K-12 partnerships and major improvements/expansion of student support.

Cross-cutting Issues

- Native Hawaiians and UHM: strong support for our role in research, preservation and service to Hawaiian community among all respondents but some concerns about resource allocation from a vocal minority. Emphasis on increasing presence in all roles on campus and integrating concepts of Hawaiian knowledge and values across the curriculum.
- Community: Tremendous sense of pride in our diversity (beyond Hawai‘i’s own), respect for others, and the unique relationship to natural and cultural environment.
- Local vs. Global: Both are highly valued. Importance of our role in service to state and community, but don’t want that to decrease our role as gateway between the mainland and Asia-Pacific.
- Narrowed focus versus program breadth: Many comments that we should strengthen those areas of expertise (land, sea, space grant mission; Hawaiian-Pacific-Asian studies) but not lose our breadth which is seen as important to a world-class research university.
- **Efficiency**: respondents want UHM to get serious about eliminating bureaucracy, both to make everyone’s job smoother as well as cutting costs.
- **Technology**: need to do a better job of creatively applying technology to solve problems, increase efficiency, apply to learning for 21st century skills and distance education, and communications within and beyond the institution.
- **Workforce education**: some sense that this term is seen as inappropriate for a research university and more suitable to community colleges. Need to stress the values seen in specific areas where we provide specialized professional and advanced education needed for the state. Also some interest in expansion of programs more widely to state via technology.
Introduction

During the weeks of August 23 – September 13, 2010, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Strategic Planning Working Group (SPWG) conducted an online survey to gather input from the University’s stakeholder community. The responses are part of a larger strategic planning process to update the 2002-2010 strategic plan, Defining Our Destiny. More information on the planning process can be found at the planning website, http://manoa.hawaii.edu/vision

The report is organized by question, reporting findings for each and showing the data summaries. Data tables are provided for questions that had quantitative responses to Likert-scale and ranking questions. Some short answer responses are numerically summarized by conversion to numerical results. In these cases, differences were examined among different stakeholder groups: faculty, staff, students, and alumni.

For open-ended questions, the raw data is extensive with most questions having over 800 individual responses, representing tens of thousands of answers that are rich and thoughtful. However, efforts were needed to summarize these to provide results that are potentially useful in the planning process. To help readers better understand the range of responses and the categories developed in analysis, a single question (question 12) is shown with each category and multiple verbatim responses for each. The other open-ended questions are summarized with the most common categories and a short sample of responses to provide an overview of the major issues identified by respondents. Because similar responses are repeated across questions, the short summaries for each question are sufficient for identifying major trends and issues. Where variations from previous responses were found in the qualitative analysis, these are explicitly noted.

While each question asked for specific information that could be used in the planning process, the results are most useful when aggregated across response items and this is done in the final section as well as briefly in the executive summary. The summary provides such an overview, but the data to support conclusions can be found in the body of the report.

Many of the respondents indicated that they both appreciated the effort to collect their ideas and concerns, and noted that it was important that their responses be used and shared. Further, the survey was seen as a good start to raising awareness of the planning process and soliciting broad feedback. Through this report and additional planning activities, the concerns and innovative ideas proposed can be described, discussed and included in the 2011 plan.
Methodology

From August 23 – September 13, 2010, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Strategic Planning Working Group (SPWG) conducted an online survey to gather input from the University’s stakeholder community. The responses are part of a larger strategic planning process to update the 2002-2010 strategic plan, *Defining Our Destiny*. This section provides information on the survey design and limitations and weaknesses.

Participants

Participants were recruited from the UHM community, with faculty, staff, students, alumni, and interested community members as the target population for the survey. Participants were invited to respond to the survey through email messages sent to the UHM all-campus announcements email list and through constituency groups including the UHM Alumni Association. The survey was also promoted through information sessions with school and college leadership groups. To increase participation, reminder messages were sent at three intervals to the campus announcement list. Individuals were encouraged to forward the emails to others who might be interested. The survey was highlighted on the Mānoa web home page throughout the survey period.

Demographics of respondents are provided in the next section. Individuals self-selected to respond and no verification was required for entry to allow for maximum stakeholder input. While there are not obvious attempts to influence the outcome of the survey phase of the planning process, exact counts of respondents are not reliable. Any email address, even faked ones, could be used for login, and it was possible for an individual or program to access the survey multiple times. The term respondent as used in this report represents the unique times the survey was completed but may not be equivalent to individuals.

Survey Design

The online survey instrument included 46 questions, with a mix of Likert-scale, short answer and open-ended questions. A total of 1313 surveys were submitted.

The survey questionnaire was created by the Strategic Planning Working Group based on example surveys developed by other higher education institutions doing strategic planning and from concepts in existing UHM planning documents and institutional reports. It covered institutional values, environmental trends expected to impact the University both positively and negatively, and areas for potential growth and change. In addition, the survey asked respondents to comment on the relationship to two external criteria which impact internal planning: the University of Hawaii System Strategic Plan and the WASC standards by which the institution accreditation is examined. A complete set of questions is included in Appendix 1.

The survey is one step in information gathering for an updated strategic plan. The process is premised on both having a starting point that is not completely open and several steps to collect input. Questions on the survey were developed to build on the current strategic plan, *Defining Our Destiny*, and lead to a revision rather than the more in-depth process required for a new plan as indicated in the charge to the Working Group. As such, questions were not designed to explore broad new arenas but relate to specific values and goals in place. The survey attempted to mix quantitative questions designed to cover specific issues important to the plan update and open-ended questions that elicited comments that may not have been considered by the survey designers.

In some cases, the original questions had to be modified slightly because of limitations in the online survey tool used. Not all types of questions were possible, such as ranking or matching questions, and presentation limitations precluded long lists of options.

Data Collection

Data were collected automatically by the online survey tool, SurveyShare.com, a commercial web-based product. Participants were asked to provide an email address as an identifier, but this information served as a mechanism for re-entry and was not verified. Based on statistics provided by the tool, most respondents took approximately 25-30 minutes to complete the questions. An exact time requirement cannot be calculated as the statistics include timeframes of days for those who left the survey and returned later. The tool produced several
reports including a numerical file of responses designed for use in statistical software and a text-based file of responses by question or respondent appropriate for qualitative study.

A few technical issues with the survey were due to limitations in the software selected and provided at no cost by UH Information Technology Services (ITS) that could not be overcome. Only one person indicated issues in completing the survey to us, but we agree the design might have been better with a different tool.

Data Analysis and Reporting

Raw data from the files downloaded from SurveyShare.com were imported into Excel and cleaned for use in a standard statistics program, PASW (formerly SPSS). Cleaning involved eliminating those entries that were empty (seven respondents) and recoding some demographic data such as school/college that were not in numerical format. This also required that those with multiple affiliations such as staff enrolled as students, or faculty who were also alumni, be recoded for easy case selection within PASW. In a very small number of cases, recoding was done to correct some affiliations, in cases where GA’s identified as faculty or students at community colleges identified themselves as enrolled students at UHM. No qualitative responses were cleaned or recoded. Quantitative responses were analyzed by frequencies of all responses, and where there were large differences, by cases related to self-selected affiliation (student, faculty, staff, alumni).

Short-answer questions were coded by categorizing and counting text. In several cases, the consistency of responses within a limited set of categories, primarily those proposed in earlier questions, allowed these to be converted to numerical responses and analyzed for frequencies and respondent affiliation. These short-answer text to numeric questions are clearly noted in the sections below, and the number of non-conforming or variation responses indicated.

Open-ended questions were analyzed using standard qualitative methods. Responses were initially coded into categories related to the quantitative questions, with additional categories added when responses suggested an area not addressed in the survey design. These categories are best explored and explained in the categorical description of Question 12 as a way to make the analysis process more transparent and providing a wide range of quoted responses. In addition to the formal themes used in coding, in every question there are comments that are unique and are not easily related to the dominant themes in the responses. In some cases, these are issues within a single department, a remark about a particular person or incident that occurred on campus, or an off-hand comment about university life. Typically no examples are given of these in the report, in part because of inappropriate language or libel issues as well as the lack of support from other respondents to the issue raised. Also, because the survey was open and lacked controls to prevent multiple entries by a single respondent, some open-ended responses are counted once when the same words, misspellings, and grammar indicated a cut-and-paste process occurred multiple times. In the report, numbers report unique responses rather than total responses to adjust for this limitation. The sheer quantity of data precludes inclusion of every minor theme with few responses in this report. It should be noted that with tens of thousands of open-ended responses, all could not be cited verbatim in the report but attempts have been made to ensure various viewpoints are represented and the major areas addressed by respondents are included. As the writing groups are formed for the revised strategic plan, additional data could be made available to help define identified issues.

The analysis was assisted by doctoral students in a research methods course in the College of Education (see “Acknowledgements,” below). During the course, the students, who represented both education and other non-education Ph.D programs, analyzed the qualitative data from open-ended questions through inductive, in vivo and value coding, then theme development, discussed the meaning of these in relation to quantitative results, raised questions about the contexts, and developed initial write-ups to link the concepts in a meaningful narrative. They further reviewed the drafts of this report to help ensure the material included was representative of the full range of responses and viewpoints. This active involvement not only provided the opportunity for hands-on learning with real-world data but served as a way to verify coding through inter-rater reliability and independent coding consistency checks. Further, these students provided a student perspective to balance what was sometimes a faculty/administrative view of the planning process. In all cases, the doctoral students went well beyond course requirements in providing assistance with the analysis. However, final coding, themes and reporting were determined by the SPWG. Results are reported here as edited by the SPWG members. In some cases, unedited answers are included in the appendices by coding category. This serves both to reveal the context as seen by respondents as well as a mechanism for validation for the reader.
Limitations and Weaknesses

A small number of respondents raised concerns about anonymity and confidentiality. There is no record of email addresses associated with the response data and it is not possible to determine who completed the survey. Email addresses were collected to allow re-entry not to validate respondents. Unless a respondent provided enough detail in the optional final demographic section to be identifiable, there is no information to connect responses with specific individuals. Responses are reported only by broad groupings and the demographic information provided will not be published or shared outside the working group.

As an open and online survey, the findings should be interpreted as reflecting broad trends but not statistically significant conclusions. It was not intended to be a validated scientific research study. Individuals who understood the openness may have taken advantage to enter and complete the survey more than once. Self-reported demographic data makes it possible to assume identities within a demographic cluster to which an individual does not actually belong. The survey itself was long and may have discouraged completion by those not highly motivated and somewhat informed on University issues. There was an emphasis on having open-ended questions to allow for collecting ideas in arenas where responses were not predictable, an ideal process for qualitative analysis but requiring more time to analyze and provide trustworthy results. However, the numerous respondents, the thoughtful and varied answers on open-ended questions, and the commitment seen from those who did complete the survey to the University’s future are highly indicative that the responses are meaningful about stakeholder perceptions and an important contribution that must be considered as the plan develops.
Demographics (Q32-45)

The final section of the survey asked a series of questions (questions 32-45) about the persons who responded to the survey. These data are self-reported. The demographics were used in statistical analyses to show differences in frequencies among the various stakeholder groups. Although the survey was anonymous, 43 responders did not provide responses in the demographic section. Comments in a final open question suggest concerns by some about being identified. These responders are reported in the following pages in total categories. Seven responders submitted a survey but the responses were blank and these are not included in the reported data. Online surveys that were paused and not submitted by the responder were not saved nor counted by the online survey software; these could not be retrieved.

Total surveys submitted: 1313
Total completed surveys: 1306

Responder Type

UHM Faculty: 345
UHM Staff: 123

UHM Students enrolled Fall 2010: 506
UHM Students not UH faculty or staff: 459*

Faculty/staff other UH institution: 63

UHM Alumni (includes UHM faculty, staff, students): 511
UHM Alumni from community: 183*

Interested Community Members: 90

Demographic data not completed: 43

Faculty Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position (n=345)</th>
<th>College or School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor: 118</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences: 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor: 62</td>
<td>Business: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor: 46</td>
<td>Education: 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist: 37</td>
<td>Engineering: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research: 21</td>
<td>CTARH: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library: 11</td>
<td>Architecture: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 49</td>
<td>Hawaiian Knowledge: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data provided: 1</td>
<td>Law: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine: 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing/Dental Hygiene: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOEST: 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific/Asian: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No data provided: 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students (includes enrolled UH faculty, staff)</th>
<th>Students (not faculty or staff)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate: 252</td>
<td>Undergraduate: 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate: 228</td>
<td>Graduate: 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate: 7</td>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified: 12</td>
<td>Unclassified: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 5</td>
<td>Other: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response: 2</td>
<td>No response: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This figure is used in the following analyses indicating group responses. No responder is counted twice.
Institutional Values (Q3-7)

The initial questions on the survey after two screening items covered institutional values. The information preceding the value questions noted, “Institutional values set the foundation for a strategic plan by showing what matters to us both as an institution and as individuals.”

The list of values in question 3 was taken from the “Mission” and “Vision” sections in Defining Our Destiny, including one value used as an acronym (respect). These were each rated on a Likert-scale of 1-4. Question 4 was a selection question asking for a top choice among five additional values and is reported below.

These were followed by three short answer questions (Q5-7) asking responders to submit their top three choices for institutional values. The open-ended format allowed for inclusion of additional value statements not in the current strategic plan. The results will be included in the final report, but initial review of responses on the short answer inquiry indicates the values in question 3 and 4 were selected by most respondents.

Not all responders completed every question, but a 95% average response rate was found for each of these items. The percentages shown in the table are based on those who responded for each item.

### Institutional Values by Percent of Total Responding (Q3 in Rank Order by Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4.00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Effectiveness</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, Society &amp; Arts</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. Development</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Top Three Value Responses (Q3) in Rank Order by Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the top three are generally consistent, greater variability was found in remaining values and these are not included in the table. Note that students ranked research as sixth among the full list. Sustainability was the third ranked value among students. For students, sustainability ranked third, and this is reflected in the next table.
Other Values (Q4)

In addition to the values from Defining Our Destiny, several other values were identified by the Strategic Planning Working Group from more recent UHM and System documents. Because these values have been used in setting goals and budget priorities, a separate question (Q4) asked specifically about five other values. These are summarized below.

Other Values by Percent of Responders (Q4)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>All n=1299</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to state/community</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity &amp; ethics</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian community/legacy</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The top value for each category is shaded to highlight differences and similarities.

Short Answer Institutional Value Questions (Q5-7)

Questions 5, 6 and 7 asked “Which THREE institutional values do you think are most important to include in the 2010-2015 strategic plan? You may include any of those above or add your own.” Three short answer boxes were provided which were ordered Value 1, Value 2, and Value 3. While not explicitly in order of importance, a weighted total was calculated (see paragraph 3) which assumed that the first value was most important to respondents who placed it there.

Although the option was presented to input other values, most respondents either copied directly the values from questions 3 and 4, or wrote a variation on the values given. In a few cases where block responses were detected, the multiple entries were counted as one.

In the following table, the value statements as they appeared in the initial questions are given, along with the number of respondents who selected it in either question 5-7, the number who ranked it as first priority, a total weighted value (first priority=3, second priority=2, third-1), and the number of variations on the value statement. The table is ordered by weighted rank. However, weight and value 1 are closely related and the order is similar although not exact. These qualitative data were not analyzed by demographic.

The column for variations counts those responses that were modified from the text provided in questions 3 and 4, but where the response clearly related to a coding category in analysis. All these altered statements appear in the appendices to provide insight into the potential meanings the values have for respondents. By presenting the data showing the coding scheme, it is also possible for others to assess whether they agree with the placement as any categorization will have slight differences among coders. However, the preponderance of the statements are exact copies of shortened versions of the values in Questions 3 and 4.

