

Summary Notes
Town Meeting – October 27
2:00 – 3:00 pm

There were 45 people in attendance.

Erika Lacro, VCAA, began the town hall meeting with a review of the UH System and Campus strategic planning process and the associated strategic outcomes and performance measures recently approved by the Board of Regents. She stressed the importance of the campus undertaking a strategic planning process to update the current strategic plan and reviewing HonCC's strategic outcomes and performance measures, of which we will be responsible for meeting. (see attached ppt file) Erika pointed out that each participant was given a note card and asked to write comments, questions or concerns, which are listed at the end of this summary.

Vern Takebayashi, Planning Council Chair, then briefly went through the outlined items on powerpoint. These were points sent out earlier to the campus. He briefly summarized the role of the Planning Council in the strategic planning process, and the goal of using feedback to improve the process, including results of the survey last spring and this Town Meeting. He outlined an example of a submission to last year's strategic plan that represented a good use of supporting evidence. He then traced through the problems with the process evident last year, and intended improvements intended to rectify these problems (all of this is on the powerpoint.) Some of the major areas needing improvement included the need for the PC to identify and publish criteria for prioritization of strategic plan activities and funding, and finding ways to make the entire process of submission, comment, and PC discussion on the items more transparent. He finished his presentation by making clear that this was the time for those who wanted faculty/staff input into the planning process to actively participate in making it work better. Vern then opened it up for questions and comment. The following points were made:

1. Vern was thanked for all of the work he put in as PC Chair, last year and this fall, to move the campus forward in a structured strategic planning process.
2. It was suggested that improvement might be based on having levels of review and feedback (and improvement) of strategic plan items prior to final PC discussion – using the current curriculum review process as a model. This might also help in ensuring departmental/impacted party review and chance to provide input, and thus have more buy-in.
3. It was noted that it is important to have written feedback from administration regarding how items and prioritization of these are changed after they leave PC. Also, if there are external and/or system forces and priorities that are going to directly effect strategic plan prioritization – (i.e. in legislature) the campus should

be made aware of these factors as soon as possible so items can be revised as necessary to be in alignment and have a better chance of receiving a higher priority.

4. If someone is not online-oriented, how will they have a chance to provide input, or know what is going on? It was acknowledged that only one form of communication is a problem, but also that online allows things that cannot do in hard copy. Perhaps, division level 'sign off' can prompt divisional/department meetings which can complement online information.

5. There was concern about deadlines – in particular the system deadlines for submission. Can these be clearer so there is not the rush there was last spring. Was noted that system cannot be tied to a fixed deadline but will try to have clearer sense of deadline for campus to be completed to work backwards in terms of internal deadlines.

6. Vern had indicated in his presentation that the goal was to enable the campus as a whole to see the PC online discussion and comments, but only PC members participate in Lulima based discussions. Was suggested that there be some other means for the campus to then add their ideas – if not on the PC based discussion boards, then some other open blog so input from the entire campus could be visible to all, and a resource for the PC in making its decisions.

7. The concern was raised that there were so many messages with links to websites, information – hard to keep track. Was suggested that there be some kind of directory of relevant websites for campus discussions and issues, or perhaps work on clarify of structure of existing intranet site.

8. Was suggested that we need to be assessing level of participation in the process in the next go-around, not just in terms of another survey (and hopefully more people participate) but through number of comments on a blog and other measures of participation in the process.

9. Concern was raised regarding dates of submission of Program Review reports (late fall – reflecting previous fiscal year) and dates for submission of items to the strategic plan in spring. What do departments/programs do if a new need emerges, further assessment is done etc. in the interim. Response was that Program Review reports can be amended – if new information emerges after report is submitted, that report can be amended and that be the basis for strategic plan activity submission.

Comments from Cards:

Can you create a forum or blog that would allow the campus to debate PC issues so PC members can see how the campus breaks on those issues?

What is End -of-the-Year money? How is End-of-Year money related to the Strategic Plan? What are the specific funding sources used to fund specific strategic planning items?

Curriculum Review model - good suggestion. Provide a preliminary review/screening at department level to improve discussion at lower level.

Revising annual program review - new idea? Amendments and updates ok? This has certainly not been clear.

The issue is faith in the process. I have done all the work on items and gone to mtgs. only to find that the item doesn't get passed for a 'political reason' or a reason I perceive as not based on the criteria that was set. So then why? Where is the direct connection between the process and the real outcome. Do those you work to prove worth get heard or are you funding the thing you wanted all along anyway? Will 'those' issues' and concerns always trump the 'little guess' and innovators, i.e. labs, electricity bills.

I like Marcia's suggestion regarding modeling curriculum review. This addresses missing justification and sign off by parties affected.

Re: Communication - in-person is invaluable. Attendance today was super! Please build town meetings into the SP process.

Please post admin response why strategic plan initiatives were rejected to all. Sometimes only long after we've submitted do we hear that it's been refused, and we have no idea what was wrong with it, so can make it better next time.

Establishing criteria for prioritization sounds good. It makes the process more open and fairer. Example / template is good. Submission sources helpful.

Strategic plan proposals - can viewers post comments?

Prioritization should not be too strict. Some items lend themselves to measurement better than others etc.. One prioritization model may not fill all types of proposals.

Cynthia's coffee hour availability in the cafe couple times a month offered a great venue to informal dialogue on items needing to be addressed. Would be nice to restart.

Who determines who are affected parties? In a lot of cases the EMC is or has not been listed as an affected party, yet a portion of the activity to be performed is done directly by the EMC.

In cases where, there is no Dean or program chair, such as all of Academic support, who assists as in developing justification.

Because communication is so critical to all of us - schedule no classes MW / TTh between 12 - 1. This would allow all faculty to have a regular time for DPC, DCC etc and campus wide meetings that are so important for all to attend.

Insist that liberal arts have an advisory board from businesses we serve - UC College is totally out of touch with what employers need in terms of competencies, skills i.e. for entry level employment as well as advancements.

Set up a skunk works (faculty and admin), 10 - 12 - no more, good creative people to monthly or bi-weekly meet and discuss solutions for main problems facing our college. Got to be creative, risk taking thinking ones!

How do we incorporate taking away, reallocation, cutting back in the strategic planning process?