MINUTES OF THE TWENTIETH MEETING OF THE UH HILO STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date:        April 1st, 2011
Time:        8-10am
Location:    Private Dining Room, Campus Center, UH Hilo

Attendees:  Kainoa Ariola        Siân Millard (notes)
            Kelly Burke (chair)   Karen Pellegrin
            Jim Cromwell         Marcia Sakai
            Dee Drozario         Elizabeth Stacy
            Mazen Hamad          Pila Wilson
            Jackie Johnson       Errol Yudko
            Gail Makuakane-Lundin

Apologies:   Thora Abarca
            Maria Haws
            Barry Mark
            Tracey Niimi
            Harry Yada

1 | **Announcements/Questions from Stakeholders**
   |
   | There were no announcements or questions from stakeholders.

2 | **Minutes of the 19th SPC meeting (41/11)**
   |
   | There were no additions or amendments to the minutes of the nineteenth meeting. The minutes were therefore approved.

3 | **Chair’s role and process**
   |
   | The purpose of this item was to clarify the role of the Chair, seek the committee’s feedback on the process we have been following to develop the plan, and seek feedback on how that process could be improved.
   |
   | Kelly informed the committee that two issues had been brought to his attention. The first was to clarify his role as chair, and the second was about the process for development of the plan in committee meetings. With regards to the first issue Kelly noted that he has three roles:
   |
   |   (1) To plan and manage the meetings
   |   (2) To aid Siân in facilitating the meetings
   |   (3) As a member with his own point of view, arguing for a point
   |
   | Kelly confirmed that he will make it clearer the times when he is speaking as Chair, and when he is offering a perspective as a member. Kelly also noted that in his role as Chair he has responsibility for moving the
discussion forward, whilst also giving people chance to speak. There is an inherent tension there though between allowing people the time to express themselves and ensuring that discussion moves forward with all members having opportunity to put forward their point of view. Members discussed this point and recognized the need for a balance between allowing people to have their say, and ensuring that discussion flows. Members therefore agreed to be more conscious of the points they do make to not take up too much time, and Kelly asked members to let him know if they feel like he’s shutting them down too early when they have an important point to make.

The second issue that had been brought to Kelly’s attention was one of process. This issue has a few components:

- The first is a potential lack of clarity of what has been achieved at each meeting, and a possible feeling that we spend too much time in committee meetings ‘going around in circles’. The result of that is that members may be going away from the meetings unclear on what was achieved and what will happen next. Kelly noted that he and Marcia will try to set aside a few minutes at the end of each meeting to summarize the discussions and confirm next steps.

- The second is whether more could be done outside of meetings in terms of interpreting and developing prior meeting discussions to move the committee forward for their next meeting, and help improve efficiency at meetings. The perception is that the process model the committee has been following in terms of trying to develop the strategic plan only in committee meetings (with some exceptions) is inefficient and that we spend too much time discussing things and not enough time drawing conclusions and clear outputs. Kelly outline two options to try to improve the efficiency of the meetings:
  - Option 1: Charge the drafting subcommittee to go away and develop discussions held by the full committee, make judgments and move things forward.
  - Option 2: Have Siân, as Strategic Planning Coordinator, take the discussions from committee meetings and, as well as summarize them in the minutes, interpret the discussions, and develop proposals to put back to the committee at their next meeting (paper 44/11 is an example of that process) in order to move things forward.

The committee discussed these two options and agreed that it is the role of the full committee, not the drafting subcommittee, to develop the strategic plan and to hold discussions around that. They further agreed that the role of the drafting subcommittee is to take what the full committee has developed and to frame it in wording and phrasings that are appropriate and compelling.

The committee agreed that the support Siân could give in terms of offering possible framings (per option 2) would be helpful and therefore agreed to pursue Option 2 in terms of process from now on, with Siân providing additional interpretive and developmental support outside of main meetings. Members did however note that they have a responsibility to critically and carefully review frameworks proposed to ensure they both reflect what the committee intends, and to ensure nothing is missed.

On a more general point, members agreed that strategic planning is not an easy nor linear process and that although they have struggled in some meetings, they have made good progress with appropriate check-points (i.e. mission and vision consultation and Chancellor/VC review) along the way to make sure they’re on the right track. Members noted that the process is speeding up and that with hard work they can and will meet the end of May deadline.