A total of 83 respondents wrote phrases that either record unique values or were one of only several who selected an alternative to those from questions 3 and 4. This list is also included in the appendices.
**Value Priorities ordered by Weighted Ranking (Q5-7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total respondents selecting as priority 1, 2 or 3</th>
<th>Number of respondents ranking first</th>
<th>Weighted ranking</th>
<th>Number of unique variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to community &amp; state</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity &amp; ethics</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian community/legacy</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, society &amp; the arts</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example unique response variations for top categories (Q5-7)**

Quoted below are some of the variants that are helpful in understanding the way terms were interpreted by respondents. A complete list of variants for the five top ranked institutional values in Q5-7 is included in Appendix 2 as these may be helpful in plan writing and in decreasing ambiguity that can arise with value terms.

**Educational Effectiveness**
- Academic Achievement
- Being able to educate the diverse classroom
- Commitment to learning as a lifelong necessity
- Education that fits the needs of the future of Hawai‘i
- Graduating students that have the knowledge and ability to think
- Improving graduation/retention rate
- Making students and their education priority
- Teaching Effectiveness
- Undergraduate experience (notice experience not education)

**Excellence**
- Attracting high quality students and faculty
- Continuous, Quality Improvements
- Excellence...which will lead to being in the forefront of change...
- Reputation at every level from local to global

**Research**
- Cutting edge research (& grant funding)
- Integration of research at all levels and every aspect of campus life
- Research, including focus on solving Hawai‘i’s problems

**Sustainability**
- Create a Sustainable Campus
- Environmental innovation (green campus, bike friendly, energy independent)
External Environmental Factors (Q8-12)

Questions 8 through 12 dealt with the environmental factors that respondents considered important for strategic planning. The introduction to this section of the survey stated, “Many changes in UHM’s external environment provide opportunities and challenges that should be considered in a strategic plan. Some national trends that have been commonly described in both popular media and academic publications as impacting higher education are listed below.” Question 8 listed some of these factors and respondents rated their importance on a five-point Likert-scale. Questions 9-11 were short answer, asking responders to list the three trends considered most important. Question 12 was open-ended asking how these might best be addressed.

Trends by Percent of Total Responses (Q8 in rank order by mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Less important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>Mean (max = 5.00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability of public education</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining state revenues for higher education</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining public support for higher education</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap between entry expectations and student preparedness for higher education</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid changes in technology</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing competition for grant funding</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing workforce demands</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising costs of energy and raw materials</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls by multiple stakeholders for greater accountability</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater demographic variability of prospective students</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition from other institutions</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Top Three Trend Responses (Q8 in rank order by group) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability of public education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining state revenues for higher education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining public support for higher education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap between entry expectations and student preparedness for higher education</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 9-11 were short-answer questions designed to have individuals rank by importance their top three external issues while allowing the option of adding trends that were not included in the list provided in question 8. While the potential was there for expanding the list, this was not commonly done and most answers were either copied from the earlier question or were minor variants of the list. Two new trends were given by respondents that had not been in the initial list from question 8: local and global changes in economy, and globalization. The table below is ordered by weighted ranking, calculated by response numbers X weighted factor (first=3, second=2, third=1). The tabled indicates total responses across all priorities for a trend, those ranking it first, and the weighted ranking. The last column indicates the number of responses in which the original statement in the question was modified by the respondent but still carried a similar meaning.

**External Environmental Factors ordered by Weighted Ranking (Q9-11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total respondents selecting as priority 1, 2 or 3</th>
<th>Number of respondents ranking first</th>
<th>Weighted ranking</th>
<th>Number of unique variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declining state revenues for higher education/funding streams</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability of public education</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining public support for higher education</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising costs of energy and raw materials/sustainability</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid changes in technology</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap between entry expectations and student preparedness for higher education</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing workforce demands</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing competition for grant funding</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition from other institutions</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and global changes in economy*</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls by multiple stakeholders for greater accountability</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater demographic variability of prospective students</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Note that these trends were not included in the list from Q8 although a number of respondents rated each as important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example unique response variations for top three categories (Q9-11)**

Listed below are some of the variants written by respondents coded in the top three categories that are helpful in understanding the way terms were interpreted by them.

**Declining state revenues for higher education/funding streams**
- Budget cuts have undermined potential for future accomplishments
- Creativity in fund raising because of competition for monies
- Declining state revenues for higher education and the belief that they are not needed
- Pressure to control costs
- Securing money as top priority (negative) over educational values

**Affordability of public education**
- Accessibility to higher education - cost prohibitive
• Funding of the college—students cannot afford to keep paying rising tuition rates
• Increased cost of living compared to average income in the Hawaii region
• Rapidly rising costs in higher ed; concern over rising student debt
• Students often hold full-time jobs just to make ends meet.

Declining public support for higher education
• Anti-intellectualism in public and policy makers and thus lack of support for universities
• Changing attitudes of Hawaii’s business towards supporting U.H.
• Frustration with/distrust of publicly funded educational institutions in Hawaii
• Lack of understanding of what a research university is in the community
• The diminishing faith of the public in our government and their affiliates.

Internal trends included by respondents (Q9-11)

A number of added trends were not external factors but issues that are internal to UHM. The list below shows internal factors and counts for each in total across the three questions; these are smaller in number than those choosing external factors and all are covered in more detail as responses to later questions. In addition, 91 responses were unique issues that were coded as “other.”

• Efficiency (18)
• Educational issues (29)
• Faculty (44)
• Leadership (14)
• Native Hawaiian inclusion (23)
• Physical plant (23)
• Students (31)

Trends and Proposed UHM Responses (Q12)

Question 12 represents the first open-ended inquiry on the survey, asking individuals to consider the trends they selected and their ideas for responding to these. The question specifically asked, “Given changing external factors, what is one thing you think UHM might/must do to improve its ability to effectively address the most critical factor(s)?” The box for typing an answer was expandable, allowing respondents to enter as much or as little text as necessary.

Eight respondents answered indicating they did not have a comment. The other responses are summarized by topic below. Many of the respondents simply indicated that one environmental factor or another should be or needed to be addressed, for example: tuition needs to be kept affordable so students can afford to attend. These responses are counted in the summaries below but the focus in the report is on those with more specific strategies and areas for change and improvement. In some cases, the categories show a degree of overlap and these are noted.

Because this is the first open question, it is described in greater detail than later questions in the report as the themes from responses that appear here are common in most other questions. Multiple examples are provided for each theme as a way to show the most common variations while fewer examples are included for later questions. The theme summaries not only cover the responses for this question, but preview the remainder of the report as common themes are repeated continually through all survey responses. In fact, because respondents often have specific issues they believe need to be addressed, in some cases the responses are more oriented towards expressing concerns rather than answering a particular question asked and so themes almost always cross-cut the survey.

In general, the themes match the issues that have appeared in the quantitative and short-answer questions but the survey’s open-ended questions help put the terms used in values, trends and priorities in context. The listed themes below are in order by number of responses on question 12.

The responses that are cited are quoted exactly as written, without an effort to correct spelling or grammatical errors. Demographics are not included as it was beyond the scope of this analysis to provide such detail. In general, the open-ended responses are intended to give scope to the survey but should not be interpreted as all possible opinions, given the thousands of responses contributed. The examples paint a broad picture of the UHM community and are not intended to be more than an initial view of stakeholder concerns to guide the next steps in planning.
Public support and outreach (138 responses)

Although revenues and affordability were highest ranked in the quantitative questions related to external trends as shown in the tables above, “public support” was the most discussed issue in the responses to question 12. In part, this is because declining revenues, especially from the state over the past two years, are linked by respondents to the public’s perceptions of and willingness to fund public education. Responses covered concerns with improving links to community organizations, actively working with the legislature, increasing marketing and media coverage to enhance the reputation of UHM, and actively reporting on the benefits that come from a research institution. The range of responses includes:

- Public relations to educate citizens of the state about the crucial role of higher education in contributing to a prosperous economy and a culturally rich society.
- There is very little local support and/or demand for quality, higher education in the State. For the most part, many people do not see a need for, nor fully appreciate, the university.
- We need to do a much better job of informing local students of the value and quality of a Manoa education and we need to ensure that we provide both.
- Declining support and state revenues indicate that public and legislature to do not see UHM as essential, we must make ourselves essential.
- Have strong lobbying support in legislature to secure proper funds for facilities and support for students and professors.
- Decide what the soul of the institution is, then accurately and aggressively explain/market/sell that to stakeholders and potential stakeholders in Hawaii and elsewhere.
- Emphasize the overall benefits to individuals, families and society of higher education, both in terms of quality of life, future of the state, and economic value.
- Make sure the public, legislature and governor understand how much UH contributes to the local economy.
- Do a much better job at educating the public and politicians on the unique role of UHM, its excellent return on investment, and essential role in helping address the coming energy resource crisis that will impact Hawaii disproportionately.
- UH Manoa is the major higher education players to educate the Hawaii workforce. Many individuals, (including lawmakers, health care workers and business players), were educated at UH. We must make the public aware that investing in UH is an investment in the education of Hawaii. At the same time, we must provide an effective, high-quality education to students who become a great proportion of the Hawaii workforce.
- Communicate to the public how much higher education impacts all phases of life, not just employment. For example, I am a much better parent because I received a higher education. Likewise, I am a better citizen, etc.
- Communicate, communicate, communicate, both internally and externally. Remember that LISTENING is 50% of communication.
- Demand that the state invest more on education. Everyone needs money, but education is an investment that takes time to realize returns. In 5-10 years we are all going to pay sorely for the shortsightedness of underfunding education today. Wake people in the legislature up, or demand that voters put different people in office.
- Get more people involved...ask alumni to help support and continue this worthy institution.
- We must be excel in service to our students and our local community. The community must see UHM as a place that provides a great education and is active in finding long term solutions to the problems of Hawaii. Support from the Native Hawaiian community is essential to making this a place of Hawaiian learning and will give UHM a unique competitive edge with other universities around the country.
- Strengthening public and political outreach to keep building the case for adequate financial support as an investment in the future of the community and society.
• **UHM must make known to the general public (the taxpayers) that funding UHM should be a priority and that this institution has contributed so much to the state. The contributions and accomplishments of UH to the state of Hawaii are oftentimes understated and taken for granted.**

• **It needs to send a clear message that it is there to serve and that is earnestly seeking to be more accessible and to improve the quality of the education offered--that it is a center of innovation and ideas, a source for spreading concepts of social justice and improving the society, that it is not engaged in war research and other detrimental activities, and that it wants to include students of all backgrounds, orientations, and ethnicity.**

• **Greater outreach and PR with public, politicians, and policy makers.**

• **Continue to work hard on showing the value to the public of research and public higher education at UH. Education and research are not good candidates for budget cuts if Hawaii is to remain a part of the first world.**

• **UHM needs an identity overhaul that begins with more outreach into our island communities. Leadership should be more representative of our local cultures and reflect a level of respect, service, educational excellence and progressive thinking that we wish to impart upon our students and State. We can do more to develop successful collaborations with local industry, businesses, environmental and human services ~ collective action will be necessary for the University's survival and sustainability.**

**Access and affordability (81)**

Affordability and access may be a hot topic issue with the national media, but from a UHM perspective, the concern is put entirely in local terms. The issues of affordability and access primarily revolve around the costs for Hawaii students and the need seen by respondents to ensure the ability of state residents to attend UHM. However, a few responses raised the issue of costs for those who pay non-resident tuition as well. While many simply indicated that tuition and fees needed to be low or sufficient financial aid be available, others noted that there were many costs contributing to affordability, including the high cost of living in Hawaii, particularly housing. Even the costs of textbooks and supplies were raised as a concern in some responses. Respondents suggested that revenues be increased in new areas specifically to help students with the costs of college, including fundraising for scholarships, increasing enrollment and raising tuition for international students to help subsidize local tuition costs, and lowering the costs of textbooks. Some raised concerns about how tuition was being spent, pushing to ensure it was used for instructional purposes. Example responses include:

• **Fundraising to help get more grants to students who cannot take out loans in order to expand the amount of enrollees to UHM.**

• **Raise tuition and increase scholarships for those who need them.**

• **Acquire nearby property to be used as affordable off campus housing.**

• **Since the tuition increases each year due to economical issues, they should compensate by making things cheaper in the bookstore or increasing the amount of on-campus jobs they offer.**

• **UHM must continue to keep the affordability of public education low to increase the number of students. This could increase revenue, make competition of other institutions less, and increase the number of prospective students.**

• **I suggest that the school should consider reaching out the local community to help financially fund for grants to help local students to go to school.**

• **What the tuition of students fund. For example, the creation of new buildings and renovations. (Building new things when money should be spent elsewhere.) Hiring better teachers.**

• **If UH keeps raising costs that students have to pay, there needs to be more dramatic improvements in all facilities around the University. I feel the school enrolls more students than it can handle appropriately for the amount of services they provide for such a huge and unique demographic of people attending it.**

• **Raise tuition! Cutting faculty and instructional support and salaries is a short-sighted solution to our budget difficulties. Tuition and fees are ridiculously low compared to mainland institutions.**

• **It needs to find a way to fund its programs without making education an exercise in lifelong debt for its students. It doesn't have a strong sense of undergraduate community so I wonder if it gets much help from satisfied alumni.**
• Create more opportunities for students to study for a lower cost, so they in turn will donate in the future.
• UH, taking a good hard look at who's getting paid how much, and then adjusting it to tend to the needs of the *students* by giving the *students* the opportunity to make those decisions.
• Control costs, so that tuition incentives can be offered to meritorious students to make higher education more affordable. We are currently experiencing a global recession. And therefore international students, who pay non-resident tuition rates, are severely affected by UHM's rising non-resident tuition.
• If the recession continues, more students and parents will not be able to afford college tuition. Solution is to seek more public funding or partner with private sector for scholarships and grants.
• Try to increase awareness of the affordability of student aids for both current students and prospective student through ads or word of mouth. Many students are unaware of the aids and scholarships available.

**Fees (16).** A particular aspect of affordability was an issue raised by respondents who are upset by fee increases and the impact on affordability for students. The overall costs of fees and tuition are what students consider when examining affordability. Some of the concern over costs targets the new athletic fee in particular, a response that is raised by small numbers throughout the open-ended questions. For example,

• UHM needs to get its priorities straight. Applying a $50 tax on all undergrads to subsidize the athletic department is the wrong thing to do at any time, but is especially wrong headed now.
• This school offers excellence in education and with its talented faculty. I am very pleased with what I have experienced. However, cost is a continuing concern for all students and I would like to see that some of the attached fees to tuition be reconsidered, such as the fee pertaining to athletics.
• Need to lower costs of everything for the student. We pay for tuition and many other things. Why do we, the students, have to pay so much just to get to school or eat at school. It's absolutely stupid. The athletic fee is outrageous for the general student body to have to pay for the funding of mostly the football team when they have enough funding for themselves through sponsorship and fundraising. The school needs to reasse their distribution on funding to the people and groups that need it most.
• Developing a creative revenue creation system without just raising tuition and fee.

**Efficiency in operations and processes (54) and leadership (18)**

An underlying theme was the need for greater efficiency in operations and the importance of quality leadership. This is a strongly advocated theme that includes a large number of responses in many of the questions below. Building on concerns about the budget process and a perception of a growing and expensive administrative overhead, there were comments suggesting further examination of leadership structures and a set of responses very critical of leadership efforts. Many respondents commented that far too little has been done in terms of decreasing bureaucracy and streamlining administrative processes as a way to cut costs overall. Inefficient operations are seen as impeding productivity in all positions and decreasing quality in everything from teaching to physical plant and infrastructure improvements. Efficiency and leadership are seen as critical to dealing with decreased revenues, potentially resulting in high cost savings. This is one area where there is complete respondent agreement with no expressed alternative perception of effectiveness.

• Learn to become more agile/responsive and re-engineer processes to make them less labor intensive and more efficient.
• UH must prioritize and utilize resources effectively in order to justify getting increased resources from both public and private sources.
• Lessen layers of administration to streamline decision-making and allow funds to be put into front line services.
• UHM's processes and procedures are getting too bureaucratic to move forward with any significant initiatives. UHM must first streamline the infrastructure (fiscal, admin, research, ...) to be user/customer centric.
• Invest in efficiency systems: automated lighting, security, parking control; streamline fiscal processes so that spending is more timely, efficient, and requires fewer persons handling everything.
• Departments need to be more efficient and strive for more funding on their own.
• Address the issue of variable employee productivity and performance
• UH needs to consider an overhaul on a lot of the student services including financial aid, billing, registrations (regular and summer semesters) and maybe cut out a lot of the unneeded jobs in order to help save some money for the school! key concept: streamline the processes!

