

PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING NOTES

Notes from Friday, November 3, 2006

Bldg. 2, Room 201

9:00-10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Bill Becker, Ross Egloria, Ken Kato, Jan Lubin, Sandy Matsui, Scott Murakami, James Niino, Sharon Ota, Ramsey Pedersen, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Sam Rhoads, Sherrie Rupert, Stacy Rogers, Vern Takebayashi, Cory Takemoto, Jonathan Wong, Von Scott Wong

Guest Present: Rob Edmondson

Not Present: Kyle Higa, Bert Shimabukuro, Cynthia Smith, Beng Poh Yoshikawa

Convener: Brian Furuto

Note taker: Stephanie Bourassa

Brian Furuto called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

TOPIC: Review and Approval of Old Minutes

Brian asked if anyone had any changes, problems, or issues with the 10/25/06 minutes.

Vote: Approve the minutes as is:

- Cory Takemoto moved to approve the minutes.
- Jan Lubin seconded the motion.
- Motion was unanimously agreed upon.

TOPIC: Should the PC have a Chair/Convener?

Sam Rhoades motioned that the, "Planning Council recommends that the charter of the Planning Council be amended to provide that

1. The Planning Council have a chair that shall be elected from its membership;
2. The Executive Assistant to the Chancellor be made an ex-officio, voting member of the Planning Council;
3. The chair shall receive release time equivalent to 6 credit hours per semester for a faculty member or equivalent (2/5 of the workload per semester) for an administrator or staff member; and,

The Planning Council Charter should be reviewed and approved in the same manner it was established, via the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Staff Senate Executive Committee and the Assessment Committee.”

Vern Takebayashi seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Sam: It seems to me if the charter is approved by the Assessment, FSEC & SSEC committees, the details can then be worked out. This is for discussion purposes and can be amended. When we get around to doing it, we can worry about the details.

Vern: Strongly supports having a chair. Not saying that Brian isn't doing a great job as a convener, but feels that the Planning Council would be better served by having a chair in the future. The chair should have regularly scheduled meetings w/Ramsey because the Planning Council is supposed to serve as an advisory in terms of planning. That kind of meeting should be occurring.

Sam: This started out as a planning agenda item from the Self Study, Standard IV Committee. It doesn't have anything to do with how it's working now, it has to do with what people felt would work better. No complaint whatsoever on the job that Brian's been doing. It's been a good job.

Marcia: Asks Sam to give rationale about making the ex-officio a voting member as opposed to a non-voting member and also the rationale for the recommended release time?

Sam: Thinks this is a very important position. If done right, it'll take a lot of time. The campus has always provided release time for faculty when they are chairing the CPC, FSEC, etc. Off the top of his head, 6 credits would be better than 3 credits per semester. Being the chair of the Planning Council is a bigger job. This committee involves people from all works of life on campus (staff, faculty, administration & executive assistant). Don't see why any one of these members should not vote.

Vern: If you're not a voting member and you can't really participate in the debates or discussions. Would like Brian to participate in the debates or whoever is in that position so I would want that person to be able to vote.

Sam: Like to say more about the function of the chair. Somebody was quoting Roberts Rules of Order at the last meeting or the meeting before. Thinks it's important for the chair should not just sit there and make sure the rules are

followed rather that the chair will be an active member of the group and be involved in the conversation and discussion. I'd like to provide at least an avenue for the chair to be an active member of these discussions.

One way the chair to step aside and let somebody else chair while he or she lead the discussion.

Another way would be to ignore Roberts Rules of Order and that particular aspect and just let chair get involved in the discussions. I think that's not an unreasonable thing to do. I've seen the FSEC chair get heavily involved in discussions. I've seen the CPC chair, not this semester because Marcia is very careful about that sort of thing. But in the past, I've seen the CPC chair get heavily involved in discussion. I don't see anything wrong with that. But I think that can be worked out.

A member stated that currently the convener is a caretaker of Robert's Rules. Agree with Sam that the Chair should be an active, discussion participating member of the council. As Vern stated, in our current set up it's difficult for Brian, as the convener, not to allow this group to go down a path when he knows there's a dead end. So he has to speak up, yet under the current rules he can't.

Jonathan: Would it help our cause if we had somebody like a Sergeant of Arms?

Sam: If this is approved, we could certainly consider that.

Scott: Who needs to recommend the release time to the faculty member? Is it the Division Chair or the Dean? What is the protocol for that?

