



# Planning Council Meeting III January 27<sup>h</sup> Meeting Notes

1/27/2006

Building 2, Room 214

<b>Type of meeting:</b>	Monthly	<b>Facilitator:</b>	Brian Furuto
<b>Notetaker:</b>	Tracy Sonomura	<b>Timekeeper:</b>	Tracy Sonomura
<b>Attendees:</b>	Bill Becker, Diane Caulfield, Theresa Cummings, Kyle Higa, Ken Johnson, Ken Kato, Sheryl Legaspi, Jan Lubin, Sandy Matsui, Shannon Miho for Sherrie Rupert, James Niino, Sharon Ota, Jerry Saviano, Cynthia Smith, Patrick Stuart, Vern Takebayashi, Cory Takemoto, Beng Poh Yoshikawa, June Zakimi.		
<b>Not Present:</b>	Don Bourassa, Ramsey Pedersen, Stacy Rogers		
<b>Meeting Called to Order:</b>	9:05 am		
<b>Meeting Adjourned:</b>	10:25 am		

## ----- Agenda Topics -----

Adoption of January 13<sup>th</sup> Mtg. Notes

Brian Furuto

**Discussion:**

Cynthia asked to complete the sentence located on the second to the last page "HCC will follow a process that is fair and reasonable."

Vern requested that Ramsey to inform parties prior to announcing at Planning Council meetings (eg., ICS & CENT).

Sheryl asked to include into the notes that she voiced a concern about disability accommodations for students (e.,g., deaf students) if the AVIT program is moved to West Hawaii

**Conclusion/Vote**

Cynthia made a motion to adopt 1/13/06 notes as amended; Beng Poh seconded; vote unanimous in favor of adopting 1/13/06 notes as amended.

**Action items:**

**Person responsible:**

**Deadline:**

Need for Administrative Assessment

Cynthia Smith

Cynthia presented a proposal for the need for administrative assessment to assist in program review. Cynthia stressed the need for administration to be accountable. (original proposal attached)

**Discussion:**

Ken stated that there are established BOR policies for E& M performance evaluations. Ken circulated a list of names who completed his evaluation last year. Point was to show that there is an evaluation system currently being used called 360.

Cynthia stated that the process needs to be made explicit.

Bill clarified Jerry’s statement that he would like to involve the faculty senate if it is determined a need to evaluate decisions being made by administration.

Vern stated that we don’t know what the criteria are and where it comes from and the outcome of evaluations.

Eileen Torigoe was invited to speak and explained what the 360 evaluation is.

Eileen stated that Ramsey wanted an open process of evaluation, and therefore, when the BOR asked Ramsey if he would be willing to allow an evaluation of his administration, Ramsey immediately agreed.

Ken made a clarification that the 360 has been used since 1998. Since Ken’s 1<sup>st</sup> year as an administrator he was reviewed by Ramsey as a method of evaluating the administrators year to year. Administrators receive either an email or letter. According to Administrators in the room, the eval’s go into some depth, are helpful to their performance, and can be difficult at times.

Questions as to whether the high turnover of administrators is a result of the 360 process.

- Ken stated he is not party to other administrator’s evaluation and he can only disclose his own evaluation. In the last go around the 360 method was used. This year 5% raises for Administrators was based on a superior eval and other criteria established by the president.

A member asked how the campus is informed that administrator evaluations have begun.

- Ramsey is asked to send out a general email to let everyone know that they may be requested to complete an administrator evaluation.

Cynthia asked the members if they feel this is something that needs to be done and if so what would the next step be?

**Conclusions:** Cynthia made a motion for the Planning Council to ask the Administration to move rapidly on an administrative assessment; Ken J. seconded; vote unanimous in favor of the Planning Council to ask the Administration to move rapidly on an administrative assessment.

**Action items:**

**Person responsible:**

**Deadline:**

Jan updated PC members regarding ideas that resulted from the marketing and advertising meeting.

**Discussion:**

The members feel that it is important to form a committee to encompass information and retention.

Ideas formed by Ad-Hoc Marketing and Information Committee are attached.

Sharon suggested that rather than simply discussing ideas, additional research should be completed by the ad-hoc committee so that a feasible plan can be formulated for council review.

Cynthia felt that the ideas should be put out to the campus for feedback and comments.

Chris Ann expressed her concern that this committee is focusing on a much broader student recruitment effort and not what the FSEC and student council proposed, for example is it really the purview of the marketing committee to be discussing distant education delivery method or our college skills testing method, or the delivery method for our courses.

Brian stressed that these ideas were formed and talked about by the ad hoc committee. Jan is here just to share the ideas with the council to keep the council apprised of what is happening. "...these are just ideas only and are not set in stone."

Ken J. proposed the question should we proceed with this ad hoc committee or should we develop a more formal committee, such as a subcommittee of the PC, that would get the representation we talked about?

Brian asked Jan/Ken what deadline the ad-hoc committee was working with to complete the summer marketing info?

- Jan replied the deadline is March 15<sup>th</sup>

Considering the short timetable, it was suggested that PC members give feedback to Jan via planners-l email so that the ad-hoc committee as a whole can review PC comments. It was further recommended that the ad-hoc committee meet quickly to finalize a plan for council feedback and action.

The Ad-hoc Committee will develop a plan with funding costs attached and propose this plan at the next council meeting on Feb. 10<sup>th</sup>.