• Develop the institution and leadership to be able to handle changing variables that will always be present. So far what my impression is that the institution and leadership are having a hard time adapting to changing environment.

• Allow greater flexibility on the requirements for reporting and accounting. UHM is increasingly asked to be innovative but we are suffocated by fiscal and other reporting requirements. I understand the need to be accountable to the public, but we cannot be innovative unless we are given some leeway. This is not an impossible request to address, because a comparison with other institutions shows that we are more bureaucratic.

• Improve the IT infrastructure, business processes, and training of staff to support academic, research and service functions of UHM. Most of the business actions are paper based with the manner in which IT business processes function are as expensive type writers--paper is still what drives any action. With shrinking dollars, IT infrastructure can help make these business process more efficient and effective.

• Effective leadership and management is lacking. We can no longer survive in this current day and age doing things the old 'state' way. Its time to look at ourselves as a business and not as a state entity.

• Reform begins at the top. We need administrators with imagination, courage, creativity, a commitment to UH, and an understanding of what teaching and research really mean.

• Ensure UHM has the best possible leaders in place who fully understand the challenges and are willing to lead by example in determining and implementing solutions.

• UHM needs to get rid of administrators who are afraid of change, do not see the need for innovation and excellence, and who are deadwood in our system. Hawaii, and thus UHM, will remain a colonized place until we begin to respect ourselves and believe that we can indeed be excellent and competitive. Raise the bar for everyone.

Finding an institutional “focus” (70)

Just as efficiency is seen as a key to decreasing costs in operations, “focus” is a parallel concept in terms of best supporting UHM’s teaching and research missions. Following in the path established by the Budget Priority process last year, a number of respondents indicated the need to focus and improve areas in which UHM excels. This is often proposed as a critical issue given declining state revenues; focusing on fewer programs is associated with high cost savings. While this theme has many responses here and in questions reported below, there is not necessarily unanimity in the direction “focus” should take. A number of respondents indicated traditional areas of land, sea, and space grant institutions as well as Hawaiian and Pacific-Asian studies, but there was equal concern that focus not decrease breadth of programs which is seen as an institutional advantage in a state without other research-intensive public universities.

• Focus on our strengths and our uniqueness: a university that attracts a broad variety of international students and with a strong connection to the host culture; global perspectives and indigenous perspectives should be integrated into the curricula in all disciplines.

• Strive for excellence and relevance in strategic discipline areas and become global leaders in those fields.

• Focus on what we do best: link the rest of the US to Asia and the Pacific. Focus on what we do best, for example topical agriculture and natural resources, Asian languages, ocean and earth science, astronomy Embrace new technology in education and communications.

• Focus on its mission of research and graduate education; raise admission criteria for undergraduates so you get the best of the best. reduce the number of degrees especially in the undergraduate level. build on your strengths. move undergraduate ed and nursing to west oahu.

• Have the courage to cut programs of low demand by students and build programs with high demand or high expected demand.

• Focus on providing excellent educational opportunities for our children - meaning emphasis on an all round education that supports critical thinking skills and promotes innovative thinking.
• Allocate all resources, money, grants, etc., in an effective way such that, while keeping a diverse budget for all things within the plan, the focus is on improving upon facilities, services, distribution of information and educational effectiveness for the overall well-being of current students and as a measure of having a strong educational infrastructure for future students.

• Focus on Native Hawaiian community, culture, language and stewardship in the place in which the school is located. Set an example for proper respect for the people and traditions on whose land you are living and operating.

• Increase support for strong programs and programs critical to Hawai‘i, and cut elsewhere. When faced with conflicts, focus on strength instead of breadth. Focus especially on strong programs with natural ties to Hawai‘i’s unique environment -- e.g., Asia & Pacific, tropics.

• U.H. needs to stay grounded in a firm understanding of its strategic educational mission and location in the world; and resist getting caught up in mission creep; attempts to become a rival to Stanford, etc. as an institution driven by the needs and desires of research grant (quest for more indirect cost money); and cannot abandon its connection to the Hawaiian people and other indigenous peoples.

• Increase emphasis on the humanities in a multicultural context, emphasizing the responsibility of learners to devote their lives to enhancing societal cohesiveness, preserving respect for all forms of life, and thinking ahead seven generations.

• The University is going to have to decide it's future on a much more specialized track than the current broad based offering of degree programs at the undergraduate and graduate level. There simply aren't the resources to support programs, both academic and non-academic, that aren't mission critical to the advancement of the University in terms of leadership, excellence, and respect in sphere of academia. In order to compete, the University is going to have to carve its niche so that both the public and opinion leaders can have the confidence that their return on investment is beneficial not only to the students but to the community and the state at large.

• Retool and consolidate to focus on selective excellence. Focus resources on only those areas in which we have a solid reputation, e.g. astronomy, marine sciences, business, etc. Fiscal and logistical realities should dictate that it is unrealistic and impractical for a university of this size to try to cover all aspects of research and education equally. It is a higher education equivalent of the no child left behind act, whereby the presence of 'slower' learners results in the overall level of the entire class declining.

• A concerted effort to *focus* the university and its limited resources appropriately. I would say that this focus needs to be done at many levels, e.g., focus on particular areas of strength, such as Asia/Pacific, as well as certain disciplines that are already strong (I will not mention which ones). By so doing, we will be more competitive relative to other institutions since we will take advantage of strengths we already possess.

• UH must continue to innovate and provide the world with cutting edge research that can best be done in Hawai‘i. They must find their strengths in the global education market and foster them until they are seen as global leaders. Redefining required coursework, and allowing students to more fully follow their passions will assist this process.

• UH must realize that it cannot excel if it tries to be all things to all people. Need to decide what areas to focus on and become a leader in those areas. By trying to be all things to all people, the resources of the university will be spread too thin and we will be mediocre in all that we do.

• UHM cannot continue to do everything for everyone. The curriculum must be scaled back and focus on those skills needed in Hawaii. For example, the College of Education must be expanded and provide top-notch instruction to support the educational needs of Hawaii. Incentives must be created to keep these teachers on the job and working in Hawaii.

**Revenues and budget (66)**

Revenues topped the list in the quantitative questions about external trends, but it did not garner as many responses in question 12. In part, this may be related to other themes being more likely solutions while declining revenues is something that needs to be addressed. Many of the responses in this category are prescriptive in nature: we need to stop declining revenues. Some urged pushing the state to increase funding, others suggested becoming
more autonomous and finding alternative revenue sources, and a few proposed belt-tightening as essential. Many expressed concerns with the future of UHM in the face of continued revenue decline.

- **Must increase state support.**
- **The options for UHM in dealing with declining revenues are to find other revenues e.g. more grants; increase tuition or cut or merge programs that are not cost effective.**
- **Greater independence from state revenues - more endowments, grants, other funds. Reliability of funding sources.**
- **Find private donors.**
- **I previously worked at UHM between 1984 and 1997. I worked on the Mainland in higher education between 1997 and 2009. Upon returning to UHM I realized that our employees here are not enlisted to give to the UH Foundation in ways that make giving fun and instill a sense of pride. Mainland colleges have a very deep and rich tradition of introducing planned giving as a way to give back to the community, a way to assist students, a way to support education. I would like to see our foundation grow here so that every employee feels so connected to UHM that they feel compelled to give generously and be able to talk about why they are giving to the UH Foundation.**
- **Start building an endowment that frees the university from the whims of the legislature/governor.**
- **Beef up alumni to 'give back' whether it be in donations and/or volunteer time. Work with other State entitites & UHM programs to attract conventions & tie into UHM.**
- **Increase funding and fiscal responsibility.**
- **Develop contingency plans for multiple economic situations.**
- **Fund raising (both public and private) for research and teaching; concentrate resources to promising units; cut resources to under-performing units.**

**Educational improvements and student academic support (52)**

The term “educational effectiveness” is rarely used in responses, but throughout the survey respondents champion the need for providing high quality education at UHM and the supporting structures and processes that lead to student retention and academic achievement. Respondents typically refer to education in relation to teaching and learning, classes and programs. Undergraduate, graduate, and professional education were all highly valued, and many indicated that a strength of UHM is in being the one place in the state with the breadth of programs and in many cases, the only place offering many disciplines. Many proposed that support structures (non-financial) be improved and enhanced to assure student success.

There are many suggestions made for improvements and a few of these are highly specific, applying to a single department or program. Where these occur in responses, they were classified as “unique” to differentiate them from responses aimed at developing larger UHM goals. Another area related to educational effectiveness is the quality of teaching by UHM faculty. This issue is covered in the general theme of “faculty” but should be seen as closely linked to educational effectiveness.

Because this question dealt primarily with external factors impacting UHM, the responses are less complete and varied than those in other questions. The responses to Question 13 later in this report more fully cover this theme. Many concerns raised here relate to the impact of funding decreases on program quality and availability of classes because of external factors. Others proposed ways to make education more relevant to the state and community to increase public support.

- **Seek ways to keep integrity and quality of programs while making UH affordable.**
- **Find other ways (maybe cut other areas) to get enough funding for more course offerings. The main object of college is to provide students with a good education, but students are finding it hard to get the classes they are interested in or need for graduation. This delay in graduation also contributes to the high cost of attending college. Students may decide to attend other colleges that offer the courses they need, rather than wait for UHM to offer them.**
- **In order to make UHM a better match in fulfilling prospective students educational needs, reinstate teaching positions, classes and degrees previously cut.**
• Help students find ways to graduate with the degree that they want. Better advisors, counselors, and department leaders who can explain and answer every question possible would help.

• Rethink its undergrad curriculum top to bottom to integrate better the parts of a student's education, and therefore better impact the student's ability to move on (to work, to grad school) after graduating. This applies to both undergrad and grad education.

• UH Manoa needs to update its teaching practices and curriculum offerings across the board to reflect what students need going into the next decade. UH is in a backwards time warp.

• Provide a well-rounded education that includes leadership development, a mandatory internship (or other work based experience), as well as classroom and research components.

• To contribute to a brighter future for Hawaii, UHM must hone itself as a teaching institution rather than a research institution that has to teach people. First-class teaching must be the highest priority, both to attract students and to raise public appreciation for UHM as an institution.

• Turn out graduates who can think and problem solve on their own, who have a sense of responsibility and commitment to a task--if we can turn out graduates like this, employers will want to hire them and people will view and value higher education in a more positive light. If it is of value to the public, it will be funded.

**Sustainability (48)**

Sustainability is an issue that is a passion among undergraduate students, and as a result, this stakeholder group has made it a highly visible category on the survey. While championed by undergraduates as seen in the quantitative responses, the supporters of sustainability as an important trend come from all demographic groups. As a result, this is often one of the more common response areas in the open-ended questions. Sustainability is seen as a way to decrease costs and future reliance on high-priced energy through a “green” campus. It also is suggested as an area to create new high quality and inter-disciplinary programs that can positively impact the state. Some respondents note the importance in global affairs as well, citing rising populations, climate changes, and pollution as issues that UHM should be addressing.

• Go green to address the rising costs of energy and raw materials, saving enough money to make public education more affordable.

• Invest in reducing energy costs on campus, both improved infrastructure and changing the culture of the campus community. Develop alternative energy resources in the state through research and outreach and utilization throughout the UH system. Where possible encourage reduced automobile traffic including telecommuting where possible.

• Make more classes relevant to the changing demands of climate change and renewable energy.

• Provide support and education to assist community to find sustainability its most important factor. Living on an island, educational preparedness is vital, but those who remain to live here in Hawaii will need to be innovative for our very survival.

• It bothers me greatly that we are so behind in waste management, alternative energy production and food production. This is an ISLAND state, we need stop the talking and get on the ball. UH should be leading the way here.

• UHM must be the driving force for inovations in sustainablility to include food, energy and economic development. Hawaii has a land resource that is cronicaly under utilized for food, feed and fuel. Water resource must be better preserved and managed.

• We must be held accountable for our energy waste, rising energy costs will only drive up tuition and drive away students, if we can invest in renewable energy technologies and development we can use the money wasted on energy for paying teachers, funding research and improving the quality of the school.

• The University needs to have sustainability as its core value. There is abundant scientific evidence that residents of Oahu are living unsustainably, and returning human use of natural resources to within sustainable limits will require a major collective effort. Ways of living more sustainably can take many forms from reorganising living conditions (sustainable cities), reappraising economic sectors (green building), or work practices (sustainable architecture), using science to develop new technologies (green technologies, renewable
energy), to adjustments in individual lifestyles that conserve natural resources. The University is the perfect place to lead the way.

- **Be more sustainable -** I think we can be world leaders here in Hawaii and we must move swiftly.
- **UH must invest in renewable energy and energy efficiency to stabilize energy costs.** This can be done through partnerships with established manufacturers and developers to conduct research and development on new technologies which can then be donated to the school. Use the ones that work and toss the ones that don’t. Encouraging and supporting students to find new and innovative ways to reduce consumption and waste, reuse existing materials, and recycle or compost waste will not only help UH with costs, but will also prepare students for the new ‘green workforce’.

**Technology (41)**

The rapidly changing nature of technology and its impact on education are a theme that not only arises across multiple questions, but is viewed as having an impact on almost every aspect of UHM. It is noted not only as a trend that must be given attention, but as a potential solution to many problems, whether educational, administrative efficiency, economic development, or communications. While never a top-ranked response, it falls in the middle in most of the following questions, given weight by the consistency in open-ended responses. In particular, issues are raised about the need to improve the technological infrastructure so other problems may be addressed more readily as well as the need to consider its use in expanding distance education to increase educational opportunities across the state. Respondents tend to perceive that technology is not adequate or up-to-date at UHM. For example, in considering the trend of rapidly changing technology in this question, respondents noted:

- **The internet has been lauded as one of the greatest inventions. Yet information literacy is not part of the strategic plan. Using something (computers and the internet) everyday does not mean we really understand it’s potential. Increased information technology literacy can leverage almost all of the strategic goals of the UH. The internet can be used more effectively as the great social leveler. Opportunities for increased collaboration enhance learning and innovation, can all occur.**
- **We must be on top of the rapid changes in technology. It is the only vehicle that matters in our performance, our communication, and our productivity.**
- **We must continue to look at ways to make what we do more efficient-use on technology eg on-line forms, classes; reduce duplication of efforts on campus and within UH system.**
- **Rapid changes in technology - need innovative thinkers in moving us to the 21st century in terms of technology - facility, equipment, pedagogy, teaching, etc. UHM needs to be a 21st century citizen first before we can provide adequate education/service to our community.**
- **The financial impact on a poor economy to the state, the school, and the students is not easily overcome. Distance learning, even for Oahu students, might allow UH to accommodate more students, earn more from tuition, and not have the wear and tear on the brick and mortar facilities.**
- **I think UH at the very least needs to implement a task force of qualified professionals to keep on track with the most current trends in technology and keep the school informed of these changes and possibly advise how changes can be made at UHM to incorporate these changes. This task force should at the very least be aware of the research done by SLOAN and other similar organizations as to what technologies could be making large impacts in the future.**
- **As an island state, it would be critical to keep up with changing technology to allow for tele-education partnering programs with other mainland universities in fields that UHM does not have in-house compliment of experienced faculty due to lack of funds and the ability to recruit qualified faculty to reside in the islands.**
- **Being a central technology hub in the pacific can be important to Hawaii’s future. The impact of technology in Hawaii for other constituents should be considered, as Hawaii could be a technological leader.**

**Faculty roles and recruitment/retention (40)**

Faculty are the core in a university’s central mission of teaching, research and service. As expected, responses related to faculty work and quality occur throughout the survey responses. Because this question (Q12) focused more on external factors, the responses related to faculty are somewhat less prominent than for other questions but many issues are addressed, including recruiting and retaining quality faculty, relationships with students, workload,
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and personnel costs. Faculty issues are raised by all demographic sectors, with faculty concerned with work environment and students more frequently commenting on teaching quality and student-faculty communication. Examples are given here but more fully addressed in the discussion of other questions.

