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

Date: May 25th, 2011
Time: 1-3pm
Location: UCB 127, University Classroom Building, UH Hilo

Attendees:

- Kainoa Ariola
- Thora Abarca
- Kelly Burke (chair)
- Jim Cromwell
- Mazen Hamad
- Gail Makuakane-Lundin
- Barry Mark

- Siân Millard (notes)
- Karen Pellegrin
- Marcia Sakai
- Elizabeth Stacy
- Pila Wilson
- Harry Yada

Apologies:

- Dee Drozario
- Maria Haws
- Jackie Johnson
- Tracey Niimi
- Errol Yudko

1. Announcements/Questions from Stakeholders

Kelly updated members on progress with seeking endorsement on the strategic plan.

Faculty congress: Kelly had spoken with Bruce Matthews (new chair of the Faculty Congress) and Bruce has agreed to write a note on behalf of the Congress stating support of the endorsement process (i.e. via survey) and acknowledging the result of the faculty respondents’ vote in that respect.

UHHSAs: The previous UHHSAs senate had been unable to take a vote on endorsement of the strategic plan so Kelly reported that he and Siân had met with the new UHHSAs senate on May 20th. The original intention of the meeting was to seek endorsement from UHHSAs on the strategic plan. UHHSAs did not have quorum at the meeting so instead Kelly and Siân gave an overview of the planning process and took questions. The senate members present highlighted that they were in a difficult position, as new members, to vote for endorsement on a strategic plan that they had not necessarily been directly involved with. Kelly and Siân acknowledged that difficulty so agreed to run a dedicated survey for the student body to indicate endorsement or not of the plan. This survey was in the same format as the survey run for the faculty and staff.

There were some issues with duplicate responses to the survey. Siân had identified the duplicates and removed them from the final result (keeping an evidence trail of deletions made). By the deadline, 44 students had responded to the survey and 82% endorsed the plan. It was noted that this sample size could not be interpreted as representative of the student body. The result only gave an indication of endorsement from those who responded.

Kelly reported that UHHSAs had been sent the results of the survey along with a detailed briefing that gave more background on the planning process and how students have been engaged throughout. UHHSAs meet again on May 27th.

[post-meeting note: UHHSAs voted to endorse the strategic plan]
2 | Minutes of the 29th SPC meeting (67/11)
---
There were no additions or amendments to the minutes of the twenty-first meeting. The minutes were therefore approved.

3 | Final Version Strategic Plan (68/11)
---
Siân introduced this paper and talked members through some minor grammatical and structural tweaks to the final draft of the plan. Members approved all changes.

The committee noted that the drafting subcommittee would take one last look at the punctuation in the plan to ensure consistency. Any tweaks will be put back to the committee at the next meeting.

4 | Progress Indicators (69/11 and 70/11)
---
The purpose of this paper was to confirm the overall progress indicators for the plan and to discuss and approve the progress indicators for the priority actions.

**Overall indicators**

Members approved the overall indicators with the change that the comparison for NSSE based indicators should be NSSE average instead of Peers. The reason for the change was that NSSE average, whilst contained data from private as well as public schools, would be a more stable comparison group that the select peers which is a relatively small number of universities and could change significantly over time. This change for the comparison group was also agreed for relevant action progress indicators.

**Action indicators**

The following adjustments were agreed for the action indicators:

- Change column heading ‘lead owner(s)’ to ‘lead facilitator(s)’
- Define column headings
- Better define targets and baselines
- List lead facilitators at high-level e.g. Academic Affairs instead of ‘all colleges’, or Administrative Affairs instead of Office of Technology and Distance Learning.
- Action 1.2 Applied learning: recommend adding a question or questions to the course evaluation form as an indicator of applied learning in class. It was noted that this links to action 2.3 on developing more effective tools for assessing teaching quality.
- Action 2.1 Teaching excellence: recommend an indicator that is student-based to assess teaching excellence (this also links to action 2.3 on assessing teaching quality.
- Action 3.4 Grounds and maintenance: Include an indicator to develop a facilities maintenance plan that is reviewed annually and includes a maintenance check-list. This may help to place less emphasis on reactive work-orders and more emphasis on proactive maintenance.
- Action 4.2 Multicultural fluency: Added curricula and extra-curricula activities, and included ‘language’ in the list of examples

The committee also agreed to move the supporting actions to an annex of the document in recognition that they had not had a lot of time to consider those in detail. The indicators of the supporting actions are therefore just ideas that those who will be involved in implementation may find helpful as a starting point.

**Action:** Siân to make all changes to the progress indicator documents as noted above.

5 | Summary of actions and close
---
Kelly closed the meeting and reminded members that the next and final meeting is Friday May 27th, 1-3pm in UCB 127