

E4.202 Long Range Planning - Policy Integrating Educational Development
Plans and Other Planning Documents



I. INTRODUCTION

The task of planning and managing the operations of a multi-campus statewide institution such as the University of Hawai'i is a complex and monumental challenge. The diversity of its programs and the many clientele to which it must be responsive makes it difficult to address planning and budgeting concerns in a fragmented manner especially when each campus or Unit is at once a major part of the over-all University of Hawai'i mission. Thus, to maintain high quality academic programs supported with appropriate but scarce financial resources and sound physical facilities, the University of Hawai'i continues to be committed to a planning and management approach that integrates academic, budget, and capital planning. It has become more critical that the current planning products such as educational or academic development plans, educational specifications, capital improvement programs, and the biennial budget be more closely related in content and continuity. It is simply good management practice to insure that while academic Planning must set the tone and direction for the University's programs, capital needs also must be planned and justified on a programmatic basis, and the budget must be prepared as a clear reflection of the costs for carrying out those academic and supporting programs within reasonable financial limits.

II. THE POLICY

The University of Hawai'i's long-range planning will be based on the mission of each of the major Units as presently articulated or as may be modified in the future. The mission of each Unit will be translated by an Academic or Educational Development Plan and a 6-year Program Summary containing the information described in Attachments A and B. These ADP's and EDP's will be reviewed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs for the President and by the Board of Regents. If acceptable, each will be approved by the Board as a general basis for program, budget, and capital planning and proposals.

The 6-year Program Summary will become the basis of the Multi-year Program Plan required by the State with each biennial budget request. The biennial budget request is simply the first two years of that multiyear plan.



Each Unit and campus must prepare a Complex Development Report (CDR) based on its EDP or ADS, and from that CDR, the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The multiyear program and budget plan must be based on the Regent-approved EDP or ADP and CDR. The CDR and the multiyear budget plan are to be reviewed by the University Administration, involving the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Director of Administration and the Director of Finance, prior to recommendation by the President to the Board of Regents.

III. PURPOSE OF THE INTEGRATION APPROACH

This policy formalizes and reaffirms an approach for tying together the processes and outputs of planning and budgeting on a six-year cycle (three biennium periods) beginning with the biennium 1977-79. This conceptual framework is shown on the next page and describes the key processes, outputs, and their interrelationships.

The integration intends to bring about consistency and continuity among the various University planning and budgeting products such that they will be related and usable within and by the Units in their campus planning and budget requirements and by the University Administration and the Regents in setting long-range and short-range goals.

In addition, by placing all University-wide planning on a 6-year cycle, each biennium being planned will be a subpart of the larger long-range, six-year planning horizon. Plans and budgets will consequently be updated biennially (or annually) as program changes and workload increases necessitate.

Importantly, the framework will also serve as a vehicle for collaboration and consultation among all levels of administrators within the University. Through such collaboration, common understandings about the role and scope of academic planning, the operating budget, and capital needs can be reached and thus minimize fragmented planning efforts.

While not shown on the framework, an important aspect of this planning process is its relationship to the overall mission, role, and scope statement for the University which influences and sets the tone for much of the planning and management activities in the University. Documents addressing these aspects will be developed with your help, consultation, and advice.

INTEGRATION OF KEY PLANNING PROCESSES
--GOES HERE--
USE PAGEMAKER

IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY

The implementation of this policy centers around four milestone outputs which provide the basic content from which most other products for planning and management uses and serve as the "targets" of planning for Units and campuses. They are:

1. Academic or Educational Development Plan (EDP) is the central document of a campus which describes the educational philosophy and mission of a campus, its program directions, the community and clientele it intends to serve, the critical issues it faces in the 6-year time frame, and the estimated resources required to carry out the objectives of the campus. Related to the EDP will be a Program Summary which translates and summarizes the broad directions of the EDP into a 6-year plan, tying together programs, capital projects, and the operating budgets.
2. Complex Development Report (CDR) or the so-called "master plan" of a campus which describes the plans for building physical facilities and plant to support program execution.
3. Multiyear Program Plan (6-Year Plan) which provides the overall campus program plan and direction translated into operating and capital budget needs over a six-year planning horizon or cycle.
4. Biennium Budget, including Capital Improvement Program (CIP) which provides a more detailed 2-year slice of the 6-year Plan and the document which has usually received the most attention in planning.