• **UHM needs to provide monetary support to faculty to develop new educational approaches, including student-directed learning, undergraduate research, and undergraduate seminars.**

• **Work harder at obtaining and KEEPING experienced and knowledgable faculty and staff.**

• **Require excellence in teaching from faculty to respond to varying student needs rather than treating all students as uniform or as research assistance/sounding boards.**

• **Build on our strength: we are a research university. This should be reflected in our teaching and service. We cannot afford to 'carry' people who are not meeting the expectation of a research university. If we continue to be leaders in research in our respective disciplines, we will find innovative solutions to whatever the environmental changes are.**

• **Pay the educators what is required to live in Hawaii. I have seen so many great educators leave Hawaii for other schools because of economics.**

• **Competitive wages to attract top faculty and ultimately top students.**

• **Bring in new innovative, tech savvy, youthful faculty to fill the gaps left by retirements.**

• **Hire qualified educators (preferably trained to educate and not just professionals in their respective fields).**

• **UHM must better support professors and departments in order to create an academic standard that is competitive to other institutions.**

• **Modify tenure rules to allow dismissal for failure to perform effectively as a researcher or an educator at UH Manoa. Tenure should protect one against dismissal for intellectual divergence from field norms but not incompetence. In our system, there are few effective ways to address this problem. Tenure has is now viewed as an entitlement to pay regardless of performance.**

• **The welfare of faculty and students is intertwined. Students will not come to an institution that treats its faculty poorly. There is a stark generation gap between full professors and new faculty in terms of institutional expectations. UHM has done nothing to address this gap, and the different needs of each. If faculty need retirement incentives, then they should be offered such things without threatening the survival of the programs they will leave. Likewise, new faculty do not have the same amenities retiring faculty do (homes they own, school systems that are adequate for starting a new family, support systems for a younger generation of scholars), and this differences need to be acknowledged and addressed in concrete ways.**

**Student preparedness and educational partnerships (34)**

A number of responses raised concerns about students being admitted to UHM without the needed skills, knowledge, and attitudes to be successful in higher education. Alternative views of solutions to this issue are presented in the responses, with some suggesting more stringent admissions’ criteria and others supporting more open access accompanied by increased student academic support. A sub-theme is the need for developing partnerships with community colleges and DOE schools to create a climate of student success throughout the educational enterprise. Such partnerships were seen as not only working towards increased student achievement prior to admission but as ways to increase enrollment at UHM among state residents and improve educational levels overall across Hawaii.

• **Lessen the gap between entry expectations and student preparedness for higher education.**

• **Expect much, much more preparedness and accomplishment of UH students, and then be prepared, as an institution, to support students and staff to the greatest extent possible to make student excellence a reality.**

• **Establish higher entry expectations of entering undergraduates to 4-yr programs, students should come to college with baseline skills, if they do not have them, we need to not accept them - but encourage them to utilize community colleges to build a solid foundation for higher education.**

• **UH needs to maintain high standards when reviewing applicants in order to remain competitive and increase in rankings and prestige (especially in graduate programs).**
UHM needs to both reach out to the highest and lowest demographics of high schoolers. Right now it is just content to take the average student who wants to go to school, but not really, and wants to succeed, but not really. There is a 'not really' atmosphere at UHM. UHM needs to make itself more attractive to high school students who are graduating at the top of their classes, maybe by offering a better honors program or with more scholarships. UHM also needs to make itself more accessible to students who are dropping out of high school or are about to drop out of high school. Maybe by extending community curriculums to teach more technical trade, do more outreaches to the public schools, target local athletes.

• Work more with schools to ensure that students that want to go to college are prepared for it.
• Move forward in working with the DOE to better align high school to post secondary ed so students are better prepared for college and therefore will not require remediation.
• Work more collaboratively with educators in the K-12 world and the private industry. This will enable ideas that can address the gaps and build much needed partnerships throughout the State.
• We are living in a global world and UH must become as noteworthy as the State of Hawai‘i itself has become. UH must be an institution that rises from a 2nd or 3rd tier university to one that provides it's student's with ample opportunities in the workforce both domestically and internationally. The only way to do this though is to encourage the State of Hawai‘i to increase it's education standards for the state's population. To become the 'Berkley of the Pacific' as one of our previous UH President's had as a vision we must assist the state in building up the education standards for the state. The University of Hawai‘i will not be able to raise it's education standards with disregard that most public high schools in Hawai‘i do not prepare their student's for the rigor of high education.

**UHM Community, diversity and respect (33)**

The campus community is both an element of pride and issue of concern for respondents, with many responses noting the importance of working together to accomplish goals. Responses are highly positive about the diversity that is found at Manoa, bringing together not only the cultures of Hawaii but bridging the mainland and the Asia-Pacific region. At the same time, respondents urge respect for differing viewpoints and point to the need for better communications to support unity. A theme that arises often is improving relationships between administration and faculty, and between faculty and students. Responses on diversity raise the need to actively recruit and fully include underrepresented groups in the campus community. This issue is more fully addressed in the responses to later questions as this one (Q12) was focused on external factors impacting UHM.

• One thing UHM must do to improve its ability to effectively address the most critical factors is to forge a strong foundation based on a united campus community, have an abundant financial foundation, support innovation, respect, and the UHM community. Together, we can be powerful and a great success!
• Continue including diversity in your students for higher education.
• That all voices are heard and not excluded, that Hawaiian history should be presented with the utmost respect and complete honesty.
• There must be some reason why we remain below the top 200 consistently. We must leave our provincial attitudes behind, these have nothing to do with the spirit of Aloha but, rather, with retrenchment and recapture of elite power. We need to address the need toward diversification and the interests of multiple stakeholders. This is the only way to move forward toward social justice.
• Diversity is a positive tool that benefits all and helps form acceptance of new ideas that enable our country to grow fiscally and culturally.
• Encourage and lead collaborative efforts within the UH system of schools, departments, colleges, etc. Working together more efficiently, effectively, and collaboratively.
• Involve faculty, staff and students much more in the decision-making process. Do not simply tell them what will happen.
• There needs to be a significant change in the way the UH administration operated. There needs to be a dramatic shift to include checks and balances of the administration by the students, faculty, and the greater community as a means to properly communicate and achieve the main goal of education -- which is to educate and teach students.
• Make sure student feedback is tapped.
• Provide more and better ways students, staff, faculty can have a say in university operations (anonymous suggestion box, recognition for ideas, taking input seriously with follow-up and reason for actions).
• Administrators and faculty need to come together to understand and commit to improving the institution, including cost-cutting measures, improving student learning and experiences, work with the broader community in providing leadership and to 'give back' provide services as an important institutional citizen.
• We need to integrate faculty interests and come together behind a mission. We need faculty to get to know each other and not stay in our pods. This will help us rally against the declining public support for higher ed.
• UHM must continue to attract the top instructors in each field and open the enrollment so that all income levels of students are able to attend UHM. Diversity is a positive tool that benefits all and helps form acceptance of new ideas that enable our country to grow fiscally and culturally.

**Workforce education and jobs (25)**

Workforce education is mentioned as a need, but more often in responses is phrased in relation to assuring that UHM graduates will be prepared for and able to find good jobs in the community. Despite shortages in some fields such as nursing or education, respondents in this question and others on the survey did not often raise these as concerns mentioned. No questions on the survey targeted workforce needs, and in general, respondents did not take a viewpoint in which these were directly considered. In some of the questions later in the survey, workforce education is linked to the need to support economic development but the role of UHM in improving the state economy only appears once in this set of responses. At the same time, some respondents raise concerns about losing broader educational goals to narrow training demands and the appropriateness of workforce training outside community colleges.

• Become economic driver for the state and important economic factor for students.
• First of all some of the external trends are overlapping. The job of the university is to produce graduates that are prepared to become a vital part of the workforce, so they must be able to take on new technological studies or work. If you go to college and you are unable to find a job, what real value has your college education gotten you? You invest a lot of money into college with the idea that it will lead to a good job, and if there are none to be found because you are not qualified, what is the sense. Most people do not have years to figure out a new career so they need to be able to find a good job right out of college.
• Find out what businesses are looking for and set up internships.
• UH must increase output in work shortage areas and STEM degrees.
• Be adaptable to the change in economy and community needs. Listen to the changing demographics of students, understand them to better prepare them for the workforce. Partner with industry to connect our students with our community and align them with potential jobs.
• Engage students with trade skills in working on projects that help to make our UH campus more sustainable, simultaneously equipping students with applicable experience.
• Curriculum to meet the demands of the workforce. An education is great but if there is no job students doubt the value of an education.
• Our graduates are the reflection the quality of our university; we should be concerned about preparing them for success when they leave our institution and not just about getting them out in four years. we should have high expectations, and we should be doing more for those student who graduate with Manoa degrees - currently, the concentration seems to be totally focused on lower classmen. support individual college initiatives rather than only broad-based freshman initiatives that are not targeted towards seamless transition to their majors/colleges.
• Keep up with the changing times... faculty need to teach students how to find success in the new and ever-changing workforce, and faculty and staff of the University need to demonstrate respect and protect our natural resources in their jobs and career actions.
• Innovation in education programs to attract students, serve state needs, and compete effectively with alternative programs is important to the credibility of the university. We should not become a job training program, but graduates will need better preparation for global competition for jobs.
**Competition, student recruitment and role in the UH system (24)**

This theme was noted by 24 respondents to this question but occurs regularly in most questions. Respondents noted not only how UHM is perceived in relation to other higher educational institutions outside of Hawaii, but also within the state and the system. The issue is directly related to student recruitment, with many suggestions about improving ways to attract students to compete with mainland and international higher education. A sub-theme is what role UHM plays among the UH campuses, and often concerns about how the growth of UH-West Oahu will impact student recruitment, programs and funding for UHM, with the general sense that this is a negative development and raising questions about resourcing both in hard economic times.

- **UHM must increase its overall competitive viability compared to other possible colleges and universities in the academic community.** When high schoolers decide on a college to pursue, they take into account the prestige of the college and the quality of its institutions (i.e. 'this college has a really great music program, I choose this University') UHM must be able to showcase greater academic resources compared to other universities in order to attract a greater student pool.

- **UHM needs to decide what students it wants to attract and then make the necessary administrative and funding decisions to attract them.** This is not happening now nor has it happened within the last 30 years. Competitiveness for students will be increasingly global in the coming years.

- **An obvious trend are declining state and public revenues in the next years. One opportunity UH has missed to explore is the market of international students paying out-of-state tuition.**

- **I feel a much greater effort needs to be put into recruiting, particularly internationally.** While I understand the importance of making UH accessible to people of our state, I also see that a diverse population of students, from around the globe (and particular from countries that have a large number of students seeking education in the US) for adding more diversity and the increase in quality that comes from exposure to diverse perspectives.

- **Flatten the UH SYSTEM as an organization.** We have tremendous excellent resources across the campuses, but we have not cross-fertilized or encouraged intra-campus excellence work teams among faculty and staff and administrators. We need to recognize models that work, support those that are making the change effort, be conscious of sustaining UH human capital.

- **Fight against duplication of academic programs at UHWO.**

- **Observe other Universities to see what measures they are taking to improve sustainability, attract the top students in their respective fields, while being recognized for their accomplishments.**

- **Increase use of technology to offer more distance learning-other schools are now draining away Hawaii residents to their online programs. We do not have a monopoly anymore.**

**Research (23)**

The importance of research to UHM as a fund generator, indicator of academic quality, and a contributor to the state economy and well being are a theme throughout the survey responses. Concerns focus on the ability to be less competitive in the absence of support from administrators and the state for this UHM mission. UHM excellence is seen as directly related to the quality and extent of its research.

- **Success in competing for extramural grants is related to the quality of existing research facilities, faculty, technical and administrative support staff and students to adjust and adapt changing technological advances to research needs and outcomes.**

- **Improving competition for grant writing.** Boosting or increasing revenue, be more creative in developing/enhancing revenue to maintain high quality research and education program and facilities/technologies in the university.

- **Increase facility support so that indirect cost rate for grants increases.**

- **Maintain research competitiveness by improving infrastructure and increasing student access to education through research and training in technology.**

- **Support interdisciplinary research and encourage forward thinking scholarship. That is where the grant money is, where our students need to be, and how we can set ourselves apart from peer institutions.**
Strive for excellence in innovative research and contributing to economic growth of Hawaii indirectly through research and spinning off start-ups.

**Physical plant and campus infrastructure (17)**

Another cross-cutting issue that occurs in every set of responses is a concern with the state of the campus physical plant and infrastructure. Respondents agree that facilities are in disrepair and aging, and while most support renovation and improved maintenance, some argue that this may not be the best use of money in times of reduced revenues. However, there is a particular emphasis on improving classrooms and labs that are seen as critical for the institutions primary missions of teaching and research. This theme is also closely linked to sustainability, with many respondents urging improvements be carefully considered to reduce energy consumption and create a “green” campus.

- Make Manoa campus an inviting place for learning--start with the physical and general environmental issues.
- Increase public support and state revenue for campus building and infrastructure improvements. The current state of the university is exemplified by the present dismal state of the facilities.
- Improve its desirability with new equipment to draw more students and keep more here.
- Improve and maintain existing facilities instead of building.
- **UHM must evaluate the methods by which it delivers its educational and research services, including its physical infrastructure, to consider making changes (such as downsizing physical plant) to more effectively provide those services.**

**Native Hawaiian education, research and culture at UHM (16)**

Native Hawaiian issues did not rise to the top numerically in responses to any survey question, but these were prevalent across all open ended questions. Further, the issue of indigenous populations and Native Hawaiian inclusion appears consistently in responses to every category, and has already been shown in sample responses above. Issues addressed by responses covered access and affordability, outreach, research and academic programs, and presence on campus and partnerships in the community. These responses came from all segments in addition to being a single-issue focus for some advocacy respondents, primarily students and external community members, who indicated this as their main issue for every question on the survey.

- Native Hawaiian Educational Attainment as well as Native Hawaiian access and success in accordance to the UH system strategic outcomes and performance measures. Also a Hawaiian place of learning in accordance to the 2002-2010 UH Manoa strategic plan.
- Put emphasis on investing in Hawaii students. Especially through the creation of programs that foster Native Hawaiian students’ success in admittance and matriculation into upper graduate studies.
- Remember that the school exists to benefit the local residents and stop trying to attract more people to move to Hawai‘i. The highest duty should be to residents, especially Native Hawaiians, whose native land makes it possible for UHM to exist. Native Hawaiians are the ultimate stakeholders!
- Offer scholarships to the Hawaiian Community. There are more non-locals than locals and it makes me sad that Hawaiians are basically the minorities here at UH. The reason is because though UHM is indeed a great school, not too much can afford it even with financial aid and other grants. And even if we can, we still bury ourselves with debt.
- More Native Hawaiians in the higher education areas as well as Native Hawaiian students, we need NH faculty, TA and administrative personnel and more work opportunities for NH in leadership positions. More grants and scholarship should be made available to Native Hawaiians too.
- Create a supportive environment for Native Hawaiian students, faculty, and staff within the Campus community so that the number of Native Hawaiians can be increased.
- Increase the number of Native Hawaiian students, faculty and administration to 23% in all disciplines at UHM.
- **Address Native Hawaiian student success. You raise one you raise all.**
Accountability and stewardship (14)

The trend of accountability expected by multiple stakeholders was selected by fourteen with seven stating simply that this needs to be addressed by repeating the word or phrase from the earlier question. Stewardship is a term not often used in responses, but is related to public accountability throughout the survey. A sample of responses include:

- Demonstrate to external stakeholders some ability to make hard decisions and implement them to improve quality, responsiveness and efficiency without just asking for more.
- Accountability. Most of the external forces do not perceive or understand the value the University of Hawaii brings to the state.
- UHM must place accountability on faculty & colleges. Prove by statistics, that they produce quality graduates who successfully find jobs in their fields within one year after graduation.
- Becoming more accountable (through good leadership and vision) will better enable achieving goals/objectives—the results of which will likely contribute in gaining the public's confidence (that UHM is a credible learning institution). It is necessary to have a clear understanding of why mainland campuses have managed to secure Hawaii's best students; and, why parents have chosen to pay the higher cost to send them away. There are obvious unmet needs if UHM is not even on the list of institution choices.
- Although I am not completely aboard the Assessment Express, I do think that we need to come up with ways of demonstrating to all stakeholders our effectiveness as educators (i.e., our students do indeed learn from us).

