

MINUTES OF THE  
PLANNING COUNCIL  
November 2, 2007

Members Present: Ramsey Pederson, Chancellor; Brian Furuto, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Erika Lacro, Interim Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs; Sandy Matsui, Dean of Students; Ken Kato, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs; Scott Murakami, PCATT Director; Beng Poh Yoshikawa, International Programs Director; Jan Lubin, Management, Information, and Research Director (Recorder); Jim Poole, Accreditation Oversight Committee Liaison; Femar Lee, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison; Kyle Higa, Staff Senate Executive Committee Liaison; Bill Becker, Information Technology Center Liaison; Sam Rhoad, Tech 2 Division Chair; Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, University College Division Chair Representative; James Niino, Apprenticeship Representative; Cory Takemoto, Academic Support Faculty and Staff; Shanon Miho, Student Services Representative; Vern Takebayashi, Faculty-at-Large (Convener); Kim Kawamura for Jonathan Wong, Staff-at-Large Representative

Excused: Ross Egloria, Assessment Committee Liaison; Bert Shimabukuro, Tech 1 Division Chair; Noelani Agunoy, Student Representative

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 by Vern Takebayashi, Convener, who introduced Femar Lee as the new FSEC Liaison, Kim Kawamura, who was substituting for Jonathon Wong, and thanked Jim Poole for refreshments.

Vern wanted clarification from Bill Becker that the trial testing statement in the October 5, 2007, minutes was accurate, which Bill confirmed. Corey moved and Marcia seconded approval of the minutes. The motion to approve passed unanimously.

**Strategic Plan Cycle:** The current explanation and Strategic Plan Flow Chart was distributed. Vern noted that this was a work-in-progress, and that the Administration had added a few steps to get all parties involved at a lower level and to get more buy in from the faculty and staff. To do this, the document should be clear and visible to everyone. The question that Vern raised was whether or not the current document should be posted as is or did it need modification before posting. Vern noted that one addition that should be made was to clearly state that assessment is part of the Planning Process.

Sam stated that he was confused by the use of the diamond at Step 9. What are the two flows? A lively discussion ensued that clarified that the diamond represented two different types of fiscal decisions. If the fiscal decision was internal, then funds were reallocated. If the fiscal decision was externally funded, then the budget request was sent through the executive and legislative budget process. If it was approved, then funds would come to the College from the State. If it was not approved, then the College would need to reassess its needs and possibly delete the request from the Strategic Plan. Jim thought that the diagram for Step 9 would be clearer if yes/no was placed on the lines outside the diamond and that the description inside the diamond read Internally Funded. In

addition, the description for Step 10B should read Executive/Legislature Funded with yes/no placed on the lines outside the diamond.

Vern said that there would need to be a larger document that describes the entire process in detail, but Sam thought that the Flow Chart could provide more detail than it does now. Marcia agreed, noting that in the current diagram that it appeared that no yes/no decisions were made until the fiscal allocation phase of the process, which was false. Another discussion ensued about who had the power to decide what got put in the Strategic Plan and items that should be added to reflect what actually is taking place, i.e. more visibly tying Assessment and Program Review into the process. The Planning Council recommended that a sub-committee be formed to look at the Strategic Planning Process and to modify the current document and description so that it will be clearer. Jim Poole will solicit members outside the Planning Council. Sam, Erika, and Jan (after the meeting) volunteered to serve on the sub-committee.

**Retirement of Faculty:** There are at least 55 faculty members who are eligible for retirement. Vern was concerned that when these faculty do retire that we will be in competition for the most qualified applicants with other schools, and that we tend to take longer in making decisions, so will miss out on hiring the faculty that we want to bring into HCC. Beng Poh thought we should focus our efforts on certain challenging disciplines, i.e. Math, where we knew that we were going to lose a lot of faculty. Marcia wondered how we could determine whether or not a discipline would be losing a lot of faculty. Vern said that we could do a survey of all departments. Marcia also noted that there were implications on retention and allocation of positions.

