

**Chancellor's Advisory Council  
Meeting Notes**

**Tuesday, August 1, 2017**

**2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

**Naio 203**

**Facilitator: Interim Chancellor Louise Pagotto**

*Chancellor's Advisory Council Members: Patricia Taylor for Karen Boyer, Krystal Patterson for Kelli Brandvold, Candy Branson, Merrissa Brechtel, Sarah Bremser, Christopher Edmonds, Sheryl Fuchino-Nishida for Dave Evans, Bob Franco, Shirl Fujihara, Brian Furuto, Carl Hefner, Carol Hoshiko, Brenda Ivelisse, Lisa Kanae, Alissa Kashiwada, Justin Kashiwaeda, Susan Kazama, No'eau Keopuhiwa, Sheila Kitamura, Kathleen Ogata for Charles Matsuda, Karl Naito, Michaelyn Nakoa, Nāwa`a Napoleon, Keolani Noa, Veronica Ogata, Patricia O'Hagan, Joe Overton, Louise Pagotto, Trude Pang, John Richards, Shannon Sakaue, Ismael Salameh, Ron Takahashi, Susan Weber, Joanne Whitaker, and Jeff Zuckernick.*

*Members Absent: Brian Furuto, Carol Hoshiko, No'eau Keopuhiwa, Michaelyn Nakoa, Nawa'a Napoleon, Joe Overton, Shannon Sakaue, Ismael Salameh*

*Guest: Sunny Pai, Lisa Yamamoto and Louise Yamamoto*

| <b>AGENDA ITEM</b>                    | <b>DISCUSSION</b>   | <b>ACTION/RECOMMENDATION</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Call to Order</b>                  |   |  |
|                                       | Interim Chancellor Louise Pagotto called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.  |  |
| <b>New Business</b>                   |   |  |
| Approval of minutes – June 13, 2017   | Karl Naito moved to approve the minutes, Bob Franco seconded. Minutes were approved unanimously.  | The Chancellor Advisory Council minutes will henceforth be published in the News Bulletin. |
| Strategic Plan Scorecard – Bob Franco | <p>Bob Franco reviewed the status of the Strategic Plan outcomes for 2017 including the performance funding measures. <b>(Appendix A)</b> John Morton will update these numbers at his fall visit.</p> <p>OFIE will be leading a process to assess the ARPDs on August 12th. A rubric was developed. The Deans will ask 8 people to assess 5 randomly picked ARPDs using the rubric. The UHCC gives us the data and template for our ARPDs, but we submit the narrative. Are we addressing the connection between the outcomes, data and resource requests?</p> <p>Chancellor Pagotto commented that this process will inform the revising of our</p> |  |

| <b>AGENDA ITEM</b> | <b>DISCUSSION</b>  | <b>ACTION/RECOMMENDATION</b> |
|--------------------|--|------------------------------|
|                    | <p>program review policy 5.202, which will be implementing in fall 2018. The ARPD structure comes from the UHCC but we determine what goes in the Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPRs). Whatever is derived from the ARPD assessment will help us with the CPRs. Paul Sakamoto is changing the look of the ARPDs. On August 15, the new ARPD data is coming in. Our reports will be due to the system on Dec. 15. We need to determine what information is meaningful for us.</p>  |                              |
| ACCJC ISER Report  | <b>(Appendix B)</b>  |                              |
| CAC Review         | <p>Chancellor Pagotto asked the CAC members to discuss how to improve CAC and the CAC work groups. See <b>Appendix C</b> for the written comments collected after the discussion. Other comments were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CAC charter should be followed especially for the work groups or the charter should be amended.</li> <li>• CAC is more effective. Being able to vote has been good but the process needs to be changed. Some items are seen on the same day the vote is taken. Are the votes representing a larger constituency? If so, a suggestion is to distribute information a few months before the vote to get feedback from the constituents. Who are we representing when the members vote? Is it the unit, department or AGO? Or are members making decisions as their role as a Department Chair or Unit Head? If a CAC member is on an AGO, is there voice already represented by the AGO?</li> <li>• There are only a few staff members on the work groups.</li> <li>• The Work Groups should be implementing or creating a plan. If there is not a planning piece, the work group is unnecessary.</li> <li>• A suggestion was to have a work group for the Perkins campus plan as it impacts across the campus and has budgeting implications.</li> <li>• When there are similar groups on campus such as the Faculty Senate budget committee and the CAC Budget Work Group, guidelines are needed to avoid overlap.</li> <li>• If committees already exist on campus that have the same function as the work group such as the Enrollment Management Task Force, the work group should be dissolved.</li> <li>• Instead of work groups, use ad hoc or disappearing groups.</li> <li>• We need to close the loop on issues to see if progress has been made. We need to identify who is responsible and a timeline.</li> </ul> |                              |
|                    |  |                              |