Excellence and reputation (11)

While the issue of excellence arises around both educational and research themes, it also regularly appears in responses in terms of the necessity of maintaining quality across all UHM activities and the essential nature of excellence for continuing to attract good faculty, students, and staff. Excellence is seen as critical to growing extramural research funding as well as the good will of the public.

- Pursue excellence in both teaching and research in order to be competitive in increasing revenues and obtaining funding.
- Find way(s) to generate income to sustain ourselves due to declining state revenues so that excellent and qualified faculty and staff will come to and continue to work here, in turn hopefully this will be a draw for students and create excellent and well-educated graduates who will be proud of the institution and contribute back to school and community.
- Excellence in research and innovation partially depends on funding the institution receives. However, the argument can also be turned around: money follows excellence. Therefore focus on excellence in research and innovation may improve the chances of higher public funding and support of UHM.
- If the school wants money it first must appear (physically) like a top notch school to encourage new students and revenue to come into the school. Appearance and ranking are extremely important to students and prospective private investors. They want to invest their money in the best. The school is going to have to pour money into itself without sacrificing some of the many benefits and financial help afforded to students. That's tough.

Economic development and private-public partnerships (10)

The importance of links to the private sector for ensuring workforce education, research and technology transfer, and the UHM role in economic development occurs in multiple responses. This theme is perhaps more relevant than in the earlier strategic plan because of the economic downturn and its impact on UHM revenues and student employability. Unlike the theme of workforce education above, this category is more specifically focused on the partnership aspect. A number of respondents, both internal and external to UHM, pushed to promote increased links to the business community and examine impacts on state economic development from such partnerships.

- UH system wide should have a more concerted effort in developing partnership with local and international alumni and business organizations.
- UHM must find ways to better bridge the community's wants, demands, and expectations of the school with the strategic plan. Better and more periodic touchpoints are needed to ensure that UHM is continually serving this...
community. As an executive in a global firm, we are still committed to looking at UHM as our primary secondary educational institution for new hires, but UHM needs to stay 'relevant' as we and other firms such as ourselves are able to recruit talent from other schools fairly easily.

- UHM must start listening more to businesses to understand their needs and then address them. The UH has had a greater than thou attitude and has always preached to businesses rather than meeting needs.
- Realize its full potential as an 'honest broker' and neutral, highly valued partner in state-wide and nation-wide development of economic sectors, cultural competence, and social justice and community endeavors.

**Other Themes**

Some themes occur in small numbers but continuously throughout the open-ended question responses, often with the same respondent repeating a concern that is personally important. These are briefly described here but are not broken out for every question. In addition to these smaller themes, 55 responses were coded as "unique" reflecting their singular nature to particular incidents on campus or commentary on individuals.

**Arts (2):** Continued funding for the arts and cultural activities during hard economic times is a concern for these respondents, numbering fewer than five in any most questions. For example: “We must diversify to combat the changing social, political and economic factors. This is why arts education and programing is so important. If we are able to foster the creative nature inherent in all people, we are then able to come up with better ideas of how to fix and thrive within the current systems.”

**Athletics (6):** While UHM athletics has many supporters across the state, in this survey the responses related to athletics tended to be small but negative, with concerns raised about the amount of funding to support sports during a time of declining state revenues. The athletic fee for students was specifically mentioned in some responses as unreasonable. Some comments note the public appeal of UHM sports, for example: “increase public image/support through a stronger commitment to an elite athletics program.” However, more typical in the small number of comments across the questions is, “Stop focusing and throwing all available resources at athletics. While it may be important, other departments (sciences, etc) are suffering and deserve the same, if not more, resources.” These comments are found in less than 10 responses per question.
UHM Strengths and Weaknesses (Q13-18)

Questions 13 through 18 were open-ended questions asking respondents to examine UHM’s strengths and weaknesses from various perspectives. While the responses to the previous open-ended question (Q12) were detailed and reported fully, in these questions the focus is on the major themes for each and those areas where respondents raised new issues not yet addressed above. Major themes and numbers of responses for each are listed, along with a short list of example responses cited verbatim for each question.

Educational Effectiveness (Q13)

Question 13 asked respondents to consider UHM in terms of educational effectiveness, looking at where there are strengths in the current approach. The question states, “What is the area that you think is UHM’s greatest strength from the perspective of educational effectiveness?” There were 865 responses to this question and 28 responded no comment or not sure. Of those who responded, 22 indicated that they did not think there were strengths in educational effectiveness at UHM. As with some earlier questions, many responses were short, such as “quality faculty” or “diversity,” and are therefore summarized in a table.

Open-ended responses by category and number of responses on educational effectiveness (Q13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty excellence, knowledge, teaching skill, dedication, etc.</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>(5 mention combination faculty/student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Dedicated teachers who are proud of their curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Excellent teachers, knowledgeable in their field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-High quality faculty teaching challenging classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Its faculty and learning community initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Professors who care about teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Some excellent faculty who are committed to teaching &amp; learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of faculty, staff, students and availability of multi-cultural offerings</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>(13 mentioned student diversity; 15 faculty and student diversity; 16 faculty diversity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Integration of a wide range of cultures and languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Diversity in cultural and professional backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-The diversity and respect for ethnic diversity and multiple cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of individual department or program</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(18 mentioned Asia-Pacific focused programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Unique responses naming specific programs or colleges.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of programs available</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-Providing exposure to the widest possible range of fields of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-A diverse educational field to allow a wide spectrum of students to study in areas they feel suits them best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHM's unique place in Hawaii and relation to the islands environment and cultures</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-Engagement with local culture and understanding of student background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Diversity and natural resources. Manoa exposes students to an atmosphere like no other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to meet the needs of local students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to research in discipline and experts in research</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-The opportunity for students to participate and engage in research and cultural activities that supplement and enrich their classroom experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus on students  & 35 & Faculty and staff working together to put students first.
Specialness of location  & 26 & Access to Asia/Pacific resources, local resources; result of location
Small class size, student-to-faculty ratio  & 23 & Close relationship between teachers and students--small class size and more sections.
Focus on assessment and traditional outcome measures (retention, graduation rates, etc.)  & 22 & Willingness to assess and evaluate programs and outcomes.
Value to residents (affordability)  & 20 & From an economic perspective, I believe we provide excellent value for the education we provide.
Range and availability of classes  & 19 & Variety and pertinence of courses offered
Student support services  & 17 & The amount of support that UHM gives to struggling students if they take advantage of it.
Relationship with Native Hawaiians  & 11 & Striving to include the Hawaiian culture and the place where we are located into the curriculum.
Availability of online and outreach programs  & 11 & Willingness to do online programming / consider hybrid online programs.
Technology  & 10 & Utilization of new technologies for distance learning.
The students at UHM  & 5 & Student involvement.
Sense of community  & 4 & Creating a feeling of community for both the students and the instructors.
Quality of its graduates  & 4 & Graduation of students who will work and contribute to Hawaii.
Other (unique responses)  & 60 & n/a

### Value to External Stakeholders (Q14)

As a public university, UHM is accountable to the state of Hawaii, including its local communities, businesses and organizations, and its legislators and elected leaders. In addition, UHM maintains a special relationship with alumni both in Hawaii and beyond. This question raised the issue of the value UHM has for these external stakeholders. The questions stated, “What is the area that you think is UHM’s greatest strength from the perspective of external stakeholders?”

The responses covered a range of areas depending on which stakeholder group was the focus of a response. For example, alumni respondents had a particular viewpoint related to their interests and past experiences as students at UHM. By contrast, others viewed this question from the vantage point of relationships with legislators, public schools, Native Hawaiian community, or prospective students and parents. Some focused on broad service to the state, in terms of economic development, extension services, or application of research to improving living conditions and the natural environment. In general, there were many aspects of what UHM does that were seen as highly valuable to the state, but an underlying theme was the lack of a good public relations program to make sure people knew and the community was able to work with UHM. An important area for external relations was the athletics program; while this was an area that was seen as somewhat negative in other questions, here it was acknowledged to play an important role in external relations.

- I don't know that I would call this a strength, because I can't necessarily say that UHM directly causes this, but I would say that UHM should take measures to continue and capitalize on a prideful alumni network.
- There are many prominent individuals in the community who have graduated from UH. They should be tapped in helping UH move forward to where it needs to be.
- Athletics...since it attracts even people who don't attend or have ever been apart of UHM.
- The university is the educational and cultural hub in many ways for Oahu (and the whole state), and probably is a fair-sized employer as well.
• The State of Hawaii requires a highly educated and moral populace who can discuss and process the complex and ever changing challenges in our future in a thoughtful and mature manner. The University of Hawaii is in a unique position to prepare the future leaders of this state for these challenges.

• Engagement in the economy and economic issues, ranging from community development to agriculture.

• Excellent research capacity. Potential for dramatic impact on the entire state population, if we effectively demonstrate the value of learning, knowledge, and evidence-based decision processes.

• The environment and biota of Hawaii and the Pacific Islands are so unique that it is difficult for mainland institutions to provide research products and students comparable to those generated by UH.

• I think that it is seen as a very affordable education and an institution that makes a great partner in many different fields.

Areas of Excellence to Maintain (Q15)

As a large and diverse university, UHM was seen as having many strengths that should be preserved. The question asked, “Is there an area in which UHM currently excels that is important to maintain?”

One dilemma in asking such a question is that each respondent has a personal idea of what is important to maintain, and on an open survey without a more formal sampling method or explicit process for evaluating excellence, numbers of responses cannot be interpreted as showing that one department or another is more valuable when the metrics are unknown. Of the responses, 220 mentioned a specific department or school (or several of these) and another 15 cited areas perceived as traditional strengths for a land/sea/space grant institution along with Asia-Pacific studies. 58 indicated Asia-Pacific studies alone, and another 56 indicated the area of Hawaiian studies, noting that the latter was critical because UHM is the only research university having this as part of its mission.

Other areas that came up in multiple responses included areas that are important to the community, including affordability for local students, hosting of cultural and arts events, and the education of the state’s future workforce. Areas important for continued excellence including research, faculty positions, and educational improvements were also frequently mentioned in responses.

One area that was most noted within this question were issues related to the uniqueness of UHM, its diversity and multicultural community, and its location in Manoa and within the Hawaiian islands. Respondents noted that as much as maintaining programs and activities, the heritage and culture were critical aspects to maintain.

• UH is the best hope for a bright future for most Hawaii families. Resident tuition remains a tremendous value for the local community and should be maintained at reasonable levels.

• Our unique culture mix and role as a cultural bridge linking the entire Pacific Rim region is also vital (North American - Asian- and Oceanic cultures, societies, literature, and the arts).

• The Culture, Society & The arts are very important to maintain because we are a unique 'melting pot' of different cultures from the 'Western' and 'Eastern' world and many other demographics as well.

• Intimate atmosphere and cross-relationships between departments, inter-disciplinary studies.

• Multicultural background and ability to bridge the gaps between people with various specialties and disciplines.

• Native Hawaiian values and construing the campus more generally as a meeting place for scholars (faculty and students) worldwide.

• Sense of place and relationships with the Pacific.

• The excellent research should be maintained . . .

• Relationship of Hawaii as a state, with the broader mainland.

• The quality of life.

• Our reputation as a good educator in Hawaii,
Areas for Growth (Q16)

In general, the responses to this question about areas to grow parallel those in the previous question on maintenance. This question asked, “Is there an area in which UHM should excel that is important to grow?” In general, respondents did not identify new areas that should be expanded, urging greater focus on areas of strength, increasing excellence in educational effectiveness and research, ensuring adequate support services for student academic success, and using technology to increase efficiencies and expand online learning. More noted in these responses are calls for new interdisciplinary programs and looking carefully at the needs of the state for workforce and professional employment by having graduates with skills needed for the future.

- More emphasis of risk taking and entrepreneurship - more connections among the different colleges.
- Training future leaders and giving them a role within the university, local community, and national/international community. Research as it affects the community and establishes university of Hawaii as a leader in academics. Gaining support from the community, ability to collaborate with others.
- Creating a living community on campus and around UH for undergraduates and graduate students that is highly attractive and enjoyable. We already have the beach and weather in our favor, but facilities certainly lack in quality.
- Encourage students to work across disciplines and have opportunities to do so.
- The relationship with community building locally within the state.
- To be a force of change to drive the island for greater independence.

Areas that Should Not be Maintained (Q17)

This question raises the issue of what could be eliminated to fund new initiatives or to deal with severe budget shortfalls. The question asked, “17) Is there anything UHM is doing now that you think will NOT be important to maintain as we address the challenges of the next five years (what might we consider decreasing or eliminating)?”

While the question is a legitimate one, the responses suggest that most who answered believe there is somewhere else that can be cut. There is little agreement about what should not be maintained and no evidence provided that targeted areas would significantly decrease costs. Few responses give reasons for the area indicated for not maintaining. Many suggest there would be significant savings from new process efficiencies, creating a “green” campus to save on energy costs, focusing on areas in which UHM is already strong, or targeting a specific department or program that is perceived as weak.

The most commonly suggested areas to not maintain were:

**Athletics (149 responses):** Many respondents raised concerns over the costs of the athletics department, noting high costs for coaches, and a number specifically targeted football while other indicated all sports.

- Attempting to maintain an expensive athletics program. Athletics should be better integrated into the campus, and should contribute to the student experience, not just drain resources.
- I think money spent on sports is largely wasted. UH is not a major competitor in most sports areas and sports do not generate much revenue relative to other large schools. Throwing money at sports programs and coaching salaries is a waste in my opinion. I think it would be better to support a select few sports programs well but not excessively.

**Efficiencies by streamlining processes or eliminating administrative positions (81):** These respondents argued for decreasing administrative positions and for improved operations efficiencies that would save money.

- All the academic programs are important. Can we save money by reducing increases in administrative positions and salaries?
- Eliminating the excess in administration - streamlining the bureaucracy - the savings from eliminating the extra positions will generate substantial savings.
**Specific departments or programs** (78 responses): Respondents indicated that weak or small departments be eliminated, often naming one that was perceived as a potential target. The named departments are not included in the examples.

- There are many marginal departments that are not worth wasting money on. UH cannot be everything to everybody.
- Some subjects that very few students take or major in, may have to be absorbed into other departments.

**Focus on areas of strength** (63): Broader than targeting a specific department, these respondents urged that resources be applied to areas of perceived excellence and strength, with decreases rather than cuts to other segments of UHM.

- I will not single out any particular program(s) or activity(ies) but, I believe it is important for an institution to recognize its limits in expertise and resources and NOT be a 'jack of all trades, master of none!' I think UHM may be over-extended in its course/program offerings and trying to appeal to too broad an audience. The fact is that some fields/subjects are best left to other institutions which are more-qualified to proffer instruction and research in various disciplines and topics. It may be time to trim the subject and program offerings.

**Physical plant – new buildings and energy efficiencies** (31): These respondents indicated they were uncertain that all construction and renovation was essential, and urged physical plant and infrastructure improvements be examined in the context of sustainability to save funds.

- The amount of energy we expend will not be important to maintain. Reevaluation of the energy demands on campus, and elimination of excess is greatly needed.

**Areas for Improvement (Q18)**

Many areas were suggested as in need of improvement although there was no strong consensus that any particular one was more of a concern. The question stated, “What is the one area/issue that most needs improvement at UHM from your perspective?”

The responses tended to vary along demographic lines. Students were more likely to indicate the need for more classes, more flexibility in graduation requirements, improvements to student housing and parking, and expansion of student support services. Affordability continued to be a common concern.

