Kathy Hill briefly recounted the history of the current strategic planning effort and explained why the plans of the UH, the UHCCs, and Leeward are interconnected: so that we can work together more effectively and deal with budget issues using common terms.

The strategic plan URL was publicized: emedia.leeward.hawaii.edu/oppa/strategicplan

The 5 strategic outcomes common to all UHCCs were outlined, and the LCC committees and committee members with their email addresses were listed.

An explanation of how strategic outcomes and action outcomes are related and labeled was provided. The action outcomes are the measurable actions that lead to the accomplishment of the strategic outcomes. All the CCs have the same strategic outcomes and action outcomes. The strategic outcomes are numbered 1 through 5, and the action outcomes are identified by 1.1, 1.2, etc.

For the first two strategic outcomes, the action outcomes--1.1 through 1.4 and 2.1 through 2.4--are similarly worded. Action outcome 2.5 focuses on Distance Education and is not included in the first strategic outcome.

Outcome 3 focuses on programs that lead to jobs whose wages yield the average or better than the average annual income in the United States ($38,651).

Outcome 4 focuses on areas with shortages in the State’s workforce (in those occupations with wages at or above the U.S. average)—in particular, STEMS graduates.

Outcome 5 focuses on how we acquire and use resources, including employees, facilities, technology, and renewable/sustainable resources, properly.

We then need to shape the outcomes specified above for Leeward College. The Leeward-specific action outcomes are lettered, rather than numbered.

The cells in the charts currently show UHCC data, but the data will be drilled down to provide campus-specific data.

========================================================================
The floor was opened for questions and feedback.
========================================================================
On Outcome 1

Summary/Comment: Two main concerns appear to be

1. Assigning responsibility for the carrying out the action outcomes. In particular, Financial Aid is concerned because it cannot really focus on one ethnic group. Questions about HOW to accomplish these outcomes arose.

2. Making sure that if we increase our outreach to students and if we are successful, resources will be available to accommodate the needs of these students.

There was also some confusion of tactical with strategic planning. Many of the questions had to do with specifics of implementation that should come later under tactical planning.

Aileen Lum-Akana pointed out that the outreach programs (like Gear Up and Upward Bound) cannot target specific ethnic groups—i.e., native Hawaiians. There really are no outreach programs targeting native Hawaiians. Change the verb in 1.1 from “Increase” to “Create.”

Our financial aid program is federally funded cannot target ethnic groups.

Similarly for 1.2.B, we cannot target an ethnic group. So the action outcome should be simply “remove roadblocks” that prevent students in general from applying.

For 1.2C, the college financial aid packages cannot target Hawaiians, but there are programs outside the college that can. Insert “external” before “financial aid packages.”

Can we track the awards to see if native Hawaiians are receiving more financial aid? Yes, we can do that, but we cannot focus on getting a particular ethnic group to apply for financial aid.

But there are programs like Hooulu that can help students get aid.

Therese Nakadomari pointed out that these action outcomes are CAMPUS efforts, not the initiatives of just one office—in this case, Financial Aid.

Nancy Buchanan asked if we should be having discussions with particular offices or organizations as these outcomes are articulated so that the people who have more specialized knowledge and more experience in these areas can inform the discussion.

Kathy Hill pointed out that such discussions were being conducted as the outcomes were being formulated. There was also a serious limitation of time for such discussions. Still, after the open forums, committee members would have the opportunity to follow up on some of the issues raised. The plans will be updated after the open forums.

The question was asked: Had there been consideration about the need for units within the college to handle the increases in workload as a result of some of these projected outcomes? For example, in 5.1, will we increase support for professional development? Or if we increase the numbers of students, are we planning to increase the support for those students?

Yes, the strategic plan is supposed to inform the budget process. If these outcomes become
part of the strategic plan, they will then affect how we allocate resources.

However, we don't need to specify the numbers in the strategic plan. That kind of detail will come up in tactical planning. First we need to settle on the As, Bs, Cs, etc. Decide what should be in the plan before how the items should be carried out.

Aileen Lum-Akana: we do need to think about who is going to do what is being planned.

Judy Kappenberg pointed out that the strategic plan is designed to direct the efforts of the college, and it will need the commitment of the college.

Stuart Uesato recommended that in 1.3.C, we delete the specific program names—“Upward Bound” and “Gear Up” because they are not designed to assist native Hawaiian students. 1.3.C and 1.3.D should be combined into one outcome.