Ramsey agreed and said that the retirement of faculty was being discussed at the President's Council, and that the discussion was not about filling vacant positions, but was looking at finances, positions, and system concerns to see where we will be going as a system. The Council is looking at the Second Decade Project and the System and individual Colleges Strategic Plans to see what growth will take place. There are approximately 1000 vacant positions System-wide, a majority of which are Deans at the Manoa campus. These positions are being looked at differently than in the past. It is not who has the money attached to the position, but based on the data where is the need most great that will determine where these positions will go. HCC will need to reassess its needs through Program Review and Assessment, which is connected to the Planning Council through the Strategic Planning Process. It is important to remember that the faculty who are retiring will be at higher salary levels, than the faculty who will be hired to replace them, which may result in a net surplus in personnel funds to campuses. Scott stressed that this is a new way of doing business for the System, which is more difficult than the way business has been conducted in the past. Shanon mentioned that she thought that departments could review old ads to make sure that current SLOs are addressed before new ads go out. Ads that aren't reviewed carefully can slow down the hiring process if they have to be fixed after going out and readvertised. (These new ads could be reviewed by the Planning Council to make sure that they address the current needs of the department based on SLOs before being posted to [workatmyuh.hawaii.edu](http://workatmyuh.hawaii.edu) or other venue.) Vern suggested

that this be discussed further via email before a recommendation is made from the Planning Council.

**Computer Technology Innovation Team:** Vern stressed that the creation of this team would not replace the current Tech Advisory Committee, but that the new team would test out new computer applications that could benefit instruction/assessment. The testing would be approved and set up by ITC, and the faculty would provide their insight and expertise based on classroom experience. Thus, the purpose of the Computer Technology Innovation Team would be to encourage innovation, in order to help make HCC students more creative. Members of the team may be able to get release time for their efforts. Guidelines would have to be set up to prevent abuse of the system, and to specify what kinds of technology-related paths are good for innovation at HCC. Vern wondered if this was a good idea or not?

Sam thought that the Computer Technology Innovation Team could be a sub committee of the Tech Advisory Board. Scott said that this can be happening now as ITC has worked with interested faculty before and will continue to do so. He stated that innovation, creativity, and creating opportunities for students is part of every faculty members responsibility. Vern acknowledged this and stated that he just wanted to formalize the process. Ramsey stated that this was an operational issue and should be brought before the Campus Leadership Team, not the Planning Council. Jim mentioned that if it is decided that the Computer Innovation Team is a sub committee of the Tech Advisory Board, then the FSEC would need to get involved, and that because of the emphasis on distance education at HCC that we should put our best efforts forward to progress in technology innovation. The Planning Council recommended that the discussion of whether to form a new Computer Technology Innovation Team be passed to the Campus Leadership Team.

**Moodle:** Bill Becker stated that the use of Moodle as a discussion board for the Planning Council is under testing now to make sure that everything is working correctly, and that the tool will be available to the Planning Council soon. Once the system is deployed, the discussions of the Planning Council can be archived.

**Marketing and Public Relations Organization:** Brian passed out a memo that was going to be distributed via email to the entire campus in the afternoon. The memo went into detail about a new Marketing Committee that was being formed in order to complement the new system-wide marketing effort, and maximize HCC recruitment and retention issues. Brian acknowledged that marketing had been taking place at HCC prior to the forming of this committee on an ad hoc basis through Karen Hastings' promotional efforts and the Ad Hoc Marketing Committee. The new committee is comprised of Brian Furuto, Sandy Matsui, Gary Boydell, and Ralph Kam. Marcia noted that there were no faculty on the new committee. Brian stressed that the committee will be asking faculty and staff for input and that Karen Hastings was not going to stop her promotional efforts for the campus. Ramsey added that he wanted his administrative team to focus and be responsible for marketing, and Brian reinforced this by saying that Gary Boydell had already solicited information from the Communication Arts faculty. Marcia thought that the sooner the issue of faculty involvement was clarified, the better. Ramsey stated that this was going on now.