Faculty expressed concerns about lost positions, competitive salary and benefits, need for enhanced support for research, and infrastructure support for teaching. Both faculty and staff strongly urged improvements to decrease bureaucracy that impedes effective productivity. Again there was an emphasis on the role of leadership in promoting improvements, and a concern that either the wrong leaders or too much management was in place. All indicated a need to improve the campus physical plant and infrastructure, particularly that related to teaching and research.

A common theme was the need for greater community on campus, with improvements in faculty-administrator relationships and more respect and inclusion of students in decision-making.

- Allowing students to be able to afford attending school. Parking, food, and books.
- Class availability and graduation rates. And parking availability.
- Keeping the community alive. I think that UHM has become a little detached from its Alumni base and a little off putting for those who would love to maintain a relationship with the school.
- Collaborative partnerships across traditional fields of study and the importance of grounding student-learning in Hawaiian Culture and Language. It is a shame that graduates have only a superficial knowledge of the 'geographic and historic place' that support their learning.
- Achieving academic excellence while maintaining access.
- Administrative process are horrible. They waste valuable time and kill morale of everyone who is trying to accomplish something. If we are serious about being better, we have to improve our internal processes.
- Making sure qualified faculty that are good educators are not lost due to insufficient salary or bad management.
• Truly representing UH as a Hawaiian place of learning, through faculty hiring, curriculum development, research and service.

• The administration of UHM is fractured and a new, interconnected structure needs to be developed.

• Support for research, and a mechanism to reward/encourage/foster *top quality* research. Right now there is no incentive whatsoever from the university for anyone to produce top research. That is a sign of a backward institution, and I know we can do better.

• A common vision of research and teaching excellence. This is currently a campus of fiefdoms, and it does not have to be that way.
Priorities (Q19-23)

Five short answer questions (Q19-23) asked respondents to rate their five highest priorities for UHM over the next five years, from most important to less important. A list of possibilities was provided although it was possible to add additional priorities if an area was not included in the list. The question stated, “In the following question, you will be asked to select your top FIVE strategic priorities for the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan. While there are many high priorities, please consider which you think are most critical. You can copy and paste from the following table or add your own short answers.”

Very few (less than 5%) chose to input new priorities with most simply copying and pasting directly from the provided list. As a result, the responses were recoded numerically and frequencies derived. All listed possibilities appear in the table below except athletics which had so few responses it is counted in others. In limited cases, individuals modified the wording, for example by changing the list of what comprised professional schools to add others such as nursing and education, or adding a research area of strength not included in the list such as agriculture or Pacific languages. Because the numbers of changes and variations was so small, these are not broken out in the tables. The table below summarizes all responses by priority.

Top Five Priorities Listed by All Respondents by Percentage Responding (Q19-23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category from Survey List</th>
<th>Priority 1 n=1207</th>
<th>Priority 2 n=1164</th>
<th>Priority 3 n=1158</th>
<th>Priority 4 n=1135</th>
<th>Priority 5 n=1120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate education (degree programs)</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core educational commitments (e.g., traditional liberal arts education)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid for undergraduate students (tuition waivers)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support services (advising, counseling, tutoring)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad &amp; Professional Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate education (degree programs)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for graduate students (tuition waivers, GA/TA positions)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional schools/colleges (e.g., business, engineering, social work, law)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded research</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in areas UHM is uniquely positioned to excel (e.g., Asian and Pacific language, ocean sciences, astronomy)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All research (including unfunded)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian education and research initiatives</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global connections</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-private partnerships</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical plant (e.g., new buildings, maintenance &amp; renovation of existing buildings, campus appearance)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recruitment (salaries/benefits)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries/digital content</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology infrastructure and systems</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other includes all responses given by a single respondent as well as those with less than three responses by priority level. Those with small numbers of responses included arts, athletics, sustainability, and affordability.
No priority was supported by a majority of respondents at any given level. The next table shows the numbers of responses for each area across all priority levels, the numbers who ranked a priority as highest, and a weighted ranking calculated by using counts at each level, giving the highest priority a weight of five and lowest as one, then totaling these. What does emerge from this calculation is that degree programs, both undergraduate and graduate, received the highest weight. Student financial support ranked 4 and 5 after funded research.

**Priority Rankings by Number of Respondents and Weight across All Responders (Q19-23)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by weight</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Total respondents who selected as priorities 1-5</th>
<th>Number who ranked this first</th>
<th>Weighted ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undergraduate education (degree programs)</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>2524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate education (degree programs)</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Research in areas UHM is uniquely positioned to excel (e.g., Asian and Pacific language, ocean sciences, astronomy)</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Funded research</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support for graduate students (tuition waivers, GA/TA positions)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Financial aid for undergraduate students (tuition waivers)</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Physical plant (e.g., new buildings, maintenance &amp; renovation of existing buildings, campus appearance)</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student support services (advising, counseling, tutoring)</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>All research (including unfunded)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian education and research initiatives</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Professional schools/colleges (e.g., business, engineering, social work, law)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Core educational commitments (e.g., traditional liberal arts education)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Technology infrastructure and systems</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Global connections</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public-private partnerships</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Faculty recruitment (salaries/benefits)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Distance education</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Libraries/digital content</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in priority ranking between the top priority (undergraduate education) and the second highest weighted rank in the table above shows a marked drop in the strength. The lack of majority agreement about priorities is more clearly marked when the responses are viewed by constituency groups as shown briefly in the next table looking at the selections for highest priority (Q19). All but graduate students selected “Undergraduate education” as highest priority but in no case was this a majority selection. The second highest category in Q19 shows no agreement across groups, and further, the actual numbers are small, often under ten by category because of the wide variation among respondents. Similar results occur in other priority levels (Q20-23); these are not summarized here as the disparities do not provide helpful patterns for strategy selection because respondent numbers are low for each category.
### Highest Priority by Percentage Shown by Constituency Group (Q19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Faculty (n=343)</th>
<th>Staff (n=121)</th>
<th>Undergraduate students (n=213)</th>
<th>Graduate students (n=183)</th>
<th>Alumni (n=176)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of responses on Q19: Undergraduate education (degree programs)</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>(second among graduate students)*</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second highest level of responses on Q19</td>
<td>Graduate education 14.4%</td>
<td>Funded research 13.4%</td>
<td>Physical plant 9.1%</td>
<td>Financial aid 20.7%</td>
<td>Undergrad education 15.3%</td>
<td>Research in areas uniquely positioned to excel 10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Graduate students ranked “Undergraduate education” as second with “Graduate support” first, selected by 15.8% of graduate student respondents on Q19
UH System Strategic Goals (Q24-25)

Two questions (Q24-25) addressed how well UHM is meeting major goals identified in the UH System strategic plan. Question 24 is reported in the table. Question 25 was open-ended and is described below. In the introduction to the question in the survey, these goals were described as, “Since the last UHM plan was written in 2002, the UH System refined its strategic plan. The most recent iteration was provided by UH President Greenwood in her address to the legislature in spring 2010.” Breakout by group is not included as there were limited differences.

UHM Alignment with UH System Goals by Percent of Responders (Q24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UH System Strategic Goal</th>
<th>Weak, requires major change to address</th>
<th>Addressed but could be improved</th>
<th>Actively addressing</th>
<th>Mean (max = 3.00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positioning the University of Hawai’i as one of the world’s foremost indigenous-serving universities by supporting the access and success of Native Hawaiians (n=1224)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and completion of students, particularly Native Hawaiians, low-income students, and those from underserved regions (n=1221)</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the state’s economy and providing a solid return on its investment in higher education through research and training (n=1221)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing critical workforce shortages and preparing students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) for effective engagement and leadership in a global environment (n=1220)</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring, allocating, and managing public and private revenue streams and exercising exemplary stewardship over all of the University’s resources for a sustainable future (n=1209)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting UH System Goals (Q25)

Question 25 was an open-ended question asking what UHM could do to meet these goals, following immediately after the ranking question with the list of UH System goals (shown in the table). The question stated, “What specific goal might be addressed by UHM in the next five years to better address these areas?”

A total of 554 unique responses were entered for this question. In addition, 50 respondents simply listed one or another of the five goals with no additional information on meeting it, and 34 indicated no opinion, no comment or indicated they had already reported a goal in an earlier response.

Again, many themes from earlier questions arose in these responses, including access and affordability for local students, decreasing funds to support athletics, finding new sources of revenues, supporting physical plant and infrastructure improvements, providing strong supports for students and assisting in increasing preparedness, and building a sustainable campus.

Native Hawaiian focus and student success (44)

Several items which garnered more responses in this item included attention to Native Hawaiian access and education (44), with attention to increasing research and education in Native Hawaiian studies. However, some
responses indicated dissatisfaction with giving priority to Native Hawaiian initiatives, urging support for all underserved populations or suggesting the University needed to take a more global rather than local focus. Some examples of suggestions to improve service to Native Hawaiians included:

- Instead of just setting targets and percentages, really examine programs and make strategic changes to meet the goal of supporting access for Native Hawaiians. Too often we just set a target and then sit back to see what happens.
- Develop a program to engage and mentor Hawaii students starting in grade school. They need role models and specific information on how to get to UH and beyond.
- Emphasis, including major commitment to funding for educating Native Hawaiians in all areas of the institution.
- Increasing participation of Native Hawaiians, low-income, and underserved students could be improved by increasing merit-based grants to such students, particularly in the graduate programs.
- Recognize that the state/university has not made good on its obligations to Native Hawaiians. UHM should be ethical about this even during financial crises.
- Support the budding efforts of Hawaiinuikea School of Hawaiian Knowledge and Native Hawaiian Student Services, that works to support Native Hawaiian students and knowledge generating systems.
- Recruiting and supporting the success of Native Hawaiians at this school. Making it a goal to furnish programs that enable their success. Focus on Native Hawaiian students, and opportunities for respecting their culture, language, and islands.
- Giving all Native Hawai’ians the opportunities for free higher education, since UH is situated on Hawai’ian lands.

**Stewardship and accountability (43)**

Stewardship and accountability were also more prominent in these responses, with a continuation of those urging greater efficiency in UHM operations and processes (43).

- University administrative paperwork in many areas appears inefficient, poorly thought out, and moves at a sluggish pace. In addition, technology (e.g., coordination among information systems) is lacking that would make various procedures more efficient (advising, HR, etc.). It seems to me that there are many opportunities to streamline the paperwork and procedures the university uses to go about it's business, thus getting better use of the public’s money.
- Removal of duplicate and dysfunctional accountability systems.
- Need to streamline bureaucracy for more efficient operations and cutting costs, better use of technology in administrative processes.
- Establish SMART goal (i.e. Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Timely) for consistent and substantive improvement in managing public and private revenue streams.
- An employee training and benefit system put into place to reward employees for improvements in doing their job well. For example, finishing their job quickly to reduce waiting time, good feedback from students in regards to treatment (based on surveys administered), becoming more autonomous (able to do more parts of their job with out managerial support), etc.

**External relationships (96)**

A final theme that is well represented among these responses (96) involves external relationships, both to the community as well as within the UH system, including partnerships to promote economic development in the state.

- Look at what is working well within the UHM System and improving on those strategies and reassessing the viability of areas that are not working and making meaningful recommendations for change.
- Better advertise clear link from high school graduation to career opportunities in local economy via UHM, while ensuring that such a link exists by guiding development of university programs.
• *Collaboration with UHM's greater community leaders to establish a plan that would address the areas. (Don't do it alone!)*

• *Improve or increase ways to communicate to constituents (i.e., politicians, general public, parents, students) the value and worth of education provided by UHM because it really is a great school!*

• *Expand public private partnerships that will tap into existing community skills and resources to assist with these areas.*

• *Become a major factor in driving economic growth in the State.*
An additional factor impacting strategic planning are the standards of UHM’s accrediting body, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. Question 26 addressed the issue, asking “WASC has four standards by which it evaluates institutions. How well do you think UHM is doing in each area?”

The introduction to this question noted, “One way to consider important strategic directions is to consider the expectations or standards set by accrediting agencies. Because accreditation may require specialized knowledge, you can indicate “not sure” in the columns below.” As a result, responders who either skipped these questions or indicated “Not sure” ranged from 31-34% of the total survey respondents on the four issues. Breakout by group is not included as responses for most groups other than faculty were low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC Standard</th>
<th>This area needs significant work to meet the standard</th>
<th>UHM has a plan to address this issue</th>
<th>UHM is actively engaged in meeting this standard</th>
<th>Mean (max = 3.00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives (n=890)</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions (n=867)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources to Ensure Sustainability (n=899)</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement (n=904)</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic goals and WASC standards (Q27)**

Question 27 was an open-ended one asking about strategic goals that should be implemented in support of standards attainment. The question stated, “What strategic goals should UHM establish to ensure the campus will achieve excellent evaluations in meeting the WASC standards during the next five years?”

As with the question above, Q27 had a smaller number of responses than most survey questions. A total of 353 represented unique responses, with another 77 indicating no comment or not enough information about WASC to respond. In addition, 54 copied one of the standards or part of the standard with no information towards implementation. Of those with specific suggestions, 130 were UHM faculty and 121 were students.

Many of the themes that arose in this question are well documented in above questions: sustainability, improved leadership, increased efficiency in operations, focus on strengths, more research and increased revenues from various sources to support these efforts. Physical plant improvements and technology infrastructure are mentioned in these responses with a particular focus on classroom upgrades and building improvements for buildings used in teaching.

**Educational effectiveness, faculty role, and student support (186)**

Most respondents had specific suggestions related to teaching and learning, the role of faculty in instruction, and the need for academic support services to help students be successful. 186 responses were included in this category.

*To invest research and evaluation efforts into learning how people learn in that particular discipline. All instructors should take interest in effective instruction and use the feedback data to improve.*
• Provide support for implementing needs identified in assessment processes.
• Make sure that all required courses are designed to improve the educational experience of each student.
• Improve the likelihood of students being able to finish their degrees in a timely manner (revamp degree requirements and ways to obtain course waivers for transfer students).
• Better, consistent academic advising (at BOTH the departmental and university levels) to ensure that students have a reasonable chance of completing degree programs in 4 years.
• That faculty value the above standards, and become more involved, skilled, and interested in the above standards - To do this faculty need to be rewarded, for example in tenure/promotion review and through release time, so that they view these standards as a priority and can engage in them without seeing them as another extra bureaucratic burden
• Provide monetary support for faculty to develop new programs in student-directed learning, undergraduate seminars, and undergraduate research.

**Planning, benchmarking and evaluation (49)**

Some respondents urged that the specific concepts from the standards be made a more visible part of the strategic plan being developed, and that action plans be put in place at all levels including campus-wide, by school and college, and by department to develop goals, establish benchmarks, and actively evaluate progress. Concern was expressed by some about past planning without action. Forty-nine responses covered this theme.

• Establish clear and feasible short-term (benchmarks) and long-term goals and objectives, continue to work with campus-wide task groups to develop workable strategies to achieve the goals and design methods to assess this achievement, publicize results on an ongoing basis.
• It would be helpful if all programs could take measures to directly document student learning (beyond just exit surveys or course evaluations) and have specific structures/procedures in place to use this information for program improvement.
• Strategic funding initiatives should be established, promoted, followed.
• Clear educational objectives and making sure core functions apply to those objectives.
• All UHM units are going to have to map their program objectives and show how they use data for continuous improvement.

**Communications and collaborative efforts (47)**

One area suggested for goals revolves around improved communications and the need for various stakeholder groups to actively work together on achieving standards, including both internal (faculty-student, administration-faculty, faculty-staff) and external (UHM-business community) groups. A need was indicated for more visible feedback on progress to faculty and students. Forty-seven responses were related to this theme.

