

Planning Council Meeting Attendance

Date: 10/10/2008

<i>Title</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>initials</i>
Chancellor	Mike Rota	
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor	Brian Furuto	BF
Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs	Erika Lacro	EL
Dean of Student Services	Sandy Matsui	SM
Vice Chancellor Administrative Services	Ken Kato	KK
Director of PCATT	Scott Murakami	SM
Director – Management Information and Research	???	
Dean - University College	Ralph Kam	RK
Dean - Transportation and Trades	Mark Silliman	MS
Dean - Communication and Services	Gary Boydell	GB
Accreditation Liaison Officer	Cynthia Smith	CS
Liaison – Assessment Committee	Ross Egloria	RE
Liaison – Faculty Senate Executive Committee	Jim Poole	JP
Liaison – Staff Senate Executive Committee	Kyle Higa Jonathan Wong	JW
Liaison - Information Technology Center	Rose Sumajit	RS
Tech 1 Division Chair	Bert Shimabukuro	BS
Tech 2 Division Chair	Sam Rhoads	SR
University College Division Chair - Humanities and Social Sciences	Marcia Roberts-Deutsch	MRD
University College Division Chair - Language Arts	Dolores Donovan	DD
University College Division Chair - Science and Math	Kerry Tanimoto	KT
Representative – Apprenticeship Program	James Niino	JN
Representative – Academic Support Faculty and Staff	Cory Takemoto	CT
Representative – Student Services	Shanon Miho	SM
Representative – Student Senate	David Sakaria	
Faculty-at-large	Vern Takebayashi	V.T.
Staff-at-large	Jonathan Wong	JW
Community Representative	not active yet	
guest	AScott	
guest	Leon Floren do	Kupin Ka Wai Council

Planning Council subcommittee on updating Strategic Plan

Subcommittee members:

Erika Lacro, Brian Furuto, Rose Sumajit, Ross Egloria, Grace Funai, and Vern Takebayashi

Discussion

Here are some ideas that we have discussed so far:

1. To support Campus Assessment, we should ask for the creation of two new positions. One position would provide the technical, back-end support for designing the databases that HCC uses to store assessment data. This person would also be available to perform queries and generate reports needed by programs and administration in creating reports related to assessment data. The other position would be a person who provides direct support to faculty, staff, and administration in terms of creating assessment surveys and analyzing the results for the purpose of program improvement and for assessment reports. Can resources from Achieving the Dream be used to start this off? Erika indicated that we did go forward with three positions for the Achieving the Dream initiative in one of our program requests. This was in the top tier priority, but this was prior to the budget cut directives.
2. The Recruitment and Retention (R and R) committees needs to be kept in the loop for any modifications to the Strategic Plan. So far, they have done a great job of choosing items that align with the Strategic Plan. It is probably a good idea that someone representing the R and R committee be a member of this subcommittee. Grace Funai has agreed to become a member of this subcommittee.
3. We started to discuss some of the external driving factors. One of the external driving factors that Mike Rota had mentioned is that our community needs to replace a number of retiring workers in the installation and maintenance technologies. Besides this specific item, the Second Decade Report and Appendix A (The Hawaii Planning Context), clearly indicate we have worker supply gaps that need to be filled. We need to look at the worker supply gaps and see where HCC is able to address these gaps. For example, (in Appendix A page A-5), there is a growing need in baccalaureate fields such as education, nursing, electrical engineering, and health sciences. However, HCC would probably only indirectly be involved in doing things in these areas. At the same time, that study shows a gap (of around 500 per year) between the supply and demand for technician jobs (vocational certificates and two-year technical degrees). However, since our initial discussion, the budget cut directives are probably the overriding external factor.
4. We need to look at the leaking education-to-work pipeline. As part of the Planning Council, we need to look at all phases of the pipeline so that the campus efforts are

coordinated.. If we consider a hypothetical student that is going to come to HCC, let's try to identify what contributes and what takes away from the chances for that student's success:

- What makes a student choose HCC? If they arrive here as part of an Academy program, that student is likely to have greater success because they are continuing a process that started in high school. In addition, the training that this student received in high school is at least partially overseen by HCC faculty in that program. If the student arrives here because that student correctly perceives that HCC is the correct place to attend for Fashion Technology, or Cosmetology, or Auto mechanics for example, the student is more likely to be successful than if they don't know why they came here. This is why "branding" of our campus may be beneficial. If that same student came to HCC expecting to learn about nursing or culinary arts, that person is probably in the wrong place. I don't think we can afford to have people think that coming to HCC was a waste of their time. It would be nice to think that they could take some of the basic education courses here, but this should not be a high priority for this campus.
- Once the student arrives on campus, he or she may have some immediate needs. The student may require remedial education. This is quite likely if the student is coming from the public schools (Academy programs may reduce this need.) All students should get an orientation (the R and R committee is working on this). I think a mandatory credit course that covers things like time management, note-taking skills, and how to work with their instructors would be worthwhile. (That course should be mandatory and free, in my opinion.) It may even be better for each program to offer such a course to tailor it specifically for the kind of critical thinking required for their program.
- To further help out a student once they are here, we need to encourage (provide training for) the use of tools such as Lualima to make it easier for students to keep up in case they miss a class. Our student population often have to work and may have young children to tend to. Having class resources (assignment sheets, due dates, exam dates, etc.) available on the Web for all of their courses could mean the difference between a student passing or failing.
- When the student is part way through the program and is thinking about getting a job, what kinds of things do we provide that make this more likely? Does the program have an ongoing relation with its advisory board so that the curricula is appropriate? Does the program internship program provide the

students with an education that goes beyond what they can learn in the classroom?

- The student graduates (hopefully) and goes out and gets a job? What kind of follow-up do we set in place to determine if we are successful at educating that student. Can we gather feedback from the student to see what worked, and what did not?
5. We will be looking into having our faculty/staff participate in the Community College Inventory that Mike Rota has used in the past. This will help to identify problem areas that adversely affect morale (low morale hurts students), and may even provide clues to bridge the gap between CTE and Liberal Arts.

PC Subcommittee to Review Strategic Plan Process

1. Share results of survey done last semester assessing PC's effectiveness in the Strategic Plan Process.
2. Have a dedicated website on the intranet with links to:
 - minutes of last year's PC meetings prioritizing Strategic Plan
 - a template/sample of a good submission - in particular with support from assessment/research
3. Need to refine/establish the criteria for prioritizing Strategic Plan items. For example, health and safety first, legislative dictates, programs in trouble, etc. Without establishing these criteria upfront, the people submitting items don't know what needs to be addressed in justifying the item. We might also add a criterion that states that any item that is not justified based on assessment/research will automatically be placed on second (or third) tier status.
4. We need to ensure that all interested parties have input and agree with the submitted item. This is to address the concern that some of the items showed up on the Strategic Plan based on erroneous information. Requiring a sign off from everyone in the department making the submission with the Program Dean mediating if necessary could make this less of a problem.
5. Town meetings and Faculty Development workshops should be held to show and explain good and bad examples of providing supporting evidence for a submitted item.
6. The PC chair or this subcommittee can review items when they are submitted and request that weak or missing justification be supplied. This can go back to the Program Dean or Division Chair for follow up.
7. There needs to be better follow through on what becomes of the prioritized list the PC comes up with. If items go forward that are not high on the list, there needs to be written explanations as to why this occurred. Otherwise, this invalidates the entire process.
8. The online submittal process needs to be made more visible (to invite all interested parties to provide input).
9. Assessment must be made easier to perform and analyze. For assessment to be used as a planning tool, there needs to be a common definition of how we measure whether or not a goal has been met. (In addition, to design databases to store the assessment data, these definitions must be in place.) For example, a common definition of how we measure retention must be agreed upon. This should be taken up by the Assessment committee.