Consultation plan (42/11)

Siân introduced this paper and explained that its purpose was to discuss and approve the consultation plan.

The committee confirmed that the consultation should be issued as planned in the week commencing April 11th.

The committee approved the proposal to offer the consultation via two mechanisms – online survey and town halls. In this discussion the committee noted that whilst the town-hall sessions held for the last
consultation had limited attendance, that holding them is still important to give people access to the committee and give their views in person.

The committee agreed to hold three town-hall sessions. Recognizing that there was limited student input to the previous consultation (and indeed only two to the town-halls), the committee agreed to make one of these three sessions dedicated to students. Siân agreed to investigate with the Chancellor if he could fund provision of refreshments for this session to help encourage attendance. Dee suggested that the student meeting be held on Wednesday April 13th as this is when UHHSA meets and they may therefore be able to encourage greater student involvement. The other two sessions would be open meetings but with one particularly targeted to community members. In that vein, one of these two extra meetings will be held from 4:30 (as there is free parking for visitors after that time) and the other at lunchtime.

**Action 1: Siân** to amend the provisional room bookings per the committee’s discussion.

The committee discussed three options for the format of the town halls and agreed to follow option 2 as set out in the paper. In that regard, attendees will receive a short introductory presentation on the plan’s development and an overview of the sections that the committee is consulting on. They will then be asked to consider the whole package and provide feedback on: (1) what they like, (2) what doesn’t sit well/what they would like to see changed, and (3) any other general comments. The emphasis will be on trying to identify potential ‘deal-breakers’ that need to be addressed by the committee.

The committee agreed that if they are able to reach agreement at the April 8th meeting on the draft plan to be issued for consultation, that the online survey be advertised the afternoon of April 8th and close at 12pm on April 14th. The committee noted that would give respondents 5.5 days to respond and will also mean that the committee will be able to review raw, anonymized comments and Siân to have done some preliminary analysis prior to their meeting on April 15th – thereby giving them a head-start in reviewing the feedback.

The committee agreed to send any comments to Siân by email on the draft survey questionnaire, and that Siân, Errol and Elizabeth will meet to review and finalize it.

**Action 2: Siân, Errol and Elizabeth** to meet to review online survey questionnaire.

The committee approved the communications plan for the consultation.

---

5 Updated ‘what we stand for section’ (43/11)

Siân introduced this paper and explained that its purpose was to approve changes made by the drafting subcommittee to the original bullet point on ‘excellence in teaching’ to address feedback from Chancellor/VC’s on more explicitly referencing scholarship in its own right. The bullet point was changed from:

- **Excellence in teaching:** We view teaching as our primary focus and value the integration of teaching with scholarship, connecting instruction with applied research, service, and professional experiences that enhance both our students learning and our university’s contribution to academia and society.

   to:

- **Excellence in teaching and scholarship:** We value the integration of teaching with scholarship, connecting instruction with research, service, and professional experiences that gives our students a competitive advantage over their peers. We strive for excellence in teaching by promoting effective and innovative teaching methods that that have a positive impact on student learning, while also seeking the advancement of scholarship in its own right.

Siân reported that she had run the change past both the Chancellor and VC Brown (who had raised the issue) and both were content with the proposed amendment. The committee agreed that inclusion of the phrase ‘advancement of scholarship in its own right’ adequately addressed the concern and therefore approved the change proposed by the drafting subcommittee.
Siân introduced this paper and explained that it represented a proposed framework for the goals and actions that attempted to take into account the Chancellor’s feedback for more specificity in light of the committee’s discussions at their last, and previous meetings.

In terms of level of specificity, Kelly reported that Siân had showed the Chancellor this proposed framework and he confirmed that it was at the level of specificity he requested, and he was happy with five goals given their greater level of specificity. The 8 initial broad goals did not lend themselves to strategic decision making, but that more specific goals (as presented in 44/11) did. As such, it is the level of specificity of the goals that is most important, rather than the number.