Sharon: My thoughts are that this is a council of the Chancellor's Office and should be chaired by a member that's an administrator for purpose of continuity and staff support including note taking and responsible for coherent and consistent memory of what this body does. Only because we all know that the CPC and FSEC chairs do a lot of work. They are responsible for document action, to follow through, etc. We know when there is a change over, there's a period or sometimes the lack of continuity. When you have people changing of faculty or staff being the chairs, you have this problem of maintaining continuity, institutional memory, and some repository of all this information to go back on.

Regarding the assigned time issue, the FSEC and CPC chairs have 3 credits a semester. They are responsible to do everything. When you suggest 6 credits, does this mean the chair does everything without support from administration?

Vern: Even if the person is from administration, how would that guarantee continuity unless it's the same person?

Sharon: Because Administration has mechanisms such as the Central Files to file documents.

Vern: So if the chair is not an administrator, they wouldn't be able to store the information?

Sharon: I'm not saying that they wouldn't be able to store information. But I've look in the FSEC and CPC files in the Central File and there are voids. There are no records of things. Apparently, the chairs have not been forwarding the information to administration to put in the Central File for reference. I'm looking in terms of a practical standpoint of information retrieval, reference, etc. You need the support of minutes, logistics, room arrangements, etc. Will six (6) credits include all of that? I'm just trying to equitable to the rest of the people who have assign time. None of them have secretarial support.

Sam: Some comparisons can be made between this body, the FSEC, the CPC, etc. I think you can't go too far with that. This body has a lot of administrators on it where the FSEC, SSEC and CPC don't. I think the constitution of this body would not allow things to simply happen as it sometimes have happened with the FSEC where one person this year would do a better job than the person who did it the year before. I'm not really concerned about institutional memory. I think it's going to go on. I don't think that it's likely that the chair would be a faculty member. It's a possibility. Certainly would think that the Administration would still support note taking. Think that's important.

Sharon: How would you justify 6 credits or equivalent?

Sam: It's something that can be an amended motion. If the Council thought 6 credits was too much and 3 was more appropriate, we would obviously change it. When I came up with the motion, I was just imagining that this committee is so much more important than the FSEC that I thought the workload would be more.

Sharon: All committees are important.

Sam: Agree all committees are important, but I don't think anyone would question this is the most important committee on campus for the future of our college.

Sharon: I think they all have different functions. I think we have to be careful to say they're all important because we need

Bill: Satisfied with current operation of the Planning Council. It was more shared and not from one department or area than another. It was more of a council. It was different than a standard chaired committee. It was a council of the Chancellor's Office. There might have been a few bumps and difficulties, but that was being worked out. My feeling is to leave it as is.

Cory: Would still like to have more clarification on how chair would be different from what the convener is now.

Vern: Need chair to point to and say this person is responsible. The chair, in my view, is someone who is looked at basically as HCC goals. To make sure that the way the agenda is carried out to the way the minutes are summarized just every way the meeting is conducted. All visitors are treated equally. That's not necessarily something a convener can do because somebody has to be responsible for saying this is what the Planning Council stands for. These are the kinds of things that we have to deal with. These are the kinds of things we can defer to and that's not something you would put on the convener because the convener is someone who. It's not that our current convener can't think of these things. I think an elected chair can be responsible for that. That's the person the faculty can point to campus at large and say that's the person responsible for that.

Cory: I believe that having a convener is satisfactory right now. If screening the agenda is an issue we could have an agreement with our convener on agenda items, purpose, goals and direction. How would an elected chair be any different? Except that you're pulling someone out of one department and putting them on a pedestal. You can try your best to be impartial and try your best to be fair. You're in one department. You see your department/area/division and your thoughts are guiding your decisions.

Vern: People have raised these concerns because Brian is Ramsey's right-hand man. That's his job. Basically, they are concerned if he is in charge of agenda, why is he carrying out what Ramsey wants and not what the campus-at-large wants.

Cory: The people who voiced their concerns feel that Brian is bringing Ramsey's agenda items and not the campus as a whole. They feel that if we had an elected chair, it would be different? I don't see the problem here. If they submit agenda items to pc-l or submit it to us and we forward it to Brian, if we cc'd the entire council, everyone would know what is submitted and we see what is being put on the agenda immediately.

Vern: People don't want to see the council as a whole as being responsible. They want to point to one person. It's too vague to say who is responsible?

Planning Council? They want to say that this person is ultimately the one they can point to.

Jonathan: Good points have been brought up. Do need one person that we can hold accountable. A chair is appropriate as well as important; Planning Council is advisory to Chancellor so it does make sense for an administrator to continue as convener like what Brian has done. Don't see why Brian shouldn't be the convener or chair. Just by virtue of his job, we should appoint him as the chair. Maybe we could look at having a campus ombudsman to look at these things?