In the integration process, the current or revised EDP's of each Unit or campus will be the starting point, i.e., all campuses do not need to begin anew. For each EDP, a Program Summary (see Framework in Attachment B) will be developed which will be transmitted to the Board of Regents with the EDP for review. (In any future EDP development or update, the campus may wish to accomplish a revision on their EDP according to a framework in Attachment A which is merely shown as a suggestion.) The document should also include input or information from department/division planning, accreditation reports, or self-studies of program priorities which may occur prior to any revision effort.

Concurrently, in the capital planning process, the Unit or campus will either have or will be in the process of developing a generalized and very tentative campus layout which provides an overview of the facilities needed to



support the program plan in the EDP. From the EDP and a generalized campus layout, the Educational Specifications Plan (Ed Specs) will be developed. To assist in Ed Specs development, Standards for Space Allocation will be identified for Universitywide use.

From the Ed Specs, the Complex Development Report will be produced. The CDR will be the basis from which CIP's will be recommended for each biennium. Moreover, the CIP's emerging from the CDR will be related to the academic program plan as contained in the EDP. Although capital facility planning usually requires more than six years of projections, all CDR's will at the least be related to the objectives in the 6-year Plan. Other legal documents necessary such as environmental impact statements will be completed to support the CDR development.

The 6-Year Plan will be the vehicle by which academic planning considerations, operating budget, and capital needs are integrated into a cohesive, over-all direction of the Unit or campus, taking into consideration Universitywide, Unit, or campus priorities, the existing programs, and any new programs or contemplated changes to existing programs to be made during the 6-year planning cycle.

Finally, the 6-Year Plan will serve as the basis from which the biennial budget and CIP will be developed.

Effective immediately, each Unit or campus will be responsible for:

1. Developing a summary of the program plan contained in its most current EDP (see Attachments B & C for suggested guidelines), and
2. Providing an overview of the facilities plan or educational specifications for carrying out the program plans in the EDP.

As a matter of process, the Board will sequentially review for discussion and approval the campus and program plans (as described by the EDP and Program Summary), the Complex Development Report, and the Biennium Budget with related CIP's as a basis respectively of:

- 
1. Preparation of Ed Specs to be approved at the President's level, and
 2. Development of the CIP for the 6-Year Planning cycle,
 3. Development of the Regents Budget for transmittal to the Governor and the State Department of Budget and Finance.

The President will inform the Board on the progress of this integration process as it is implemented. Moreover, it is the intent of this policy to insure that all Units and campuses will have an updated EDP and a Program Summary by the beginning of FY 1978-79 as a basis for planning and budgeting for the next biennium 1979-81. By the 1979-81 biennium, the entire integration process should be fully implemented, subject to adjustment according to experience and changing planning requirements.

A FRAMEWORK FOR EDP/ADP
(A Suggestion Only)

Assumptions

- EDP reflects direction of academic and other programs of the campus
- EDP serves as a basis upon which budgetary considerations can be made
- EDP is the result of the collective program development and reviews of a campus

Uses of EDP/EDP

- Tell story of Unit/campus - what it is, what it does, what it will do over a specified period of time
- Foundation for budget planning (operating budget, CIP, priorities)
- Basis for judging the accountability of the educational enterprise
- Communication vehicle among various levels of administrators and Faculty

Its Components

Foreword - general educational philosophy of the campus

I. Mission

- A. Role and clients to be served
- B. Relationship to the other parts of the University
- C. Relationship to the community
- D. Relationship to the state, national, international arenas

II. Philosophy and Assumptions

- A. Philosophy on student learning
- B. Philosophy on faculty renewal and vitality
- C. Philosophy on instructional methods
- D. Assumptions upon which this EDP/ADP is being developed relative to:
 - 1. Internal environment and constraints
 - 2. External environment and constraints