The committee began their discussion on the framework by identifying areas that were potentially missing from the goals/actions. Four areas were initially identified:

- Faculty scholarship
- Morale
- Distance learning and outreach
- Endowments

On these aspects, the committee agreed to reference faculty scholarship under goal 1. They noted that distance learning and outreach were already listed under Goal 1, and that reference to ‘additional and innovative’ funding streams was made in Goal 5, but that it would be made more explicit by referencing the need to build endowments. In terms of morale, the committee noted that the term was not explicitly used in the proposed framework but that actions that would help to improve morale are included throughout e.g. professional development, recognition and reward, gathering places, streamlining of processes.

Members were then invited to give their general comments on each goal and its supporting actions. The key points relating to each goal are given below:

**Goal 1: Provide students with applied scholarship experiences that help prepare them to thrive, compete, innovate and lead in their professional and personal lives**

- Amend the text to read ‘provide every student’ to match the vision
- Reference developing and supporting a culture of faculty scholarship. General infrastructure support is needed for this (e.g. faculty release time to pursue grants to bring in the research dollars, start-up funds, faculty-student mentorship, lab space, reward). There is a perception that faculty scholarship is not actively encouraged at UH Hilo so with respects to rewarding faculty for investing in student scholarship an appropriate rewards system will need to be developed (e.g. text could read ‘develop reward system for faculty/student research collaboration.
- Other potential actions to include under this goal that fit with a ‘continuum’ of the student experience would be to:
  - Invest in an ‘introduction to university’ program that gives new students an overview of the expectations of the institution
  - Encouraging students to identify with the program with their program of study to engender a sense of belonging (that would be a strategy to improving retention as studies show that students who identify with a group at their university e.g sports athletes) have higher retention rates.

**Goal 2: Foster a greater sense of campus community through a vibrant, effective and well-maintained environment within which to study, work and live**

- Under the student housing point, reference the plans for a ‘freshman village’ that is noted in the Long-
Goal 1: Range Development Plan.

- Split the student housing actions into two with one dedicated to maintenance and improvement of existing housing, and the other dedicated to the development of new housing.
- Under the bullet point to extend the library hours, extend this to other services (e.g. food) to provide more evening services to students.
- Under library hours, note hours and ‘resources, particularly distance learning’

Goal 3: Reflect a sense of place by cultivating and celebrating our diverse, multicultural campus

This goal represents an amalgamation of the original goals 5 (Hawaii as a locus for learning) and 6 (diverse, multicultural campus). The committee was split on the effectiveness of merging these original goals into this proposed one. The sticking point was on whether it was appropriate to center multiculturalism and diversity, within a Hawaiian base, or whether it was more sensitive to split out the goal into two separate points. With regards to just having one goal, a suggested wording for the goal was ‘To build an identity as a distinctive Hawaiian university that radiates out from an internationally acclaimed and indigenous based core’.

The committee could not resolve this at the meeting so Siân will work up two options – one for the goal with everything together, and another with the two areas split out. Siân will work with Pila, Jackie, Kainoa and Gail to develop these.

Action 3: Siân to develop two options for the committee to consider with regards to Hawaii as a locus and diversity/multiculturalism.

Goal 4: Strengthening UH Hilo’s impact on the community and island of Hawai‘i through responsive and responsible higher education provision

- Change K-20 to P-20
- Expand the college-town bullet point with examples on how the university could open up more to the community e.g. through the arts – a place for the community to come for education, recreation and inspiration.

Goal 5: Facilitate organizational excellence by fostering a culture of continuous improvement, responsible resource management, and effective communications

- For the goal text, amend it to read ‘resource development and management’ to bring into the goal statement the fourth action bullet about revenue stream development.
- Include reference to improving communications and ‘collaboration across units’ to action bullet 1 to emphasize both communications and collegial working.
- Add an action on clarifying roles and responsibilities of personnel
- Add an action about instigating a process of continuous assessment and review of progress towards the plan (i.e. an action about implementation and the desire to develop and sustain a culture of effective planning at the university, and to put in place systems to monitor that).

The committee agreed that Siân would revise the framework per the committee’s discussions and circulate a new draft for review asap prior to the committee’s next meeting on April 8th.

Action 4: Siân to update goals/actions framework based on committee’s discussions.

7 Summary of actions and close

Marcia confirmed that Siân will take the outcomes of the meeting and update the framework per the committee’s discussions. Siân will do that asap and send to the committee for review, inviting written
comments prior to the next meeting which will be held Friday April 8th, 8-10am in the Private Dining Room. Marcia thanked members for their time and closed the meeting.