Jamie Yoshimura asked if we should include “parents” in 1.1.A and B as part of the effort to encourage students to apply for financial aid? Another question was why we listed only one service under 1.3.B (“tutoring”). Why not other services.

The discussion led to the conclusion that such specifics should be included in the tactical plan, not in the strategic plan. So parents should not be included in 1.1.A and B, and “tutoring” should be taken out of 1.3.B, and the program names removed from 1.3.C.

Beth Kupper-Herr also pointed out (in 1.3.B), areas like the labs are not designed to target specific ethnic groups (Native Hawaiians). Heather Bach agreed and commented that the same problem runs throughout the UH system. 1.1 and 1.3 are beyond the control of the college.

Aileen Lum-Akana: We can focus on low-income students; then “by default” the native Hawaiian ethnic group will be served.

On Outcome 2

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Summary/Comment: By accomplishing the outcomes of 2, we might very well be accomplishing the outcomes of 1.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Therese Nakadomari: What Aileen is pointing out is outcome 2. If we are successful in accomplishing strategic outcome 2, we will accomplish strategic outcome 1.

Jamie Yoshimura wondered about working with public high schools. How effective since they are so busy.

Ann Dorado read replacement texts for 2.1.A thru C and 2.2A thru C

2.1

A. Representatives from the Student Services Division, from Instructional Divisions, Career and Technical Programs, and other relevant offices will compile a listing of all present efforts at recruiting, with special emphasis on underserved regions and groups.
B. Develop a Comprehensive Campus recruitment strategy in collaboration with academic and Career and Technical programs to address specified goals.

C. With participation from campus representatives, implement comprehensive plan, which includes annual review, to determine whether targeted goals are met.

2.2

A. Work with Financial Aid Office to review current strategies to increase financial aid participation.

B. Develop partnerships with internal and external groups to develop strategies to increase outreach to underserved population.

C. Work with instructional faculty and on-campus support services to establish interventions to increase participant’s satisfactory progress.

Some of the things in the plan are being done now, but even if an office is already doing something in the plan, we still need to include the actions to mark where we are now. And they might now also be more coordinated with other efforts on campus.

On Outcome 3

Nothing was brought up about Outcome 3.

On Outcome 4

Summary/Comment: Two major points came up:

1. Success has several aspects, two of which we may miss measuring:
   a. Those who come to us as “incumbent workers” and take what they need, then leave.
   b. Those who transfer from CC to CC, but not to a 4-year institution.

2. Strategic Outcomes are intended to pressure the 4-year institutions to make the system more “transparent” for students—easing transfer between campuses.

Karen Hayashida suggested that for 4.2.C, it would be better to say “during”, as well as upon completion.

Nancy Buchanan suggested changes for 4.1.B through D:
4.1.B. Replace “Establish” with “Refine”: “Refine the articulation and transfer…”

4.1.D. Delete current text of 4.1.D and replace with this text: “Improve student retention and matriculation by continuing partnership with faculty to address state workforce needs (i.e. learning communities, career development)”

4.4.B The same change as 4.1B

4.4.D Delete current text of 4.4.D and replace with this text: “Improve student retention and matriculation by providing support services targeted to STEM majors.”

Stuart Uesato pointed out, regarding 4.1 and how we measure success, that often students don’t enroll for a degree or certificate. They are here to take one or two courses to improve their job skills. They should be counted as successes, but currently they are not.

We also need to track horizontal movement among the CCs, students who transfer to other CCs to enter programs.

Judy Kappenberg agreed: currently we track mainly transfers to four-year institutions; we don’t count the enrollment of incumbent workers who get what they want and leave.

However, beginning this year, the system has begun gathering information about why students enroll and whether or not they are here to get a degree or certificate. We may be able to use this data in the future.

Jamie Yoshimura asked if 4.1.B would allow for those moving to other campuses to get earlier registration at Manoa if they have transfer classes at CCs.

Judy Kappenberg said that outcomes such as those in 4.1 are meant to put pressure on 4-year institutions to make changes so that the system will become more “transparent” for students.

On Outcome 5

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The one major point was the importance of finding/developing new sources of income for faculty/staff development.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mark Lane informed us that the outcomes for 5.1 have been reworded.

There are funds available for staff development, but we need to make people aware that there are funds available.

Stuart Uesato asked if Resources and Stewardship should include discussions of acquisition and developing new sources of revenue.

Mark Lane agreed that 5.1 and 5.2 don’t touch on acquisition and development of funds. Private donors and revenue streams are not mentioned.