| <b>AGENDA ITEM</b>  | <b>DISCUSSION</b>   | <b>ACTION/RECOMMENDATION</b> |
|---|---|------------------------------|
| <p>Chancellor's Updates:<br/>Interim Chancellor<br/>Pagotto</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ARPD Analysis will be on Aug. 12 at 8:30-1:30. There will be important discussions such as tying planning to budget.</li> <li>• Board of Regents policy to upload faculty CVs on the website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For all instructional faculty in tenure or tenure-track positions.</li> <li>○ On the website in a public place.</li> <li>○ The CV can include academic credentials, research.</li> <li>○ The CELTT Coordinator noted that the Web team has been piloting a product that can upload information from Banner and People Soft (HR software). It will include courses that faculty have taught, their education and an area where faculty can add publications and other information. The HOST faculty piloted the program.</li> <li>○ There is no a deadline. However, faculty will need to update their information every 2 years.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Student Learning Assessment Colloquium on August 11. We were told that the faculty needed time to do the work. Department Chairs were encouraged to invite those responsible for student learning outcomes to attend. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The outcomes for the day are to either generate a course assessment plan or discuss assessment results and next steps.</li> <li>○ SLO Coaches will facilitate round table conversations to assist faculty who may have questions about assessment.</li> <li>○ There will be deep breakout sessions. Amy Patz Yamashiro created Google docs with prompts. Someone else will input the information collected into Taskstream. Laptops will be provided.</li> <li>○ Goal of the Colloquium is to increase participation and finish the work on Taskstream.</li> <li>○ Faculty who attend will get a \$150 stipend and a working lunch.</li> <li>○ Most likely this will happen again during the year as assessment is ongoing.</li> <li>○ A suggestion was made to do a meta analysis of the event to see if it was effective. Evaluation questionnaires will be distributed for the event.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Leigh Dooley is now the full time DE coordinator to implement the DE plan. The DE committee recommended her. Kelli Nakamura will chair the DE Committee.</li> <li>• 2018 Commencement will be on our campus - May 11, 2018. The Convention Center is being renovated and other venues were not available. We will need maximum participation.</li> <li>• For the annual and 5-year budgets for Department Chairs and Unit Heads, questions were added to the process. The ARFs are only a small percentage</li> </ul> |                              |

| <b>AGENDA ITEM</b>  | <b>DISCUSSION</b>  | <b>ACTION/RECOMMENDATION</b> |
|---|--|------------------------------|
|   | <p>of the budget. Department Chairs and Unit Heads will need to show evidence why a request for funds is needed. Then, the ARFs will include a justification as to why you need the additional funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A College Annual Report will be released in the fall.</li> <li>• A facility use form needs to be completed a week before an event when it occurs outside of work hours.</li> </ul>  |                              |
| <p>Announcements: Ron Takahashi and Christopher Edmonds</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cafeteria hours are being reduced in the fall. The hours will be 7am – 2pm, Mon.-Fri.</li> <li>• During duty week (week of August 14), a large delivery of classroom furniture is coming in. There will be dumpsters and vendors on campus.</li> <li>• A big tree fell on Diamond Head Road on College property. On Sunday night, City and County contractors and Kapi'olani CC's grounds crew cleaned it up. There will be a full assessment of all the trees on campus as we are one of the most densely populated campuses in the UH System. Auxiliary Services is working closely with the business office and the UH system procurement office for services on the trees and grounds.</li> </ul> |                              |

