Present:  Erica Balbag-Gerard (for Silvan Chung), Keala Chock, Ross Egloria, Brian Furuto, Ralph Kam, Erika Lacro, Sandy Matsui, James Niino, Ron Pine, Jim Poole, Sam Rhoads, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Mark Silliman, Cory Takemoto (chair), Kerry Tanimoto, Jonathan Wong

Guests:  Alapaki Luke

Call to Order:  9:08 a.m.

Approval of Minutes:

Minutes approved as amended to include Sam Rhoads as present and fix spelling error.

I. Implementation Framework

Erika updated the Implementation Framework process posted on the Intranet. The present version is the most accurate. But work on it is ongoing. She noted that there have not been any questions on specifics. She reminded members that as we go through the budget process this document will have implications on what we end up funding. There are wonderful things we are doing and things we want to do, but final decisions on what we end up funding will depend on the budget situation.

II. Biennium Budget Priorities

Ken provided an update on the Biennium process. He noted that the subcommittee met last month (April), but many items are pending. The Legislature added additional budget reductions for the entire UH system, and decisions have not been made on how the reductions will be allocated throughout the system. He reminded everyone that reductions are permanent and restrictions are year to year. The governor can still place additional restrictions on all state departments. Since this process is
ongoing, he noted that Mike wants the budget subcommittee to meet as soon as possible after the fiscal year begins, see where we are with the final decisions from the governor, and then place all the items in their proper locations with priorities based on the strategic plan items. Hence, Ken, Mike, and the subcommittee are not ready to provide the final plan to the PC.

Ken reminded everyone that next year (2011) will be the second year of the biennium. For the next biennium (2012-2013) the University will be asking for a performance based lump sum based on Strategic Plan priorities. He noted again that this approach is very different and that Mike has already gone over the new process. Soon Ken will be updating the Accreditation subcommittee on the new budget process.

He noted that there have been some changes in the budget plan. For the ATD initiatives alternative funds were found. ARRA funds were secured for the continuation of the under prepared student math project. Some items were funded temporarily through external funds.

Ron asked Erika if she was aware that the Kupa Ka Wai Council rated the ALEKS intervention as a low budget priority due to feedback from native Hawaiian students and the concern that this intervention is not working for them. Erika responded that she would like to talk to the students who had a problem with the program. Erika noted that what will be implemented is much different than what we have done traditionally and asked how many students have these concerns. Speaking for Kupa Ka Wai, Jonathan was not sure what the actual number was, but it is students who work with the Hawaiian counselors. Jonathan noted that he could provide the names and Erika noted that she would like to meet with the students. She stated that studies have shown that this is one of the best ways of taking students from second grade math to eleventh grade math in the quickest manner possible. Something that all agree we need to do.

Ron asked the target group for these studies -- what ethnicity, mainland students? Erika stated that she has a hard time seeing how students coming out of the DOE, the students we are dealing with, have a separate learning method due to ethnicity because they have been in a DOE classroom together for the last twelve years. Ron pointed out that at the recent Achieving the Dream conference that we were all advised to go to had several workshops on this topic and that the keynote speaker argued that there is a difference in a Hawaiian style of learning. She argued that there are a lot of things we put Hawaiian students through that do not work. He noted that he is not saying that there is some sort of cultural
clash or that it is true that Hawaiians have a fundamental different learning style, but only that the issue was raised by a governing body on campus who did the work Mike asked them to do. In his experience this has happened before and we should investigate the issue thoroughly before we spend a lot of money on a new program. Erika agreed and she and Jonathan agreed that they would follow up and report back to the PC.

Ken was asked what happened to the MELE program and Diesel Technology in the budget documents he was summarizing. Funding for their requests was rated high by all the governing bodies. Ken responded that MELE was now broken up into different fiscal years. Keala noted that Title III is funding some of the requests for one more year. MELE can make do for a little while longer but after 2011 there is no more grant money for numerous Title III initiatives. Ken noted that even though some items were rated high by the governing bodies, to take Diesel as an example, since APT positions are involved, there is no guarantee that we can fill these positions because we do not have a position count. It is one of the issues we face right now. The position count might have to be put into the 2012 biennium request.

Ron pointed out the concern that aside from these technical difficulties it was important to record somewhere that all the governing bodies rated the MELE and Diesel requests high. Ken agreed that the next time the budget subcommittee meets he will make sure these decisions are recorded.

Mark asked whether or not internal shifting of positions could take place while we are attempting to solve the position count issue. Ken agreed that reallocations are possible but much easier if a position is vacant. But if not, then there is the problem of who is willing to give up a position. It is also possible to use tuition and fee money, but once we do that, then there is the issue of fringe benefits, which are approximately 38% more. The Chancellor has the authority to reallocate positions based on campus priorities, but Ken noted that he was not his place to speak for the Chancellor on doing so. Erika asked if Perkins funding could be used for temporary APT positions. Ken agreed this is possible related to program improvement. Part of the process of rating the priorities is to make them clear and then see how we can fund them.

