

## PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING NOTES

*Notes from Friday October 13, 2006*

**Members Present:** Vern Takebayashi, Cynthia Smith, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Sherrie Rupert, Kyle Higa, Bill Becker, Cory Takemoto, Sam Rhoads, Stacy Rogers, Sharon Ota, Sandy Matsui, Jarren Uyehara for Jan Lubin, Stacy Rogers, Ramsey Pedersen, Ross Egloria, Jerry Cerny for Scott Murakami, Von Scott-Wong

**Not Present:** Jan Lubin, Bert Shimabukuro, Scott Murakami

**Convener:** Mark Silliman

**Note taker:** Nida Chock

Mark called the meeting called to order at 9:04 a.m. Rob Edmondson sat in as a guest; Jonathan Wong was introduced at the new Staff-at-Large representative and Jerry Cerny represented Scott Murakami.

### **TOPIC: Opening Remarks (Mark Silliman)**

- Apologized for Scott Murakami who was attending another meeting
- Vern Takebayashi would be coming in a little late
- Sandy Matsui would be leaving a little early to attend a meeting at Manoa

### **TOPIC: Review and Approval of Old Minutes (Mark Silliman)**

Thanked Cynthia and Kyle for their comments to the minutes and asked if anyone had any modification/deletions/additions that Nida could notate accordingly.

**Vote:** *Approve the minute as is:*

- Marcia Roberts-Deutsch moved to approve the minutes.
- Beng Poh Yoshikawa seconded the motion.
- *Motion was unanimously agreed upon.*

### **TOPIC: Update on the creation of a written document outlining the assessment plan for administration (Ramsey)**

- Passed out a handout (Proposed Administration Support Area Review Draft –[see attachment 1](#))
- Proposed draft timeline was circulated
- Question: Are all written comments passed on to the person being reviewed?
  - 1) Administration gets an anonymous compilation of all written comments from all respondents (NOTE: 360's are all voluntary)
  - 2) The Chancellor discusses the nature of evaluation process and then makes his recommendations to the President
  - 3) Part of the Chancellor's evaluations by the President is the evaluation of his staff

- The Planning Council requested that information related to the assessment of administrative outcomes be shared with the Committee before becoming an official and finalized part of the Annual Report.
  - 1) The published Annual Report is compiled at the end of the evaluation/recommendation cycle
- 360° evaluation is just one part of the whole evaluation process. **Outcomes** are a much better measure than people's opinions
- The Committee requested that the Proposed Administration Support Area Review be submitted to the Assessment Committee for feedback
- Administration evaluations are governed by administrative rights and are different from all other evaluations that are governed by contract
- Assessment outcomes of administrative reviews need to be integrated into the Proposed Administration Support Area Review

**TOPIC: Discussion of potential agenda items for the October 25<sup>th</sup> Planning Council Meeting**

- Discussion regarding the need for a policy or procedure by which information can be changed or updated on the HCC website
  1. Who updates the Internet website?
    - a) Ross volunteered to draft a proposal with Todd Kobayashi or Dave Cleveland for the next meeting
  2. Intranet web site – private/internal network – no director link from our public site
  3. Internet – HCC Public Website
- How can the Planning Council Charter be amended?
- Update on the Strategic Plan (hereafter to be a standing agenda item)
- Identify the top five priorities of Planning Agenda items for the PC (from the documents that Cynthia sent by email – Planning Agenda from the Self Study)

*NOTE: Leave agenda items open until Wednesday (cut-off date) for additions if necessary.*

**TOPIC: Incorporating the EON and Mele initiatives into the Strategic Plan (Ramsey)**

- In the planning phases:
  1. There are aspects of the Mele that are already in the Strategic Plan – the project will have to go forward faster than what is currently required by Title III
  2. Mele staff putting together a series of action items/timelines/activities that are being proposed
  3. HCC will not create a new curriculum but follow/link to programs already used by the top three business industry programs (Berkley Institute-Boston, Middle Tennessee State–Belmont and UCLA)
  4. Nashville Songwriters Association would like us to be a part of their Charter group and bring our their expertise to songwriters in seminars/workshops to Hawaii
  5. Belmont to assist us in terms of technical matters related to the teaching of sound production
- EON - already agreed to be a part of the International Consortium
- Do not need to be in Strategic Plan except if they use “G funds”

- The administrative review, which was submitted, included a piece that was related to the Mele project and that was forwarded to Scott Murakami who is a member of the subcommittee
- Question: Was Ralph Kam, Dean of University College (UC), included/invited in the planning of the Mele?
  - 1) UC Dean and Division Chair will become involved when related disciplines are needed and can fit into the initiative
  - 2) Nashville's activity is not about training musicians, being creative or teaching people music but rather it focuses on the business of recording music and the technology of production
  - 3) "Songwriting" is one of the most underdeveloped talents of Hawaiian artists and it relates more to an Associate in Science than the Associate of Art degree
  - 4) Liberal Arts has been faulted for not being "entrepreneurial enough" ~~ the Mele project needs to keep UC in mind since this is an entrepreneurial opportunity

**TOPIC: Planning Agenda item: "The Charter of the Planning Council should be amended so that the Council has a Chair." (See page 180 of the Self Study)**