# Appendix A



## Strategic Plan Scorecard

Update on Quantitative Performance Measures from UH Community Colleges and KCC-specific measures\* 2016-17

### 1 Strategic Direction > Hawai'i Graduation Initiative: Focus on Student Success

Performance Funding Measures

|   | Target | Actual | Difference |
|---|--------|--------|------------|
| <b>1A</b> Increase annual CA and Degree completion from 1,347 to 1,805  | 1414   | 1383   | -31        |
| <b>1B</b> Increase annual Native Hawaiian CA and Degree completion by 5% growth per year from 191 to 257                                      | 201    | 191    | -10        |
| <b>1C</b> Increase annual CA and Degree completion by Pell grant recipients by 5% growth per year from 556 to 746                             | 584    | 580    | -4         |
| <b>1D</b> Increase annual UH and non-UH 4-year transfer from 1337 to 1721 (UH System Measure)   | 1349   | 1273   | -76        |
| <b>1E</b> Increase annual STEM CA and Degree completers (including 4-year degrees) at KCC and UH 4-year by 5% growth per year from 196 to 262 | 206    | 257    | 51         |

Gap Closing Measures- Selected groups, compared with their percent of enrollment

|   |                                 |       |
|---|---------------------------------|-------|
| <b>1F</b> Close Native Hawaiian success gaps in percent of all degrees and certificates, STEM degrees and certificates, and 4-year transfer | Enrollment                      | 17.0% |
|   | Degree & Certificate Completion | 14.0% |

1

|  |                                 |        |        |
|--|---------------------------------|--------|--------|
| <b>1G</b> Close Filipino success gaps in percent of all degrees and certificates, STEM degrees and certificates, and 4-year transfer   | STEM Degree Completion          | 7.0%   |        |
|  | Transfer                        | 16.0%  |        |
|  | Enrollment                      | 14.0%  |        |
|  | Degree & Certificate Completion | 14.0%  |        |
|  | STEM Degree Completion          | 6.0%   |        |
|  | Transfer                        | 11.0%  |        |
| <b>1H</b> Close Pacific Islander success gaps in percent of all degrees and certificates, STEM degrees and certificates, and 4-year transfer   | Enrollment                      | 2.0%   |        |
|  | Degree & Certificate Completion | 1.0%   |        |
|  | STEM Degree Completion          | 0.0%   |        |
|  | Transfer                        | 1.0%   |        |
| <b>1I</b> Close Pell Recipient success gaps in percent of all degrees and certificates, STEM degrees and certificates, and 4-year transfer   | Enrollment                      | 39.0%  |        |
|  | Degree & Certificate Completion | 42.0%  |        |
|  | STEM Degree Completion          | 24.0%  |        |
|  | Transfer                        | 42.0%  |        |
| <b>1J</b> Increase percent full-time, full-time, degree-seeking students completing a Degree or CA and/or transferring to an external institution within three years, from 38.5% to 50%* | 42.50%                          | 36.60% | -5.9%  |
| <b>1K</b> For students placing one level below college ready, 75% will complete a college level English and/or math course within one semester   | 75%                             | 35.10% | -39.9% |

2

|    |  |     |        |        |
|----|--|-----|--------|--------|
| 1L | For students placing 2 or more levels below college ready, 70% will complete a college level English and/or math course within one year. | 70% | 30.30% | -39.7% |
|----|--|-----|--------|--------|