Sam pointed out that since the Sprint building and possible move of PCATT is listed in the budget, he noted that he did not see how we are going to be able to squeeze two floors from building 7 into one. He offered a possible solution. He suggested a move to building 20. It was used by CENT and Electronics. It currently has only one person in it, has seven
offices, four classrooms, and two labs. If everything left from CENT was moved to building 13, including the one person (classroom space is available in 13), then building 20 could be essentially gutted and turned into anything you wanted it to be. There would be some cost for renovation. Ken noted it seems like a good solution and asked if CENT was ok with this move. Sam admitted that they were not completely “Ok with it” but they understand it is necessary and they are willing to do it. He noted that it was worth looking into.

Jim asked for an update on the Building 7 renovation project. Ken noted that it is suppose to start in the fall but he suspects that it will be delayed until at least spring because additional items are being included in the scope of the project that are under negotiation. Painting, upgrading the data network, sealing the windows for energy savings, and proper distribution of electricity are some of the additional possible renovation items. As to the noise problem, the plan is to work at night as much as possible. It will cost more. Some of the money received this year for repair and maintenance will be reallocated to the building 7 renovation. This will be a major college renovation project and there are significant scheduling concerns. It is a great opportunity but will require everyone’s cooperation.

To finalize the budget priorities, Brian and Ken noted that the budget subcommittee will reconvene as soon as 9 month faculty return in the fall. But even this depends on if and when there are further restrictions by the governor.

III. Technology Plan

The FSEC voted to endorse the plan. Concerns were raised about the Dean of Academic Support v. the Chief Information Officer as to how this will be done. Some recommended for a Dean of Academic Support with a Technology Officer right below, some recommended for a Dean of Academic and Technology Support. Although this is an implementation issue, the FSEC strongly recommended that the position or positions be under the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

Cory also raised concerns about a combined position. Erika noted that the best arrangement would be to have a person with technical expertise under a Dean. She also stated that the administration will be working over the summer to provide a draft plan based on all the recommendations of the governing bodies and the task forces. This plan would be presented
some time in the fall, hopefully the end of fall at the latest.

Jonathan stated that the SSEC also accepted the technology plan as is but expressed concern over the Dean of Academic Support/Chief Information Officer position. Members felt the position needs to standalone and not be lumped with a Dean of Academic Support. The SSEC did not have a discussion on who this person would report to, but they would like to be actively consulted on implementation issues as many staff will be impacted.

The Kupa Ka Wai council did not have quorum at their meeting but did discuss the technology plan. The general feeling was to accept the plan but concerns were expressed on what will happen to some tech positions currently in different departments funded by Hawaiian grant money. Generally there was concern that Hawaiian monies used for technology are not misappropriated and positions for technology are not reallocated into the central organization. Alapaki noted that to be clear, members viewed the plan favorably, but had concerns about the allocation of Title III money. Members requested that they also be actively consulted as implementation proceeds.

Ken stated that when this reorganization of technology takes place, he hopes that everyone will view the implementation issues from the standpoint of what is best for the college rather than one particular unit. It will be a major reorganization and will impact many people. Unions may be involved and people will have different supervisors. It will take awhile and input will be required from everyone.

Motion to Accept and acknowledge the great job Jonathan did on this task force:

1st: Ron
2nd: Marcia

Passed unanimously

IV. Accreditation

Marcia is working with Todd to get sections of the Intranet updated with Accreditation information and additional links.

VII. Mission Statement
Jim provided an update on the Mission Statement. A copy of the current draft Mission Statement, Philosophy, and Core Values was provided. Jim noted suggestions from faculty, staff, and Chancellor Rota were incorporated in this draft. Previously Marcia had expressed the concern that the mission statement was too long. But she now sees that what was being presented is more than just the mission statement. Jim noted that this document would be sent out to the entire campus in the fall for comment. Ralph noted that in terms of referring to Kalihi and one possible interpretation (from Ben Cayetano’s book) as a place of transition, that technically we are in Kapalama. Marcia noted that Jim should document the work his subcommittee has been doing as it will be important for Standard 1 for accreditation. Mark also noted that a summary of the process would be helpful also for his committee on Standard 4. Marcia and Cory commented that once the mission statement is sent out for campus comment (town meetings, etc.), the final process should involve the governing bodies. Brian noted that the process would be similar to the budget process. Once the governing bodies comment, the results would come to the PC for further discussion for planning implications before it goes to the Chancellor for final decision.

VIII. Meeting Schedule for Fall 2010

Keala noted that in the fall semester he will always have a 9am class on Fridays and requested if a later meeting was possible for fall. The time could switch back in the spring. It was agreed that meetings will continue on 2nd Fridays due to potential conflicts with other committees. Meetings will run 10:30 a.m.-12:00 p.m. for the fall.

IX. Things to Think About For Fall

Charter

Jim noted that the key issue that needs to be looked at carefully is the relationship of the PC to the major campus governing bodies.

New Chair

Cory noted that his plans are to step down from the PC and put time into revamping the Math 1 program to address the recommendations from the Task Force on Underprepared Students. Marcia noted that since the scheduling for spring starts so early in the fall that the new chair should be selected very early in the fall meeting sequence. Cory reminded everyone
that anyone can serve as PC chair: faculty, staff, or administrator. Brian noted that sometime in the summer he will ask Mike to send out a campus-wide call for participation on the PC. Brian recommended that when the new chair is elected to make sure that the person selected attends the meeting, as Cory was not at the meeting in which he was selected.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.