• Ask the students what they think needs to be fixed and actually allow them to work towards that solution. Provide them with the opportunities work and apply their experience.
• Create organization committed to Learning and Improvement. Work on better coordination between the various colleges and Departments.
• Institutional arms should not be working at cross purposes; all parts of UH need to have the same overall vision and be actively working to uphold their part of the larger vision; this is built by clearly setting a course and identifying intermediate goals for each portion of the UH system, so that everyone know what they do and how it supports the larger goal; any misstep in this area means that people may not be supporting each other.
• Partnering with the private sector for research and career preparedness.
• Continued emphasis on publicizing achievements of individual faculty members and individual students.
Obstacles and Implementation of Planning (Q28-31)

Obstacles (Q28)

Question 28 deals with obstacles to achieving plan goals. The question states, “What are the major obstacles we must overcome to achieve this vision in the next five years?”

There were 808 responses to this question, with 20 indicating they didn’t know or had no comment. While many themes continued from earlier questions, a new set of themes that had greater prominence involved attitudes, community, and vision accompanied by leadership that was behind the plan and promoted the vision it will contain.

- Overcome negativity and be positive and do what is right. Be not judgemental.
- Institutional inertia - it seems hard for UHM to take bold action because people get upset.
- I believe that the moral of faculty and staff in our college is very low. This is the main obstacle for any objective to be met.
- An obvious answer is complacency. Faculty hear of good intentions to improve things but often there is a lack of administrative follow-through.
- Lessen the hierarchical turf battles. More can be done if collaboration was embraced (rather than constant reminders that a campus look out after their own issues)
- I think the major obstacle that we must overcome to achieve this vision is breaking down barriers of students in UHM to get involved in activities and help centers at UHM. However, we should be informed more of those activities by email, fliers, advertisements.
- Creating, communicating, implementing and navigating with a clear, coherent vision that has the support and input of multiple stakeholders and communities despite the fiscal, financial and economic obstacles ahead.
- Breakdown the traditional barriers and fortresses. Reorganize schools and colleges to meet the new demands from our communities and students.
- A sense of community. Within such a diverse environment, more issues tend to arise and we must realize that we are working together, not against each other.
- Lack of vision and clarity at the leadership level Lack of engagement by all stakeholders and potential funders Lack of funding to achieve vision
- Change the attitudes of major stakeholders, including the executive and legislative branches of government, UHM faculty, staff and students, and alumni, so that everyone can 'buy into' the mission of achieving excellence.
- To establish higher goals - the board, faculty and management must reach for greater heights

Opportunities for a New Vision (Q29)

This question raised the issue of the opportunities for a new vision resulting from the plan. The question asked, “What are key opportunities we might use to achieve this vision?” While there were multiple responses, no new areas were discussed by respondents. In many ways, the answers for this question parallel those for opportunities related to external trends (Q12) already described.

Community Engagement (Q30)

When asked how to get others engaged in the planning efforts and resulting goals, respondents had many creative answers. The question stated, “How might you propose getting the community, particularly your peers and colleagues, engaged in accomplishing difficult goals?”

Responses covered everything from incentive programs, meetings especially with food, use of technology such as social networking, active publicity programs, and vibrant leadership. In particular, respondents noted that seeing action taken was critical given past history of plans not being promoted or implemented.
• We need to develop information feedback loops so that people who become involved see the results of their efforts. Doing so will increase individual motivation to participate.

• Allow more of us (not just the financially well off donors) to be members of active committees/work groups with discrete tasks related to whatever strategic directives are confirmed. Give alumni concrete objectives. Offer opportunities to come back to the campus for mixers and volunteering.

• Educate them first of their stake in the situation; develop a plant that they can be a part of and heavily communicate while the plan is in action.

• Be transparent, inclusive and consultative.

• Ask their opinions, arrive at consensus for the greatest good, then implement activities (provide funding & encouragement) to achieve difficult goals.

• Communicate the importance of the goals and be explicit about how the goals are shared among all individuals in the community who should engage in accomplishing them.

• Encourage more active participation from community and faculty in making decisions. Work with department heads and deans to having their faculty work with putting things more on-line.

• Get the word out by hosting open mic sessions, submit ideas via email, written report, utilize technology-online discussion forum, teleconferencing, skype, facebook, etc.

• Involving more people in developing goals and ways to meet them would invite more engagement. UHM has used too much top-down management and has not explained its choices (especially those that go against faculty and student recommendations) sufficiently to the students and faculty.

• Listening tours’--go out to community and academic/research units to hear their concerns, hopes, disappointments, needs, etc.

• Rally together - set goals and timelines - identify who is accountable for which part - continued monitoring - identify an outside party to ensure goals are met.

• What is key here is transparency and genuine willingness to work with faculty and ATP staff, utilizing their expertise, and not merely paying lip service. Too many are penalized for offering their opinion if it is critical of administration.

• Encourage creativity, make work fun and challenging, rewarding good tries. Often people are looking to cover their behinds otherwise they risk being blamed. We need to foster a safer, supportive environment.

• More shared credit and recognition of accomplishments and value of current work

• Offer small incentives, and a wide variety of activities or duties.

• Reward system. Opprotunities, grants and events that bring people together. Having teachers oversee this and then in turn getting their students to participate would be one.

• Faculty need to sense that the administration has a vision, is committed to change adn clearly communicates both. Nothing saps faculty moral and initiative faster than a feeling the Administration is just a caretaker of the system.

• It may sound idealistic, but I think buy-in will occur if UHM leaders are honest and transparent with information, and are sincerely striving for excellence, integrity, improvements. Keep the messages coming and model the message. Nothing beats persistence in the accomplishment of difficult goals.

Other Issues for Plan (Q31)

Respondents were asked if there were other issues not addressed in the previous questions that should be considered in the revised plan. The question stated, “Are there any other issues that you think should be considered in the 2010-2015 UHM Strategic Plan?” A total of 427 had unique responses, with an additional 126 indicating no comment or nothing to add.
For many respondents, this question provided a place to reiterate values and positions that were strongly held but more fully discussed in earlier responses. Continuing themes recorded by more than 15 respondents included:

1. Concerns with affordability and access, including housing costs for both students and faculty (20)
2. Advocacy for maintaining arts funding (15)
3. Issues of the high costs of athletics in relation to needed funding for academics and research (15) but two others noting importance
4. Suggestions for increasing administrative efficiency and improved leadership, concerns with administrative salary levels and numbers (29)
5. Issues of faculty quality, retention including aging faculty and difficulties for younger faculty because of high costs of living (28)
6. Advocacy for continuing support of Hawaiian studies, need to increase Native Hawaiian presence on campus (19)
7. Parking shortages or advocacy for more public transportation (16)

Areas that were more prominent in this set of responses were those urging reconsideration of academic organization to favor new interdisciplinary units (8), and comments specific to the vision, process and implementation of a strategic plan (41). Examples of planning advice include:

- I think there is enough to do in 5 years before we think about adding more issues to this one.
- Stay contemporary, but hold on to traditions.
- Better use of alumni as community models, advocates, informal spokespeople, UH-Community 'bridges' for each of the 2010-2015 UHM Strategic Plan goals.
- Although I have not read in detail the plan, I'm intrigued by what specific steps UHM will take to enhance a sense of community? Has the history and scope of established Universities been visited? Has the plan embraced the societal and cultural influence that is unique to Hawaii? Has the plan taken into consideration the strains that face the people of Hawaii (i.e., high cost of living and its' impact on individual pursuits)?
- In addition to writing the plan, I would like the committee to have a discussion about communicating the plan. How will the plan be communicated to the broader UHM community after it is finished? How will different parts of it be highlighted? How can parts of the plan be driven down to the departmental level and made meaningful?
- There are many things that can use some work at UHM but no one person or office/department can fix everything (or can be blamed for everything). I think it's important for UHM to become a strong community internally before we can strategically ask for support externally. We need to listen to each other and realize that not everything everyone wants can be done.
- Make sure the benchmarks, if there will be any, are real, attainable goals and not just random percentages and figures. Put some funds behind each initiative and assign accountability.
- Manoa still struggles with who we are and who we should be. We are, I believe, increasingly, an internationally recognized university. We need to find a way to recognize our global opportunities and reach while remaining an island-based community with a Hawaii-Asia-Pacific roots and focus.
- We should continue as much as possible, a positive journey for all involved in our institution and community.
Comments (Q46)

The final question provided respondents the opportunity to comment on any issue of choice. Only 328 respondents answered this question, and of those, 76 indicated they had no comment. However, while some had concerns with the survey design, 46 noted their appreciation of the opportunity to provide input, and another 34 urged that the survey results be used and shared. The most common complaint was that the survey was long, and that some questions were ambiguous, confusing or overlapping, but these were countered by those who liked the questions and found it “painless.” The concerns have been noted in the methods section under limitations. Some respondents reiterated points made in earlier questions and a few had suggestions for improving strategic planning by using an alternative process.

Example responses:

- Publish the results, respond to them. Work with your staff / faculty / students, make them empowered to change this great university. Aloha – UHM faculty member

- I hope this feedback is useful! UH has a HUGE opportunity to change peoples lives, and I just feel like we're falling short all over the place. The students of Hawai`i deserve better than what they're being given, and we MUST do better. – UHM staff member

- I hope UHM receives a lot of valuable input from this survey and builds a meaningful strategic plan that serves as a platform to do great things. – UHM student

- It was difficult to understand unless you have the time to really contribute to each question. I am a full-time student taking 5 classes and don't have so much time to even look over this questionnaire. I did the best I could and hope it helps! – UHM student

- Some things were hard to understand being away from the institution for a long time, and not knowing what many of the terms mean. – UHM alumnus

- Thank you for the opportunity to participate and express my own opinions on these topics. It is good to know that the next half a decade is being considered and that this community is being consulted and all given this opportunity to express their thoughts. – UHM alumnus
Summary of Major Findings

Institutional Values

As noted by one of the respondents in an open final question on the survey, the issue of values is difficult to address as the terms are somewhat ambiguous and hard to understand without context. However, when each highly ranked institutional value is placed within the findings from other questions, the sense of how these fit within the institutional context become clearer.

Educational Effectiveness

All ranked educational effectiveness as the highest value for the institution, yet this phrase appears rarely in open-ended response that were not specific to values. This may occur as questions used more common terminology of teaching and learning, programs and classes. Undergraduate, graduate, and professional education were all highly valued, and many indicated that a strength of UHM is in being the only place in the state with the breadth of programs and in many cases, the only place offering many disciplines. Many proposed that support structures (non-financial) be improved and enhanced to assure student retention and academic success.

Both faculty and alumni raised many questions about the preparedness and expectations of entering and future students, including perceptions that the state’s public education system is facing serious issues of its own that will result in lower quality.

Excellence

The issue of excellence arose in multiple contexts, and while it perhaps has different meaning across the campus, the overall findings suggest concerns with both continuing and growing the institution’s “quality” in people, education, research and community. Many commented on specific programs or departments that they note are already excellent. Students perceived that there were many excellent faculty but some were not good teachers.

The areas of traditional research excellence in land, sea and space grant disciplines was cited frequently, as were the growing programs in Hawaiian studies. There is a sense of pride in UHM’s role in higher education in the state, quality research recognized nationally and internationally, support of arts and culture, and commitment to creating a diverse community (see below).

Research

While research held high value for most constituencies, it dropped to sixth among the student respondents in the survey, and even lower when considered only for undergraduate respondents. UHM is seen as being unique within the UH system because of its research focus, with respondents consistently noting the importance of research both in generating revenue for the institution and state, and as a critical need for the state because UH was in a unique position to research in specialist areas that would not be covered elsewhere.

Sustainability

Sustainability was highly ranked primarily by students in all the institutional value questions, and given the high proportion of student respondents, as a result was highly ranked value overall. But elements of this issue were found among all constituent groups across the multiple questions and responses, suggesting that the concerns are not limited a younger group or advocacy voice. The term represents many concepts for respondents, ranging from campus infrastructure development for efficiency to preservation of the state’s unique resources and beauty, and the issues of research to address global pollution, population growth and resource management. The responses consistently indicated that sustainability is closely related to a strong sense of place within the campus and to UHM’s location in an island archipelago with a unique natural and cultural heritage. Many comments about the campus physical plant and infrastructure improvements linked these not so much to aging facilities and beautification but to the need to develop a more efficient campus. It was also seen in issues of operations and processes in terms of the ultimate sustainability of the institution.
Trends as Environmental Threats and Opportunities

Perhaps the most serious issue to arise since the 2002 UHM Strategic Plan, Defining Our Destiny, was the economic depression that has defined the past few years. The impacts of this on education in general, and more broadly the state and world, have raised concerns that were perhaps less obvious in better times. Many of the issues discussed across the many responses see the changed economy as both a threat to UHM’s future but also as an opportunity to review our foundations and potentials in new ways. Many interesting proposals arose in the responses about addressing declining state revenues and ensuring that the quality of UHM does not further decline. However, the respondents do not show consensus to solutions, highlighting gaps that planning efforts will need to consider.

Access and Affordability

Affordability was the top ranked issue facing UHM across all constituency groups except faculty. However, the more encompassing issue of access was found to be a concern among all groups responding to the survey. The high costs of higher education have been a media centerpiece that preceded the recent recession, and with the decline in income and public support, are a clear worry for many, whether currently attending or considering the impact on children and other family members in the future.

Public Support for Education

While declining revenues, both from the state to support higher education and through multiple sources to support research and development in higher education ranked highly, the concern over revenue can be seen to fall into a larger concerns for public support of education. Respondents noted that public education, whether K-12 or higher education, does not hold the esteem that is seen as having existed in the past. This was viewed from many vantage points with the most specific related the cuts made in state budgets for UHM.

The areas that this encompasses are complex. A large number of respondents indicated that UHM needs to do a much better job of outreach to the community, legislature and other political leaders, and to the K-12 community to tighten partnerships to promote education as well as focus on improving UHM’s responsiveness to state and local issues. Further, there is a general sense that UHM has not done enough to show how important a research university is to the state.

Cross-cutting Issues

Some areas that continually arose in respondent answers to open-ended questions did not always show up within the top ranks of quantitative frequencies from responses but were prevalent enough to warrant addressing as major areas of strategic interest. While the values are often common to many research-intensive universities, some of these cross-cutting issues are very specific to UHM and in some cases, are what make the it a special place of learning and diversity.

Native Hawaiians and UHM

Native Hawaiian issues did not rise to the top in quantitative responses but these were prevalent across all open ended questions. This appeared in terms of access and affordability, outreach, research and academic programs, and in terms of presence on campus and partnerships in the community. These responses came from all segments in addition to being a single-issue focus for approximately 80 respondents, primarily students and external community members. Most notably, the responses indicated that Hawaiian values and sense of place and community should not be limited to a specialized unit and program but were important to instill across UHM.

Institutional Focus

There was an overall theme in the responses that related to institutional focus, covering a variety of issues in terms of scope, purpose, and outlook.

Breadth of Programs: Following in the path established by the Budget Priority process last year, a number of respondents indicated the need to focus and improve areas in which UHM excels. However, there is a lack of consensus among respondents as to where that focus might fall. While a number indicated traditional areas of land, sea, and space grant institutions as well as Hawaiian studies (see above), there was equal concern that focus not decrease breadth of programs which is seen as an institutional advantage in a state without other research-intensive
public universities. Many one-off responses urged support for a specific program or department, including ones in which a respondent specifically urged that something not be cut in the process of refining goals.

Globalization and Service to State/Community: Two issues that may be dichotomous but are not necessarily exclusive are whether the focus should be on state and community issues, or whether UHM should be seen as the gateway between the mainland and the Asia-Pacific region growing the importance of its global outlook. Sentiment was divided over whether more foreign students was a positive or negative impact, with some suggesting increases would help with revenues and quality.

Workforce Development: One area that did not emerge as a focus was that of workforce development. While this concept has been central in UH system goals, the terminology seems not to resonate with UHM stakeholders who view this as the role of the community colleges. In fact, there was at least some minor input that such a focus would decrease the quality of UHM and leave little to separate it from other UH system institutions. Further, such terminology is seen as purely centered in undergraduate or certificate programs. Yet there is significant support for professional programs, partnerships for economic development, consideration of increased internships, and even mention of developing 21st century skills. To some degree, this issue may be one of terminology and the classic differentiation between training and education as traditionally defined by higher education. This may be an area in which UHM must further define its specific role, and as mentioned in Public Support for Education (above), find ways to help both the internal and external community better understand the role the UHM plays in the state related to workforce development.