**Associate in Science/Natural Sciences Measures**

|    |   |     |     |     |
|----|---|-----|-----|-----|
| 1M | Increase the annual number of students participating in the ASNS degree by 8% from 356 to 386*  | 424 | 587 | 345 |
| 1N | Increase the annual number of ASNS students transferring to UH 4-year campuses by 8% from 421 to 64*                                      | 50  | 95  | 15  |
| 1O | Increase the annual number of students completing ASNS undergraduate research experiences and research internships by 10% from 70 to 136* | 94  | 179 | 85  |
| 1P | Increase the annual number of students completing ASNS degree by 10% from 30 to 60*   | 40  | 61  | 21  |

2

**Strategic Direction > Hawai'i Innovation Initiative: Productive Futures for Students, Faculty, and Staff**

|    |   | Target | Actual | Difference |
|----|---|--------|--------|------------|
| 2A | Increase annual CTE (non-CA) certificate completion by 3% annually from 551 to 667*   | 603    | 685    | 82         |
| 2B | Improve workforce development tracking and employer satisfaction, graduate earnings, and improve integration of continuing education and credit programs.*                                      |        |        |            |
| 2C | Establish hallmarks and assessment method for 'āina-based learning. Continue to implement and increase 'āina-based learning through teacher preparation and curriculum across the disciplines.* |        |        |            |
| 2D | Develop local, national, and global community partnerships that advance the college's strategic outcomes.*  |        |        |            |

3

|    |  |     |     |      |
|----|--|-----|-----|------|
| 2E | Increase annual number of students completing service learning assignments from 700 to 900*                                  | 753 | 461 | -292 |
| 2F | Increase the number of sustainability designated course sections from 27 to 60 and develop "Pathways to UH 4-year Campuses"* | 37  | 42  | 5    |
| 2G | Reduce the costs of textbooks and learning resources (CER)   |     |     |      |
| 2H | Develop Native Hawaiian(s) for leadership roles at the College and in the community  |     |     |      |
| 2I | Advance the use and understanding of Hawaiian language, history and culture  |     |     |      |

3

**Strategic Direction > Grow Enrollment: Improve Re-enrollment and Outreach**

|    |  | Target | Actual | Difference |
|----|--|--------|--------|------------|
| 3A | Increase fall-to-spring re-enrollment to 75% by spring 2021*                               | 75%    | 73.8%  | -1.2%      |
| 3B | Increase fall-to-fall re-enrollment to 65% by fall 2021                                    | 50%    | 53%    | 0%         |
| 3C | Increase annual Native Hawaiian enrollment by 5% growth per year from 1318 to 1854*        | 1525   | 1669   | 144        |
| 3D | Increase annual dual enrollment (high school & KCC) by 5% growth per year from 141 to 200* | 163    | 173    | 10         |
| 3E | Increase annual enrollment from feeder high schools from 794 to 866                        | 815    | 601    | -214       |
| 3F | Increase annual enrollment of working age adults by 5% growth per year from 2298 to 3240   | 2727   | 2148   | -579       |
| 3G | Increase annual enrollment of GED completers by 2% growth per year from 309 to 355*        | 321    | 271    | -50        |

4

|    |   |     |     |     |
|----|---|-----|-----|-----|
| 3H | Increase annual enrollment of Pacific Islander students from 129 to 156   | 129 | 126 | -2  |
| 3I | Increase annual enrollment of international students (citizenship Non-US) by 3% growth per year from 751 to 897 | 774 | 718 | -56 |

4 Strategic Direction > Modern Teaching and Learning Environments

Updates needed on most measures.