- The "role of the chair/convener or facilitator of the committee" should be placed on the next meeting agenda – on behalf of Standard Four
- It would not be fair or appropriate to ask the body to make the decision on whether it should have a chair or not
- One interpretation suggested that the convener/facilitator's role is to get the group together at the start and then elect a Chair
  - 1) PC should consider having a chair or co-chair rather than a facilitator/convener
- One function of the administrative convener includes the responsibility of ensuring that minutes are taken (i.e., administration secretarial staff)
- The Executive Assistant to the Chancellor should convene the meetings, make sure the rules are followed and minutes are taken ~~ the convener has no direct constituency and no voting privileges
- The Charter clearly states that the Planning Council has a facilitator and not a chair
- Items being submitted for agenda (how to decide what becomes an agenda item) should not necessarily be the convener's prerogative but rather would be the Chair's responsibility. Since the Council's inception, the Convener has made decisions on his own as to what should be on the agenda and did his best in the past. Having the Convener regulate the agenda does not necessarily serve the best interest of the Planning Council in the long term. Moreover, the Convener's role should be restricted to moderating the discourse of PC business with minimal commentary on the part of the convener/facilitator
- Robert's Rule – Article 10 – states that if the person plans to take on an active part in the debate then the person cannot accept the position as Chair
- Current convener/facilitator needs to be educated as per the proper enacting of his role and reminded of the limits inherently placed upon the requirements of this function
- There is a requirement to submit for approval all proposed agenda items 10 days prior to the meeting. The vetting of proposed agenda items have been customarily handled through email communication among PC members

- All proposed agenda items are shared with PC members through the list serv ([planners-1@hcc.hawaii.edu](mailto:planners-1@hcc.hawaii.edu))
- A suggestion was made to email items to the PC as a group so that everyone is aware of the proposed agenda item and can consider its merit
- One must be a member of the PC in order to break a tie. The Chair could vote in favor to create a 2/3 or could vote in opposition to prevent a 2/3 from happening ~~ however, only if the Chair were a member of PC
- A referendum could be held to determine whether the Planning Council should have a chair or convener.
  - Follow-up with the Accreditation Oversight Committee – PC would like to look into the matter of making changes to the Charter
  - PC is the committee to make changes on the Charter but may not have authority to amend its own Charter by itself ~~ the Council may need to get ratification by campus constituents at large in order to make changes and/or amendments to the Charter
  - Further examination of the pros/cons of having a chair or convener need to follow
- Charter needs to be changed if the Executive Assistant to the Chancellor is to be replaced as convener
- Visiting Team is interested in “sitting in” and not “talking to us” on whatever committee meetings are in session, rather than having the Committee create meetings for them to attend

### **Outcome of discussion:**

Tabled for future discussions ~~ not the October 25<sup>th</sup> meeting but the November 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting

### **TOPIC: Reports from Officers and sub-committees**

- An update on the status of the search for Tech 1, Tech 2 Deans was given ([See Attachment 2](#))
- The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs position should be filled by January 2007
- Strategic Plan Sub-committee: Scott Murakami, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch and Susanne Carvalho (no Chair was assigned) met on 10/12 and decided on the following:
  - a) Developed timeline
  - b) Follow-up with units who had not submitted their administrative review
  - c) Secured the services of Clara Bantolina (Scott’s secretary) to edit the master document ~~ Cynthia will forward document to Clara
  - d) Next meeting will be in early November
- Strategic Plan should be fine tuned and not altered – goals should remain the same
- Reported on eWaste Project
  - a) The College will deliver our items sometime in the next two weeks to Manoa, LCC or WCC
  - b) May not take all CPUs at this time – more research needs to be done to assure that all items have been properly cleared from the official inventory list
- One member of the visiting team had to step down due to illness but will be replaced

### **Agenda of next meeting:**

- Who updates the Internet website?
  - 1) Ross to draft a policy with the assistance of Todd Kobayashi or Dave Cleveland for the next meeting. Suggest clarifying:

- a) Intranet Website – secured/private website of networking
- b) Internet Website – HCC Public Website
- How can the Charter be amended?
- Update on Strategic Plan (standing agenda item)
- Identify the top five priorities of planning agenda items for the PC (from the documents that Cynthia sent by email)

### **Other Business:**

- Newspaper article on Manoa being short on funding for their electric bill and using Tuition and Fees to pay their bill ~~ how does it effect HCC?
  - a) CC's submitted request for electricity money
  - b) Manoa did not put in the same request as CC's
  - c) HCC is on good standing with Legislation
- The College needs to have a discussion on how to conserve electricity
  - a) ITC will take the lead on identifying current practices, as well as how to conserve power
  - b) A suggestion was made to launch another campaign and reminder to switch off unused lights, computers, etc. For example, moved to a 4-day week classes vs. 5-day week classes. Building 7 – 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floor always keep their doors open letting all the cold air out and central air is easier to maintain
- The first step should be to encourage conservation practices, etc. The subject will be brought up at the next CLT meeting
- PC should not be the body to start the fact-finding initiative on energy conservation; rather it should review the proposed recommendation.

Next meeting is scheduled for October 25, 2006, 2:30 pm – 4:30 am.

Mark adjourned at 10:46 am.