Vern mentioned that recruitment is only part of Marketing, Recruitment, and Retention, and Brian agreed that we have to take care of things at HCC before getting more people. Ramsey stated that John Morton's initiatives – Achieving the Dream and the American Diploma project are showing that the System is flat or going down as the market for our services is limited. We need to compile data at all levels – DOE, CCs, four-year schools on how to keep people engaged.

Vern and Jim have attended the System Strategic Planning Meeting, where they solicited input, but it appeared that they had already decided what to do. Vern felt that HCC could not rely on the System, and that we need to look at how to retain Native Hawaiian and other students. Jim reinforced what Ramsey had said earlier, that all of John Morton's initiatives seem to be stressing getting people into the system then providing them with the necessary services to keep them in.

HCC has already given money to the System Marketing Task Force, which has helped a kiosk of opportunities at all campuses. Vern had looked at the kiosk and found that some of our programs were not mentioned. He agreed that we must be consistent with the System-wide marketing effort, but also must look after ourselves. Vern requested that updates on campus-wide retention efforts be given to the Planning Council by Sandy. Brian agreed that someone should report retention efforts to the Council, but thought he would be better able to provide this service than Sandy. Brian hoped that the new marketing effort would allow all decisions at HCC to be based on recruitment and retention issues. Sam reiterated that Retention and Recruitment is an important issue, but not at the cost of quality.

Vern brought up that parking was a significant issue for students at HCC. Ramsey said that we have a lot of parking on campus. Brian said that we were not advertising parking, and Ken stressed that students don't want to walk far. Scott said that data was needed to show that parking was a problem. Jim replied that the Student Satisfaction Survey completed two years ago showed that parking was at the bottom of the students' list, which Ramsey stated was an economic issue. Scott had not seen the results of the survey or the instrument itself. He recommended that we distribute the survey again, since this was a new population of students. Brian said that we would look at past as well as present data. The question is whether or not parking is a limiter to enrollment. The question then came up to whether or not programming should be on campus or should we be looking for sites where the most people can access our programs.

Sandy thought there was a lot of misinformation about parking and the lottery process. We presently use a lottery system where continuing students can sign up when they register for parking in Lots 1 and 3. Students think they can't park on campus if they miss out on the lottery. Jim wondered if the lottery was necessary, to which Ken answered yes. Jim asked whether or not we could switch to a first-come-first-serve system instead. Ken said this was possible if we didn't issue permits. Scott asked if all the rates were the same, to which Ken responded no.

**Accreditation Issues:** Jim stated that according to the Planning Agenda that was distributed to members electronically, different people and groups on campus were assigned different responsibilities. The Planning Council was mentioned in this document many times alone and with other campuses units. He requested that the Planning Council start working on those issues under its responsibility that directly relate to the six recommendations made by the Visiting Team last year. This will help with the Progress Report which is due to WASC in March 2008. Recommendation 1 directly affects the Planning Council. Shared governance is tied to assessment, which is then put into the Strategic Plan and prioritized by the Planning Council, but we have no document to show this process. The Planning Council should have a document similar to the CPC Curriculum Reference Manual that shows the process.

Jim mentioned that Jan Peterson was bringing an action before the FSEC to transform the Planning Council Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education to an FSEC-sponsored committee renamed the Distance Education Advisory Committee.

Vern mentioned that creating documentation so people know how things are supposed to work is important. It will help HCC become better, and help the Planning Council plan for the future.

Beng Poh said that the ACCJC Accreditation Progress Report deadline of mid March may be difficult to meet because the BOR will not meet until March. Jim stated that Mike Rota would allow the Report to go forward to ACCJC with a "pending BOR approval" statement.

Meeting adjourned: 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Jan Lubin, Recorder