- 4A Adopt aggressive energy conservation and co-generation goals to have UH carbon neutral by 2050
- 4B Establish a Hawaiian place of learning through the use and understanding of Hawaiian language, history, and culture
- 4C Reach 90 percent reduction in energy usage per square foot compared to 2008 base and better incorporate sustainability practices into operations
- 4D Assess campus sustainability plans, which include operations, curriculum, teaching and learning, Hawaiian culture, and community engagement by 2019  
[Sustainability and Climate Action Plan Approved by CAC May 2, 2017.](#)
- 4E Develop the American College and University Presidents' Climate Action Plan in 2016. Assess progress on this plan in 2019\*  
[Sustainability and Climate Action Plan Approved by CAC May 2, 2017.](#)
- 4F Invest in staff and faculty development to improve impact practices and currency in their field\*
- 4G Complete the full construction of the Culinary Institute of the Pacific and develop credit, continuing education, and contract training opportunities, locally and globally, to maximize fiscal stability\*  
[First Phase of CIP Construction completed.](#)
- 4H Design and develop a model classroom and assess its effectiveness\*

5

- 4I Reduce deferred repairs and maintenance\*
- 4J Upgrade outdated building systems and infrastructure\*
- 4K Support the development of (non-academic) spaces that are designed to holistically sustain students and employees\*
- 4L Implement a long-range landscaping plan that will connect campus gardens through principles of our indigenous culture and consistent botanical signage\*
- 4M Create a culture of productivity and resourcefulness for operations staff by encouraging the best ideas and procedures to rise to the top\*
- 4N Engage with all stakeholders and visitors and empower them with authoritative and relevant information and services\*
- 4O Invest in distance education and information technology to improve learning outcomes, student success, and support services\*  
[Distance Education Plan Approved by CAC May 2, 2017](#)
- 4P Demonstrate improvement to programs and services through continuous, robust outcomes assessment\*

6

## Appendix B

### ACCJC ISER Update - Summer 2017

By Sunny Pai and Joanne Whitaker - Co-Chairs

#### Finishing the First Draft of the Report

What has been done?

- Received all parts of the Standards from the writers and subject matter experts
- Sent to the Chancellor and Consultant before getting to the next stage
- Worked on other parts of the report with OFIE
- Vignettes

#### Two Paths

- Finishing the First Draft of the ISER Report
- Addressing the Gaps to continuous improvement

#### Finishing the First Draft - WHAT'S NEXT?

- In the Fall, team of 7 to 8
- QFE in November
- Second draft due to Co-Chairs November 1st, to Chancellor Dec. 1
- In the end or spring, due May 15 to UHCC for BOR review in June-July
- To ACCJC August 1, 2018
- Evaluation Team - October 15-18, 2018



## Addressing the Gaps and Continuous Improvement

Two kinds of recommendation from ACCJC - Improvement and Compliance

- Actionable Improvement Plans vs. the QFE
- 3 possible compliance areas:
  - Standard I.B.7 - Evaluating random ARPDs
  - Standard II.A. - Student Learning Assessment Colloquium, Assessment Coordinator and Assessment Pilots
  - Standard IV.A. - Governance - Evaluating CAC
- DE Plan Implementation

