MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE UH HILO STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: April 15th, 2011
Time: 8-10am
Location: CC306, Campus Center, UH Hilo

Attendees: Kainoa Ariola     Siân Millard (notes)
Kelly Burke (chair)          Marcia Sakai
Jim Cromwell                 Elizabeth Stacy
Mazen Hamad                  Pila Wilson
Jackie Johnson               Errol Yudko
Barry Mark

Apologies: Thora Abarca
Dee Drozario
Maria Haws
Gail Makuakane-Lundin
Tracey Niimi
Karen Pellegrin
Harry Yada

1 | Announcements/Questions from Stakeholders

Kelly reported that he had received a memo from the diversity committee asking if they could have more time to respond to the consultation as they have some suggestions for how the strategic plan could better reference the many aspects of diversity. Members agreed that a subgroup of the SPC (to include Kelly, Siân, Pila and Mazen) would meet with representatives from the diversity committee to receive their feedback direct. SPC members would all be informed of the date and time of the meeting and encouraged to attend where possible. The meeting will try to be arranged in the week commencing April 18th.

Action 1: Siân to arrange meeting of SPC subgroup with diversity committee.

2 | Minutes of the 21st SPC meeting (48/11)

There were no additions or amendments to the minutes of the twenty-first meeting. The minutes were therefore approved.

3 | Consultation initial feedback (49/11 – consisted of town-hall notes and raw survey responses sent to committee previous day – survey responses confidential to the SPC)

Kelly invited members to first give any direct feedback they had received from colleagues on the draft strategic plan. Jackie reported feedback from colleagues in the languages department who felt that the plan should specifically reference the Asia-Pacific region given Hawaii’s connection to countries such as Japan,
China and Korea. In relation to that was a desire to see reference to ‘internationalism’ within the plan. It was unclear whether the feedback was suggesting those references were required as a hook for recruiting students or for developing curriculum although the committee took the view that it was possibly both. It was felt that referencing Asia-Pacific may strengthen the role of the Humanities in the strategic plan.

The committee could not agree whether or not to refer to ‘Asia-Pacific’ in the plan. The instead agreed that, should any reference be made, it may be best placed in draft goal 4 – Hawaiian identity and multiculturalism – and that input from the diversity committee may be helpful in determining which path to take. Kelly asked Pila to particularly look at redrafting goal 4 to take this into account.

Kainoa reported back on Hanakahi’s discussions of the draft plan on behalf of Gail. Overall Hanakahi is supportive of the draft strategic plan and recommended that the SPC look to reduce the number of actions and put them all at the same level (some are currently too specific and some too ‘lofty’)

Siân then provided some initial feedback on the consultation reporting that overall satisfaction ratings for the draft goals were relatively high (in the mid 70-80% range), and that 80% of survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the overall draft plan was suitable for UH Hilo for the next five years. Siân reported that she will spend the next few days analyzing the responses in more detail and will present back to the committee a summary that highlights the key issues to be resolved/considered, alongside redrafting recommendations which the drafting subcommittee can be tasked to look at.

4 Chancellor’s visit

The Chancellor joined the committee for part of the meeting and began by commending the committee on their work thus far noting that the draft plan is coherent and concise. His sense was feedback on the draft plan has been very positive, indicating how well the committee has done in capturing the essence of what is important to the university. The Chancellor noted that he used the draft plan as a framework for a speech he recently gave and it ‘test drove’ well and helped to organize the various things the university is doing. He reported that three of the most powerful words he took from the plan are ‘to inspire excellence’.

The Chancellor provided the committee with advice on the actions and key performance indicators (KPI’s):

**Actions:**

The Chancellor asked the committee to identify the top 2-3 cross-cutting, campus-wide actions under each goal to prioritize as those that would be critical to achieve in order for the plan to succeed – i.e. the actions that would have the most enduring impact. This does not mean that the committee has to remove some actions. All currently noted actions would remain (unless the committee decides to remove any following review of the consultation feedback) but some would be identified as the priority ones to achieve, and the others as supporting actions. In that way, the actions would be split into two levels under each goal – priority and supporting. In that way, it would leave space for units, colleges and divisions to put the campus-wide actions in their own terms – i.e. determine how they will respond to the actions – which in turn should increase the chances of the action being achieved.

**Action 3: Committee** to prioritize actions to select the top 2-3 per goal, supported by the remaining actions.

**KPI’s**

The Chancellor recognized that development of KPI’s would be time-consuming and something that the SPC may not be able to fully achieve within the timeframe. He recommended that the committee focus on the content of the strategic plan, and develop some KPI’s as examples – especially ones for the priority actions. The committee will therefore focus on the content first, seeking endorsement on that in mid-May, and will then seek to develop as much of the KPI’s as possible before handing everything over to whatever team is put in place to monitor and review the plan.

**UH System goals/initiatives**

The Chancellor also commented on the UH System goals and initiatives and how it would be important to
reference those in a relevant place within the strategic plan. Particularly with regards to the initiative to increase the number of graduates by 25% by 2015. It is important to make the point in a clear and unambiguous way that one of the key intended outcomes of this strategic plan is improved graduation and retention. The committee agreed that reference to this initiative is important but that the text should not focus on ‘graduation rates’ but rather the activities suggested in the actions of the plan that would support graduation success of quality graduates. That way the focus would be on quality not quantity.

**Action 4:** Siân to work with Chancellor on preface for the strategic plan to include reference to UH System-level initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Work-plan – April to May (50/11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sian introduced this paper and gave a brief overview of the work remaining for the committee before the deadline of the end of May. The committee has four meetings left prior to needing to seek endorsement. During that period, the committee will make changes to the draft plan based on the consultation feedback and will seek to prioritize the actions as per the Chancellor’s request. Between endorsement and the final deadline, the committee will finalize the implementation plan and will develop as much of the KPI’s as possible.

With regards to endorsement, endorsement will be sought from Faculty Congress, Hanakahi Council (at their meeting on May 11th) and UHHSAS (to be discussed with Dee). The committee also discussed the idea of seeking endorsement in some way from staff (who do not have a representative body on campus) and the community.

**Action 5. Siân** to investigate feasibility of seeking endorsement from staff and community groups.

The target date to recommend the final strategic plan to the Chancellor remains as May 31 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators – discussion 1 (51/11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This paper was deferred given Chancellor’s feedback that the committee will not have to develop all performance indicators prior to the plans’ finalization. The paper could however be useful as providing a template for KPI’s in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Summary of actions and close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kelly confirmed that at the next meeting the committee will look in more detail at the consultation outcomes and will resolve key issues raised from the feedback. Kelly asked members to begin thinking about which actions for each goal could be prioritized over others in relation to the Chancellor’s request that the committee identify the top 2-3 cross-cutting, campus-wide actions under each goal that should be prioritized.

Kelly confirmed that the next meeting will be held on [Wednesday April 20th 2011, 8-10am](#) in the Private Dining Room. Kelly thanked members for their time and closed the meeting.

The next meeting is Wednesday April 27th, 8-10am in the Private Dining Room.