Sam: A strong chair can do a better job at minutes than the secretary. Those minutes get very lengthy and it's easy for someone to get lost reading those minutes. I don't think the convener should try to look at those minutes and put them into capture, but a strong chair can. If we have a strong chair, that person can get involved with the body and really get involved in the discussions. He or she can take the verbatim minutes and turn those into clear and concise statements of what really happened at the meeting and I think that can benefit the whole campus. The other thing a strong chair can do is to make sure the agenda items stay with what the Planning Council using (i.e. Vern's thing about e-waste). The e-waste thing was a short-term, one-time only thing that shouldn't have involved this body should have gone to the CLT. A strong chair who was on top of things could say, "hey that's not appropriate for the Planning Council" and it make sure it goes to the CLT.

Third and final thing, regardless of how we see the convener, the rest of the campus just doesn't see it that way. I've bumped into 3 people (one from staff and two from faculty) in the last week, without any prompting from me, all three of those people used the word "running" the PC; I didn't suggest the word, but they all talked about the person who's running the PC. People see the chair as running this body and you can't change that.

Bill: We covered the topic of agenda items last year. Paraphrased Cynthia who brought up the item of "filtering agenda items." Items were going to be publicly put out and that was voted on.

Brian confirmed what Bill stated.

Sam: But shouldn't there be.

Vern: If we don't have someone filtering them, somebody that people can point to, not the PC at large, but one person, then we become a "kitchen sink" organization. We try to cover everything we think is important on this campus and it dilutes our true purpose which is planning. Unless we have a chair than

can filter agenda items, we won't be able to satisfy the campus at large. They won't be able to view us as operating in a correct way unless we do something like that.

Bill: We set our goals in planning, the convener certainly could separate planning from short-term. If there were agenda items that the convener thought were short-term items that were short-termed, can say these items should go to the CLT, we can vote on it and move on.

Sam: That's the point, the convener can't really do that, but a chair can.

Sharon: Why not? What is appropriate to be on the agenda?

Brian: I find myself in a quandary right now because as the convener and under the current rules, I'm not even supposed to be sharing my viewpoint or opinion. I believe that there is a question of "running" the Council. People see me as the Chancellor's guy not as the fair minded convener of the Council. As a result there is always a question of "filtering" that Cynthia first tried to address in our discussion last year. Some of you might say that all the convener has to do is ask questions as to the appropriateness of the agenda item. But, once I start asking questions, that's when there really is "conflict of interest" stigma that has to be fought through.

This "conflict of interest" reaches into every aspect of managing or "running" this Council. Do I think that the Council should be focusing on other issues? Sure, but I cannot begin to even suggest this.

Sharon: There's a difference of questioning and filtering. Well Vern, this may be part of the CLT—operational. We concur. We just do it. We take it off the agenda. What is the role and responsibility of the chair? Do have an elected chair or do we or continue with the assistant to the Chancellor or do we get somebody else?

Vern: Having an elected chair is good because if someone is not doing a good job, we can replace that person. If it is someone that is just appointed, then you don't know who to go to in case that person is not what the council wants. I would like to see an elected person, then we can say we vote this person out.

Cory: Convener is still appropriate. Roberts Rules of Order is old, practically ancient. If chair is setting agenda, I feel that it wouldn't be appropriate for the chair to be involved in the discussion. You set the agenda. You can control the discussion and really push it in your favor. Where as the chair is not involved in

the discussion because you put the agenda on, the body needs to discuss it. Not according to the Chair's view, but the body's positions.

I still feel a convener is appropriate. You can call it something else if you want to. Brian should always remain on this council. His experience with the legislature is invaluable. He keeps us on top of the process as the session goes on and we're going through our budgeting. I still don't feel comfortable with an elected chair especially if that chair is going to be a participant in the discussion and a voting member.

Sharon: The point was made that the chair can bring their own perspective, whether it be a faculty or an administrative perspective that needs to be considered.

Scott: Agrees with Vern. There is a need for a chair. Agenda items need to be filtered because we haven't talked about planning yet. Who read "The World is Flat?" Did we talk about any of those issues? How is it going to impact the college? Until we start talking about these things then we're not planning.

We've tried having agenda items go through this process and there isn't a way to separate it before the meeting as to what is appropriate and what's not. In my experience, I haven't seen that happen. Which is why things like the e-waste disposal popped up here. I agree that it should have gone to the CLT instead of the Planning Council. Even the internet vs. intranet policy that was discussed the last time.