## Appendix C

| Looking back over this year, how effective was CAC? What could be improved?   |
|---|
| 1. Somewhat effective- Think too many work groups without clarity on roles. Would dissolve and rethink priorities for the year. Also focus on action- What's the purpose of CAC for the year or ever- is it an update group? Vetting group? Working group? Procedures group?  |
| 2. Not sure what the purpose is? What's the goal of having work groups? Read the charter! Difficult to meet. Time constraints. Not sure what happened to the work we did in meetings. Underlying cynicism that all of the work done in these groups will go nowhere.  |
| 3. List of outcomes based on agenda from previous meetings. Were some of tabled items ever finished? Did communication with Chancellor improve- yes. Disseminate info well in advance to voting. But sometimes already voted on Faculty Senate. Here to rep. dept/unit. CAC- are you representing your role or your constituents?   |
| 4. Not effective and need to work on closing the loop, reporting consistency and end recommendations  |
| 5. Good venue to receive information- but whether or how it's being communicated out is questionable. Most effective this year.   |
| 6. Read the charter! Need place for CAC info, including data so we can make improvements to our dept./programs/units. Timeline for data. Accessibility of info and data- is there a place? Official? Feel lost, have to do a lot of hunting for info and data. We do all these assessments and have a scorecard, what is the plan for next steps to meet strategic plan outcomes and measures? Purpose is unclear? AGO vs CAC? Who do we represent when we are already represented in our AGOs? Not informed in a timely manner. Sometimes busy work, sometimes info overlaps too much (AGOs, VCAC, CAC). Very valuable in getting to know people and learn more about what they do, build relationships. What is our role? |
| 7. Need to read and understand the CAC charter.   |
| 8. Too much information, not much engaging discussions. Get out minutes sooner, i.e. approve minutes by email? More AGO involvement. Have occasional "town hall" meeting before large CAC decisions are made so direct input is made from respective departments/constituents. How effective- very moderate; harmed by overall lack of communication on part of campus.   |
| 9. 5.2012 policy program review. Curriculum policy. Policy of policies. VCAC is operational with a distinct purpose. Need to have operations people like HR. CAC more procedural. Does the college really address key campus problems? Decline enrollment. Less repetitive. Examine procedural questions?   |
| 10. More effective this year than in years past. Examples: Voting- a lot more was brought to a vote; however, it needs to be made clear when you are voting on something as an individual and/or as a department. Suggestion for improvement- better timing, more time to get items out in front of groups. AGO should have no more voting power in CAC than any other department head or chair. If there is an issue pertaining to the entire campus, we need to make sure we keep to addressing these issues in the spring/fall. Important decisions need to be made during school year, when faculty/staff present.  |
| <b>How do we improve the CAC Work Groups?</b>   |
| 1. Running list of accomplishments added to agenda. Have the mission and purpose of CAC on agenda, every agenda.  |
| 2. Instead of finding issues to resolve while meeting as the smaller groups, try brainstorming issues as a larger group and then breaking out. Similar like-minded discipline or fields on the same committee vs such diverse expertise in one group.   |

|  |
|--|
| Technology to meet might make it easier to meet. Shared Google reporting so we would know what happened. Topics are so broad, might be easier if topics were more specific.  |
| 3. Detailed in charter- need to follow it. Lack of staff representation. Midterm reports, completion reports, ad hoc groups. Planning piece development and implementation.  |
| 4. Have a work group chair. Monthly updates in CAC meetings. Web page for CAC work groups. Annual results of recommendations.  |
| 5. If items are to come to a vote, send items out for review at least 2 weeks prior. Make it explicit and identify the system on how this information received at CAC is reported out and how/who representatives vote on measures. Are they voting for their units or themselves? (Representing your role or your constituents?) Work groups called together when needed- ad hoc groups. Perkins planning group- per Patricia. What are the problems? Where are the gaps? How can we work toward accomplishing goals? What are goals? Read the charter then suggest changes to or hold to the charter. Develop a plan or implementing a plan. |
| 6. Overlaps w/senate committees or other AGOs? Unclear of who does what and how it fits in with other committees on campus. Perhaps admin led or person responsible for it. Clearer direction. Too much work groups- more focused. Purpose? Roles?   |
| 7. Implementing a plan or developing a plan. What is my role here? Are you representing yourself or your unit? Disappearing work groups- ad hoc groups may be more effective.  |
| 8. Need more staff and possibly students (e.g. Student Success) in work groups. Some groups were lean in membership (recruit)? Subject area experts not represented adequately (e.g. Technology could use more subject-area experts.) General members could balance overt specialized areas; (Enrollment Management) could use more balance. Work groups should extend beyond CAC membership. Results of work groups were not communicated in a timely way to be of any value to subsequent meetings. Work groups should report regularly to overall CAC and publish minutes.  |
| 9. Do ad hoc groups instead. The Chancellor is responsible for the procedures. Setting deadlines for [redacted] deadline is a policy. A syllabus template is a policy.   |
| 10. Are meetings called? Unclear communication on what the exact role/goal of each CAC work group is. Do the individuals on the CAC represent the campus, department, or themselves?   |