Leadership and Efficiency: An underlying theme was the need for greater efficiency in operations and the importance of quality leadership. Following concerns about the budget process and a perception of a growing and expensive administrative overhead, there were comments suggesting further examination of leadership structures and a set of responses very critical of leadership efforts. Many respondents commented that far too little has been done in terms of decreasing bureaucracy and streamlining administrative processes as a way to cut costs overall.

Community and Communications

One area that continually arose but was not specifically addressed in the initial questions was the issue of community and the importance of unity. What emerges from responses are that many take pride in their affiliation with UHM, and highly value participation in what is generally perceived as a diverse community, both through the mix of students from Hawaii’s many regions and cultural traditions as well as with those from mainland and international roots. The special place of Native Hawaiian culture and values was noted, along with a commitment to preserving what is unique both in the natural and cultural environments of the state. More than the term “place” that has frequently been used in official literature, the concept of community seemed to be what was seen as making UHM a special organization with a unique role of bridging the differences. This sense of community, and the importance of working together to address the issues facing UHM in the future, are something that is seen as setting the institution apart from other research-intensive institutions.

Technology

A final major cross-cutting theme was technology, with applications to almost every issue raised and a particular importance to communications across an island state. Many noted that online education has grown everywhere, and that competition is now possible where once UHM was a sole provider of advanced degrees and many disciplinary programs in Hawaii. Respondents urged the institution to upgrade technology infrastructure for teaching and administration, provide leadership in the state in technology applications, and partner with businesses to apply technology in economic development. The role of UHM as a bridge between the mainland U.S. and the Asia-Pacific region was viewed an potentially enhanced through technology.
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Appendix 1: Survey Questions

Section 1. Brief Demographics

1 & 2 Check all that apply – required response

- UH Manoa faculty
- UH Manoa staff
- UH Manoa student (currently enrolled)
- UH Manoa alumni
- Faculty/staff at other UH system college
- Interested community member
- Oahu Resident
- Resident of Hawaii – not Oahu
- Resident of other U.S. state or territory
- International resident

Section 2. Institutional Values

Institutional values set the foundation for a strategic plan by showing what matters to us both as an institution and as individuals. You can access a version of the 2002-2010 UHM Strategic Plan: Defining Our Destiny to see more about the current values by clicking here. The Strategic Planning Web site has additional documentation related to the existing plan.

3. The following represent institutional values expressed in the current 2002-2010 UHM Strategic Plan. From your perspective, how would you rate each of the following values for inclusion in the UHM 2010-2015 Strategic Plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In this section, please rate the following statements:</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Educational effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Social justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Economic development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Culture, society &amp; the arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Some additional institutional values that are found in other UHM documents but not in the current strategic plan are listed below. If you could select ONE to add, which would it be? Please check ONE box below

- Sense of community
- Service to community and state
- Integrity & ethics
- Sustainability
- Stewardship
- Native Hawaiian community/legacy
Which **THREE** institutional values do you think are most important to include in the 2010-2015 strategic plan? You may include any of those above or add your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Section 3. External Environmental Factors impacting UHM

Many changes in UHM’s external environment provide opportunities and challenges that should be considered in a strategic plan. Some national trends that have been commonly described in both popular media and academic publications as impacting higher education are listed below. One background paper that may be of interest as you consider these issues comes from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *Considerations for State Colleges and Universities in Post-Recession America* (Daniel Hurley, Nov. 2009)

8. In your opinion, how important is each of these to UHM’s plans during the next five years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In this section, please rate the following statements:</th>
<th>Less important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Declining state revenues for higher education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Declining public support for higher education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Affordability of public education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Rising costs of energy and raw materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Competition from other institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Increasing competition for grant funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Greater demographic variability of prospective students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Gap between entry expectations and student preparedness for higher education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rapid changes in technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Calls by multiple stakeholders for greater accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Changing workforce demands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What **THREE** external trends, either positive or negative, do you think will have the most critical impact on UHM over the next five years? (You may choose from above or add your own, including trends that may be unique to Hawaii).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trend 1</th>
<th>Trend 2</th>
<th>Trend 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. (Open-ended) Given changing external factors, what is one thing you think UHM might/must do to improve its ability to effectively address the most critical factor(s)?
Section 4. UHM Strengths and Weaknesses

Plans typically identify institutional strengths which are important to recognize in goal setting and weaknesses which need to be addressed. In the 2002-2010 UHM plan, these were grouped under Research; Educational Effectiveness; Social Justice; Place; Economic Development; Culture, Society & The Arts; and Technology.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What is the area that you think is UHM’s greatest strength from the perspective of <strong>educational effectiveness</strong>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>What is the area that you think is UHM’s greatest strength from the perspective of <strong>external stakeholders</strong>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Is there an area in which UHM currently excels that is important to <strong>maintain</strong>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Is there an area in which UHM should excel that is important to <strong>grow</strong>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Is there anything UHM is doing now that you think will <strong>NOT</strong> be important to <strong>maintain</strong> as we address the challenges of the next five years (what might we consider decreasing or eliminating)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>What is the one area/issue that <strong>most needs improvement</strong> at UHM from your perspective?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5. Funding Priorities

As UHM realigns strategic priorities to economic realities in an era of budget restrictions the campus must make difficult choices about where to direct limited resources.

In the following question, you will be asked to select your top **FIVE** strategic priorities for the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan. While there are many high priorities, please consider which you think are most critical. You can copy and paste from the following table or add your own short answers.
Undergraduate education (degree programs)
Graduate education (degree programs)
Core educational commitments (e.g., traditional liberal arts education)
Professional schools/colleges (e.g., business, engineering, social work, law)
Financial aid for undergraduate students (tuition waivers)
Support for graduate students (tuition waivers, GA/TA positions)
Student support services (advising, counseling, tutoring)
Faculty recruitment (salaries/benefits)
Funded research
All research (including unfunded)
Research in areas UHM is uniquely positioned to excel (e.g., Asian and Pacific language, ocean sciences, astronomy)
Native Hawaiian education and research initiatives
Libraries/digital content
Athletics
Distance education
Physical plant (e.g., new buildings, maintenance & renovation of existing buildings, campus appearance)
Technology infrastructure and systems
Global connections
Public-private partnerships

19. Strategic Priority 1:
20. Strategic Priority 2:
21. Strategic Priority 3:
22. Strategic Priority 4:
23. Strategic Priority 5:

Section 6. UH System Directions and Impact on UHM

Since the last UHM plan was written in 2002, the UH System refined its strategic plan. The most recent iteration was provided by UH President Greenwood in her address to the legislature in spring 2010. You can find the UH System Plan for reference by clicking here.

As you consider the statements, please indicate ONE specific goal you think UHM might implement to better address these areas. This could include:
- making sure a current program is funded or given priority;
- developing a new initiative to address an issue better; or
- consolidating/reorganizing existing structures to be more effective.

24. How well does UHM currently address each of these issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UH System Plan Strategic Goals</th>
<th>Actively addressing</th>
<th>Addressed but could be improved</th>
<th>Weak, requires major changes to address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Positioning the University of Hawai‘i as one of the world’s foremost indigenous-serving universities by supporting the access and success of Native Hawaiians.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Increasing the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and completion of students, particularly Native Hawaiians, low-income students, and those from underserved regions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Contributing to the state’s economy and providing a solid return on its investment in higher education through research and training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Addressing critical workforce shortages and preparing students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) for effective engagement and leadership in a global environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Acquiring, allocating, and managing public and private revenue streams and exercising exemplary stewardship over all of the University’s resources for a sustainable future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 7. WASC Standards and Strategic Directions

One way to consider important strategic directions is to consider the expectations or standards set by accrediting agencies. Information on WASC standards are found on UHM’s Accreditation Process web page. Because accreditation may require specialized knowledge, you can indicate “not sure” in the columns below.

26. WASC has four standards by which it evaluates institutions. How well do you think UHM is doing in each area? You may find it helpful to review UHM's WASC reports. For each standard, select the response that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>UHM is actively engaged in meeting this standard</th>
<th>UHM has a plan to address this issue</th>
<th>This area needs significant work to meet the standard</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources to Ensure Sustainability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. What strategic goals should UHM establish to ensure the campus will achieve excellent evaluations in meeting the WASC standards during the next five years?

Section 8. Open-Ended Questions

The following questions provide an opportunity for you to comment on issues you think are important by elaborating on your responses above or adding ideas or concerns we didn’t ask about. Please take the time to provide this additional feedback.

28. What are the major obstacles we must overcome to achieve this vision in the next five years?

29. What are key opportunities we might use to achieve this vision?
30. How might you propose getting the community, particularly your peers and colleagues, engaged in accomplishing difficult goals?

31. Are there any other issues that you think should be considered in the 2010-2015 UHM Strategic Plan?

Section 9. Detailed Demographics

Please provide us with additional data on your self and relationship to UHM. We will make sure that no information is released that might personally identify you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>If yes, please complete…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. □ UH Manoa faculty or staff</td>
<td>33. Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. College or Division:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Years at UHM:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. □ UH Manoa student (currently enrolled)</td>
<td>37. □ Undergraduate □ Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. Major:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39. Years at UHM:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. □ UH Manoa alumni</td>
<td>41. Highest UHM degree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. Graduation Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Please check any additional categories that apply:</td>
<td>□ Faculty or staff at UH community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Faculty or staff at UH university (not UHM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Faculty or staff at another higher education institution in Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Interested community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44. □ None of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. If you checked community member, please briefly describe your interest in UHM:

46. Do you want to add any comments about this survey?
Appendix 2: Institutional Value Statements

Because the statements written by respondents can be a useful way to provide meaning for a term, the variant statements to the original institutional values (in blue) are included here for the top five values in Q7. Most respondents used the value word without additional context but some had more specific ideas about how a value should be described and wrote a short statement. In the following, a single instance is given for each phrase but some were repeated more than once. The intent in providing the unedited data statements is to frame a context for strategic planning writing groups as they seek to develop each value statement. This also serves as a visible way of revealing the coding process used for those interested in how categories emerged.

Educational Effectiveness

Educational effectiveness, give our students the best they could receive.
Educational Effectiveness & Efficiency
Educational effectiveness and access
Educational Effectiveness and Excellence
Educational effectiveness as a service to the community and state
Educational effectiveness by way of innovation and ancient principles
Educational effectiveness, including workforce training
Educational effectiveness. It's kind of the whole point of a college.
Educational excellence and effectiveness - teaching
Educational excellence and opportunities
educational excellence for a global community
Educational innovation
educational quality
Educational values
Educational values
educational vision
educational vision
effective and committed teaching by faculty
effective education - requires information access and technology
Effectiveness & value of a UH-Manoa education
Emphasis on Educational Effectiveness and Excellence
Emphasis on Educational Effectiveness and Excellence
enough classes for on-time graduation
Excellence in Education
Fine teaching
first rate education for our students
Good education in offered areas
Graduate education graduating students that have the knowledge and ability to think
Helping Depts reach excellence goals helping students to make and define professional goals
high quality education and training holistic learning
improving graduation/retention rate
Improving the standards of our own teaching
interdisciplinary education
Learning Atmosphere
Learning Collaboration Intersecting all levels/affiliations
liberal education available to all liberal education in arts and sciences
limit class size (more faculty)
maintaining educational excellence
Making students and their education priority
More class options
More opportunities to graduate
more programs
More teachers/smaller class size. No one left behind.
Offer effective education
Provide educational excellence
Quality and Value of Undergraduate Education
Quality control of teachers, delivery (instructional) methods and facility.
Quality education
quality of scholarship
Quality undergrad and grad education
Quality, well resourced teaching
Reducing administrative barriers to effective teaching, research, and plain old everyday UH work.
Respect for academic excellence (national, international)
Rigorous teaching
Scholarship
Educational Effectiveness continued

Scholastic excellence / excellent undergraduate education
Seamless Pathway to build on knowledge to become a professional
Strong Academics
Student academic support availability!
Student learning
Study Skills
Support for Educational Effectiveness through New Infrastructural Action
Supporting student academics
Supporting student research
Teacher excellence
Teaching
teaching and learning
Teaching competence
Teaching Effectiveness

Excellence

Academic excellence
Academic rigor and excellence in every aspect of the university system is required
aim for excellence
Attracting high quality students and faculty
balancing risk and reward in moving to excellence
Commitment to Excellence
Commitment to excellence
Commitment to Excellence
Commitment to Excellence
continuous improvement (TQM)
Continuous, Quality Improvements
Excellence - be the Best
Excellence awards to faculty
Excellence in all values named above
Excellence in Arts and Culture
Excellence in basic and applied research
Excellence in education
Excellence in Education, Leading the State's Future Workforce
Excellence in research
Excellence in research
Excellence in teaching
Excellence in Undergraduate Education
Excellence...which will lead to being in the forefront of change...
getting higher ranking, at least try to get

Research

Community Research
cutting edge research (& grant funding)
Excellence in research
first rate research
focus on faculty research
funding for new research
Innovative research
Integration of research applications, educational and training interventions with service to communities in the Pacific
Integration of research at all levels and every aspect of campus life
Leadership in selected fields of research
Providing quality research opportunities
Quality, well-resources research
Research - focus on STEM and sustainability
research - develop and communicate new knowledge
Research (includes innovation, excellence, technology, leadership, economic development)
Research *and dissemination* (amplifying role of public intellectuals)
Research and Innovation
Research and Leadership
Research and Publication
Research Competitiveness
Research Excellence
Research focus
research gear towards social justice
Research in selected areas
Research Leadership
Research opportunities to diversify jobs offered in Hawaii
Research quality and quantity
research requiring globalization-local specificity convergence
research resources unique to academic excellence
Research should be given the highest priority in all fields
Research support
Research Training programs in biodiversity for Native Hawaiians and other Minorities
Research with relevant application research, both basic and applied
Research, including focus on solving Hawaii's problems
supporting research
unique research contributions
world-quality scientific research

Teaching Excellence
undergraduate education
undergraduate experience (notice experience not education)
Undergraduate focus
Undergraduate education
Value of Education
Visible Learning

high quality faculty (as educators, researchers, artists, etc )
High standard and expectations from students
Highest standards in education and research
intellectual quality
Quality
Reputation at every level from local to global
Selected Excellence
striving for excellence
Striving for excellence
Student Commitment to Produce Distinctive, Quality Graduates
Student excellence.
Sustainability

Commitment to sustainability
Commitment to SUSTAINABILITY of the campus (strengthening and supporting existing buildings, community, programs)
Conservation
Create a Sustainable Campus
creative and sustainable use of resources

energy (i.e., energy independence)
Environment
Environmental Awareness
environment conservation
Environmental innovation (green campus, bike friendly, energy independent)
environmental sustainability

Environmentalism
environmentally focused
Focus on sustainability
reduce, reuse, recycle
Renewable Energy on Campus
Self Sufficiency
self-sustainability

Service to Community and State

Civic Responsibility
Commitment to multiple modes of SERVICE -- to students, to the community, and to faculty and campus employees
Community service, locally and globally,
community support through extension
Connecting Manoa to Hawaii
Contribution to community
Contribution to community in Hawaii and world
Engaged Institution (applying knowledge in-community to improve quality of life)
equality of service to community statewide
Excellent service to the local communities

EXTENSION
faculty service to the community
Give back to community: involve students in community (both immediate - in Moilili - and on a larger scale - Hawaii)
local community perspective
Meet the needs of the community
Meeting community needs
Outreach
Planning for the future of Hawaii
Public Outreach
Public service
Relevancy to community and state
Responsibility to serve community
Service / outreach to Hawaii NI AND the Pacific
service to /sense of community

Service to community (through sustainability)
Service to community & state to improve economy
Service to community including immigrants
Service to community, State and Country
Service to community, to state and to the planet
Service to Community: Academic and Social
Service to others
service to others
Valued for the Service & Economic Contribution made to the Community & State