A better use of our time is to put people to work who can plan and let them plan. Let them talk about what's going to happen when the interest rates go up or when construction isn't need in the islands. What happens when Senator Inouye doesn't bring the money and we won't have construction opportunities here? What's going to happen to our college at that point. Those are really critical issues that I think we should leave tabled and the problem is that they haven't even surfaced yet. I think that by clearing up what the function of each committee is and suggestions of policies and how to handle them. I think those are good ideas, but let's focus on function. Let the Planning Council plan. Let CLT recommend policy/ procedure and create a way where both committees are communicating with the Chancellor. To me it's simple. It's straightforward. You can really get to the issues. The function is clearly articulated. We serve that function and let the chair do their job. Quite frankly, if the chair can't be partial, then they can't professional. If they can't be professional, get them out. They don't deserve to be chair. From my experience, that works.

Stacy: Anybody on Planning Council can be elected. Brian's hands are tied. Brian's hands would be more utilized in this committee if he was more free to speak on legislation and the impact on this committee. If we did have an election, who's to say that Brian wouldn't be elected and chair the committee as well. I think we're getting off the point a little bit. The openness of the election will still allow for the best person on the committee to chair it and have the strengths to filter. Because without filtering, this is a catch-all committee that will struggle on.

Brian: Recommends to break this up. From my perspective, I see:
1) chair/convener? 2) Who? 3) Making the Executive Assistant a member or not? I don't even know if we have to go into the charter to do this anyway?

Group: Yes, we do.

Brian: Then that answers the question. We are not going to take a vote on it today. Didn't we agree to go into the charter?

Vern: It's in Sam's motion.

Sam: This doesn't end the conversation because those three (3) bodies would have to discuss it. As far as breaking it up into 3 parts, we certainly could do that, but don't think it makes sense to separate it. We can take off the release time and not worry about that for now. Making the executive assistant a voting member and electing a chair, I don't think it makes sense to break up the two.

Bill: I still think we can do with convener. I feel it's a new body and we ought to give it a little more time as is to see if we can get ourselves on track. Police ourselves. Stick to the point. Without have a police chair.

Sharon: Define what the convener's role is; we can expand; familiarize yourself with the charter; that's what we started with; good opportunity to do it

Cory: Agrees with Bill; this is brand new body, only been here for a year; no distinction between committees; lot of the issues need to be brought forth; how many of us saw the e-waste on the agenda & didn't comment on it; didn't see any objections to have it on the agenda; as a body, we need of E-waste or as an agenda item; each time that person has to learn the position, a new learning curve; what if we're not happy with the chair right at crunch time; extremely difficult; Brian has a lot to do, everybody has a lot to do; as to pointing a finger at somebody, we always point a finger at Ramsey;

Vern: had basically one year to work; people have been patient with us so far; the time to patient is over; need to move faster; need to cut as more mature

group in terms of how we function; having chair will keep the committee to move in the right direction

Marcia: Wanted to clarify why E-waste was on the PC agenda. E-waste agenda item was originally was put on the agenda as a policy-making issue dealing with the proposal; the fact that we had a one-time opportunity to dispose of 25 pallets, that's great, but we still have a policy issue; this is a policy-making body that might be a discussion for another day; let's leave the e-waste issue alone.

Sam: When I first heard about the formation of this Council I thought the Planning Council was going to be another CLT. However, the Planning Council should be looking at long-term issues; we have to start being the people to look at the long-term.

Sharon: Motion to table the current question and discuss at next meeting; come prepared with the charter.

Cory: Seconded the motion

A vote was taken to "motion to table" the current discussion. In favor = 13;
Opposed = 3

TOPIC: Accreditation Exit Interview Discussion (non-voting issue)

Vern: Cynthia brought the issue up based upon what Accreditation Team said we had a lot to clear up; there is confusion as to on what the purpose of the Planning Council need to clarify role on campus; it's a good thing everyone did a good job; we still have a lot to do. When actually we have a lot of work to do. Now is not the time to pat ourselves on the shoulders for a job well done.

Cory: Accreditation Team's evaluation will help Planning Council to grow & evolve and define itself as to its own purpose, outcomes; measure ourselves; people just doesn't know what Planning Council is suppose to be doing. Most times the Planning Council doesn't know what the Planning Council is suppose to be doing. Define our purpose Planning Council role.

Marcia: If we do our homework and revisit charter; do homework that might also clarify

Ramsey: Attended a couple of management meetings one w/Dennis Jones and Colleen Sathre (former UH institutional researcher). There were three (3) items he wanted to share.