III. Program and Scope

- A. Description of major programs and goals (Instruction, Research, Public Service, etc.)
- B. Emphases for each program, including for instruction the degrees which the campus awards and the majors or program options .
- C. Identification of new programs being planned in each major program or those being phased out
- D. Student enrollment picture (by program option or discipline)

IV. Resources

- A. Faculty (size, a description of their strengths, renewal and vitality plans)
- B. Instructional support (status of equipment, supplies, travel, services)
- C. Facilities support (general description and pending capital needs)
- D. Community support (ties to community agencies and resources)

V. Priorities On a Six-Year Timetable, by Major Programs.

VI. Estimated General Six-year Budget by Major Program and Program Option or Discipline Area

SUGGESTED CAMPUS PROGRAM SUMMARY FRAMEWORK

I. Mission of Campus

- A. Campus Priorities and Emphasis
- B. Goals of Major Programs, e.g., Instruction, Research, Public Service (Definitions)
- C. Unique Strengths Relative to Overall University or Unit Mission
- D. Critical Issues to Address

II. Assumptions of Operating Environment

- A. Growth Patterns
- B. Resource Patterns, including cost data
- C. Facilities/Program Patterns
- D. Administrative Flexibility

III. Program* Direction Information (Estimations)

<u>Program Type</u>	<u>1976-77</u>	<u>1977-78</u>	<u>1978-79</u>	<u>1979-80</u>	<u>1980-81</u>	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>1982-83</u>
Continuing Programs	A B C **	A B C	A B C	A B C	-	-	-
1.							
2.							
3.							
New Programs Planned							
1.							
2.							
3.							
New Program Implementation							
1.							
2.							
3.							

**A= Total Expected Enrollment/Number of Majors Planned

B= FTE Faculty (Planned)

C= Operating Budget (Estimated) by program area, or discipline if available, including instructional equipment

*"Program," at this time, refers to (1) any sequence of courses and educational experiences that comprises an area of concentration and leads to some form of certification of major, option, or degree and (2) a grouping of activities that constitute a support function such as student service, academic support, and institutional support

IV. Estimated Capital Needs

Description of Need*	ESTIMATED CAPITAL, BY YEAR					
	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83

*In each description of your capital need, distinguish between (1) enrollment related and programmatic needs and (2) between renovation needs and new facility contracts.

V. Other Comments

SUMMARY OF INTEGRATED PLANNING PROCESS CHARACTERISTICS

- A sequential integration of basic planning and decision steps for academic programs, physical plank and budget development;
- Provides an opportunity for all levels of University administration and the Board of Regents to review and products of each phase of the planning at stages appropriate for change, if desired;
- Exposes the various steps of planning and the assumptions on which they are based in "digestible" portions; to ensure relationships and consistency among the various products of planning;
- Utilizes the step-by-step process by which a University of Hawai'i Master Planning Process and Role and Scope Document may be prepared without unnecessary descriptive intervention but by which necessary adjustments to components may be made.

UNIVERSITYWIDE FACTORS REVIEWED IN EACH EDUCATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PLAN (EDP) AND ITS PROGRAM SUMMARY

- * Mission of the Unit or campuses and its educational philosophies
- * The reality and credibility of enrollment projections contained in the EDP
- * Conformity to current University and Regent policy and past Regental actions regarding the specific campus
- * Aspects of the EDP that affect other University Units and programs
- * Accuracy of current biennial budget as reflected in the recommendations of the Executive Budget to the Legislature
- * Identification of current programs, their relationship to the Regent-approved list and the program review schedule
- * Identification of new programs for which tentative plans are being made in order for program authorization to be reviewed.

ASPECTS OF EACH EDP THAT MAY BE OF SPECIAL INTEREST AND IMPORTANCE
TO REGENTS IN THEIR REVIEW FOR GENERAL APPROVAL

- * The educational philosophies, policies required by them, and students to be served;
- * The magnitude of the enterprise as projected and described within the time period indicated;
- * The "general" configuration of the scope and nature of instructional programs and their support, including
- * Tentative plans for property acquisition and physical facilities needed;
- * Approximations of cost if the EDP is implemented as presented;
- * Unique problems that need or will need resolution at various administrative levels.