Planning Council Meeting Minutes  
September 26, 2014  
9:00 am – 10:30 am  
Building 2, Room 614

Present: Erika Lacro, Billie Lueder, Katy Ho, Ken Kato, Dee Uwono, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Russell Uyeno, Wayne Sunahara, Conred Maddox, Connie Montero, Ka’iulani Murphy, Pat Patterson, Mike Meyer, Bert Shimabukuro, Jim Poole, Kara Kam-Kalani, Jennifer Higa-King, Femar Lee, Jeff Stearns, Alapaki Luke, James Niino, Stefanie Sasaki, Pearl Nakagawa, Gerimi Tangonan

Absent/Excused: Silvan Chung, PCATT Representative

I. Call to order at 9:02 am by Chair Stearns.

II. Review of August 29 Meeting minutes
No corrections. Minutes approved.

III. Program Budget – Chair Stearns
[Handout – Suggested Changes in the Program Budget Process]

Jeff said that he received some comments and suggestions about improving the program budget process. The council discussed these suggestions and decided on them as noted below.

1. Many of the Tech I and Tech II faculty were not present at last academic year’s budget town hall meeting because it was held on the same day as a Perkins meeting. Russell said that if he knows in advance, he could help make sure that the Perkins meeting does not fall on the same day this coming year.

2. One comment concerned the town hall meeting being too long and suggested that it be broken up into several shorter discussions. Last year's town hall was approximately 90 minutes long. Although a suggestion was proposed for two or more town hall meetings, such as one day for Tech I and one day for Tech II, committee members said they preferred the current single meeting.

3. A third comment suggested that the budget process would be smoother if members of all governance committees reviewed the proposals ahead of time (the proposals are posted on the Intranet). Committee chairs need to encourage their members to attend the town hall meeting so they can be better informed. The committees should also announce when they would hold their meetings so that proposers could attend to answer further questions.

4. Carryover proposals that were not funded should be written into the new program reviews. The carryover list needs to be reviewed by the
Planning Council by having program representatives confirm if the items are still needed or have been funded by other sources and if the priority remains the same. This process should not take more than 20 minutes of the Planning Council meeting.

5. Ken had suggested that we think about a 5-year program budget plan, which had started with Chancellor Rota. Projects could be placed in different fiscal years so that we could come up with a long-term budget that ties into the strategic plan.

6. Although Mike recommended taking computer-related items out of the annual process so IT could handle them, the consensus of other committee members was that the current program budget process is the best way to justify and receive campus approval for projects, including computer-related items, that are important for their programs.

7. To reduce the overall time for the budget process, rankings by the governing bodies would go through only one pass this year instead of two.

8. There was a suggestion that budget requests be broken down into separate single items rather than a larger budget request. The smaller parcels would allow some items to be funded in the subsequent year.

9. One suggestion was to put the program budget requests at the end of the ARPDs. There would be no change to the form for this.

10. One thing hampering the budget process this year is that the data from the system’s office has not been released. The data is needed for the ARPDs.

11. Despite the operating budget cuts and the difficulty of getting program requests funded, should the UH Board of Regents give money back to the campuses, we should have a list of priorities prepared.

IV. **Strategic Plan Update** – Erika Lacro/Katy Ho

[Handout]

Erika highlighted key changes in John Morton’s strategic plan:

The plan now includes more ethnic groups, such as Pacific Islanders and Filipinos. The plan also focuses on working adults, high schools, and transfer students.

The measurement for Pell was changed from how much is awarded to how students receiving Pell are performing.

There is an increase in the weight of STEM and an increase in the weight for transfer students. The transfer indicators encompass both students moving to a 4-year college and students graduating from a 4-year institution.
For 4-year transfer outcomes, there is a change in the metric to annual measure instead of a fall semester measure.

Erica noted that with the tuition increase down from 7% to 2%, our college needs its enrollment to grow. We should look at strategies for getting part-time students to take more credits. Currently, part-time students are 72% of our enrollment.

Information about the Velocity program will be presented at the next Planning Council meeting.

V. **Accreditation and Assessment Update** – Marcia Roberts-Deutsch

Marcia said that the follow-up report was sent out to the campus and a final draft was submitted to John Morton’s office on September 22.

Our campus report addresses the remaining recommendations. The Actionable Improvement Plan will update these items for the mid-term report, due October 15, 2015. Work on the mid-term report will begin Spring 2015.

VI. **Meeting adjourned** 10:26 am by Chair Stearns.

*Meeting Minutes prepared by Billie Lueder.*