**Conclusion:** Cynthia made a motion for Jan to go back to the ad hoc committee and share the council's feedback with committee, finalize proposal; Jan seconded; motion passed unanimously.

<u>Action items</u>	<u>Person responsible:</u>	<u>Deadline:</u>
Ken J. and Jan will go back to ad hoc committee to formulate a proposal and present at the next council meeting.	Ken J. and Jan	02/10/06

Direction of Distance Education

Cynthia Smith

Cynthia made a request for a vote to establish a clear plan about the future of distance ed. on campus by creating a committee to compile fact & figures and expenditures. (original proposal attached)

**Discussion:**

Bill and Vern agreed that a committee should be formed to address the needs of distance learning.

Beng Poh stated that a plan must be in place by Fall for accreditation purposes.

Ramsey was not present, however, did provide written comments on this proposal. Gist of comments was to wait for council action on this issue due to policies, directions, etc. that are being formulated at the University systemwide level. (Comments attached)

Members were in favor of developing a plan ahead of the University as a whole and adjust as necessary if directions/policies coming from BOR or President impact HCC's proposal.

Ken J. recommended that the council move ahead with forming an ad-hoc committee to formulate proposal.

Sharon recommended that the committee which is formed should include employees who are currently handling distance education. Sharon also recommended that any policy take our budget requests and other asks into consideration.

**Conclusion:**

Ken J. made a motion to create an ad hoc committee to develop a distance education plan; Vern seconded; motion passed unanimously.

**Action items:**

**Person responsible:**

**Deadline:**

IT Replacement Policy Update

Vern Takebayashi

**Discussion:**

IT replacement policy committee has been formed.

Vern reported he received a total 5 email responses of which 1 was valid from Patrick Stuart.

Vern expressed a concern about firming up the policy without more input from the faculty by the next meeting.

Vern asked the members if the vote should be delayed because of the dismal response.

Cynthia felt that she didn't think the responses would be any better if the vote was delayed another month. Cynthia stated that the people were given ample opportunity to submit their feedback.

Vern was thanked for his hard work on this proposal.

**Conclusions:**

The committee will finalize a policy for council review and action.

**Action items:** Vern will firm up policy and submit for vote at the next meeting.

**Person responsible:**

Vern Takebayashi

**Deadline:**

02/10/06

Pressing Issues

Administration

Feb. 24<sup>th</sup> meeting is cancelled due to high school day.

Brian gave a “heads up” about what administration is dealing with at the legislature. Council informed that the University is lucky to be working with two Chairs of the higher ed committees that actually care and want to make progress.

Members informed that Rep. Tommy Waters introduced two measures, which mirror the HCC supplemental budget request. The bills will likely not move much further in the process as an appropriation bill of this nature will eventually be part of the State budget vehicle. However, it gives HCC an opportunity to tell our story, hear are our priorities, etc.

Brian cautioned members not to confuse the “construction academy” with the “construction initiative.” The proposal was put together by James Niino, Guy Shibayama, Ken Kato, Bernadette Howard, and various people from here, KauaiCC, and MauiCC at the request of certain legislators, certain congressional delegation members, and certain people in the industry. The goal of the proposal was to help the industry widen their base of qualified workers. The proposal was never designed just for the Construction Academy. If viewed in this nature, then it looks like CC’s are padding their pockets with the extra \$1.5M that is in there for apprenticeship program expansion.

Brian announced that sometime this session the legislature is planning to hold legislative hearings on campus. Conducting legislative hearings on campus will largely work in our favor as exposure in marketing and information. The first legislative hearing is scheduled for February 10 at LCC. All administrators will need to be at LCC. Next planning meeting will be rescheduled and Brian will notify members via email regarding the status of the next meeting. The reason the hearing is being held at LCC was due in part that LCC personnel expressed their feelings of always being left out because of their location.

Ken K. asked who will be at this meeting?

- Members of the House Higher Educ. and the hearing will focus only on bills relating to Oahu’s CC’s.

Members informed that legislators don’t want to hear from the Administration because they hear from us everyday, every week. However, the legislature does want to hear from the campus wide community, students, faculty, staff, etc.

Ken K. added that Rep. Waters wants to hear from students. Ken has mentioned it to Patrick Stuart would be willing to show their support the supplemental budget request.

The supplemental budget is \$1.4 M, including systemwide requests, and HCC only received \$50K in the Governor’s budget for both operating and CIP. Priorities for this year are CIP (planning and design money for the new science and technology bldg., money to re-roof Hangar 111), all of our operating requests, and lastly the construction initiative. Brian stated we’re asking for a lot and probably will not get it all, but our priority is CIP.

Sharon stated that it is a good time to emphasize the importance of a strategic planning document because many items in our budget are related to this plan.

- Ken will email spreadsheet of our supplemental budget request for members.

Kyle asked the administration to keep the campus aware of legislative happenings. Although this is already done, his concern is that the campus finds out too late. Members informed that this is possible, however, by the nature of the legislative timetable oftentimes the campus will find out after the fact anyway.

- Brian will work with internet/intranet staff to post testimony and other legislative documents in as timely a manner as possible.

**Conclusions**

**Action items:**

**Person responsible:**

**Deadline:**

**Invitees:** Linda Buck

**Resource persons:** Eileen Torigoe