1. Colleen Sathre shared a website that is very succinct and that pretty much said 70% of what the Planning Council was doing was on the right track; the Council is planning, organizing, assessing, and budgeting. However, we are not as focused on what planning is about as we should be.
2. It might be helpful to bring Colleen on campus to conduct a workshop; she would be willing to do that.
3. The BOR is the only policy setting body in the University. What we're doing is setting a series of processes, procedures, outcomes (setting processes/ procedures to all your campus can function properly). Might sound like a minor linguistic ;

This group can set and work with him to set processes and procedures.

Scott: Looking at charter, it's very clear that we should be working with; CLT should be empowered to set procedure and process; we shouldn't compete with that; when you look at it

PC can focus on planning; CLT should know that they have a supporting role; if we have the understanding,

Ramsey: Planning Council can have internal processes in how this group; exit meeting --what's operational and procedural and what should be long-term planning; the person reporting back to O'Hearn said that ; set limits to allow time to plan (mid-term and long-range). It's perfectly reasonable ; Those are the things that you have to decided;

Scott: PC should have our own;

Ramsey: Biennium budget was a good exercise; if there is a consensus, he could get Colleen Sathre to conduct a workshop;

Cory: Workshop is a good idea; we would benefit something like that

Sam: Website not an appropriate agenda item

Brian: Closed this portion of the discussion.

TOPIC: Strategic Plan Review Committee (SPRC) Report

Scott Murakami handed out copies of the HCC revised 2006-2007 Strategic Plan to the committee members.

Scott: Any items that were asked to be deleted, we did not delete them. We struck them out. We wanted to know how the Planning Council wanted to put its input on this report. Planning Council take Strategic Plan to your constituents or closed-door caucus or take time to review the report & discuss at the next meeting or post on intranet?

Discussion on when the next meeting will be.

Marcia: Take back to constituents and Planning Council discussion

Discussion will be held on 11/17/2006.

Vern: When will it be posted? No cost item

Scott: No longer a priority? The report will be posted on intranet as "2007 Draft" in December.

Sharon: Suggests the 2006-2007 Strategic Plan be posted as a revision on the web; it really has to be going out; comes back to the Planning Council; agenda item; compliance with review policies; put on CLT agenda after posted on web;

Stacy: Can he share Strategic Plan with his advisory committee members?

Ramsey: Doesn't see a problem with that; advisory committees are still part of the campus; any advisory committee has my approval; will take it back to Tech I programs.

Sharon: If we don't get it and it's still a priority, we'll resubmit it.

Brian: Scott will email to Jan Lubin and she will have Todd post on intranet. Draft will be posted FSEC, CLT, SSEC; and document will emphasize that it is a draft and dated. Discuss again at the next meeting on November 17th.

TOPIC: Admin Pressing Issues

Brian informed the Planning Council that the Senate Higher Education Committee will be visiting HCC on Thursday, November 9, 2006, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Looks like the visit will be fairly well attended, Senator Clayton Hee, chair and five (5) other legislators. A full day was planned including

a visit to Kalaeloa. However, this visit will include only the main campus and METC. Focus of visit is R & M projects. We will be plugging our CIP request for a new building.

Ramsey shared information from the Kamehameha Planning Meeting (Master Plan) he attended. Also in attendance were people from the business, community, State, and City & County agencies. Kamehameha Schools owns everything from the Kapalama Canal to King Street; freeway to Nimitz Highway. This group is looking for a light industrial area similar to other areas across the country that have been gentrified (i.e., the Pearl area in Portland). HCC is considered an anchored gem in Kalihi. They wanted to focus on us. They want to see where HCC is going. They are looking for an epicenter. We want to make HCC the epicenter of Kalihi.

The Mayor is planning possibly a two-day Kalihi Visioning Planning meeting which could bring approximately 200 people on campus.

Ramsey also shared information about HCC becoming the lead campus along with the Department of Business Economic & Tourism, Department of Labor, Governor's Office, Department of Education, and Vice President for Community Colleges and the Community Colleges system to establish a "Hawaii Technology Academy." The HTA will be based on the Construction Academy concept, but focus on STEM related activities (STEM: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math). This is a request coming from the Governor's Office through DBEDT. The Governor sees the value of our Construction Academy and wants to go forward with a similar academy proposal that focuses on other areas. STEM is a federal grant, however, the Governor will include this in her biennium budget for general funds. It may not be a \$5m proposal, but it will be a substantial request.

Agenda items for next meeting: Chair vs. Convener discussion; Strategic Plan Review Committee Plan Issues; the top 5 priorities discussion; Cut and Paste (???) Management; Review and Bring the charter to next meeting.

Next meeting is scheduled for November 17, 2006, 9:00-11:00 a.m.

Brian adjourned the meeting at 10:26 a.m.