Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate to Discuss the Strategic Plan

February 13, 2009
Olona 106
1:00pm – 3:00pm

A special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to discuss the Strategic Plan, due to the fact that time had run out at the last regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting, February 2, 2009.

I. The Process
The first part of the meeting was devoted to discussion of the process used to develop the Strategic Plan. The process was viewed as “top down” with many senators stating that they had voiced objections to the procedures for developing the plan from the beginning. The ensuing discussion attempted to describe the process and the reasons for possible dissatisfaction with the process that resulted in a document viewed by some as emphasizing special campus initiatives, not representing all interests of the College. Other senators stated that each department had two or three representatives on the Strategic Plan Committee which would provide adequate representation. According to one senator, the Strategic Plan Committee was divided into two parts: The Tuesday group and the Wednesday group — but the two groups did not meet together. Individual members of the committee did not generally express concern previously, but perhaps did not understand the implications of the document as it would drive funding and faculty projects in the future.

The Strategic Plan draft was published openly, presented at departmental meetings, and appeared on the opening page of the KCC website for comment.

Senators voiced understanding that the process was necessarily a “top down” process for the sake of expediency: to meet time constraints, to comply with system-wide directives from the President’s office, to include broad collegiate goals related to eligibility for outside grants and funding, to relieve faculty of the burden of writing the document, and for the document to be written with one editorial voice. The definition of “committee of faculty” was viewed by some as more of an “input group”, rather than as a committee of faculty professionals tasked as authors of the Strategic Plan, in contrast with the faculty-driven process used to develop the Accreditation Self-Study.

Example: Continuing Education was required to provide input and is satisfied that their content was included in the final document.

Example: Chair Davis was a member of the UH System Committee on Outcomes and Performance Measures, the committee that set the priorities and added the percentages. The Committee met two times. There was discussion and faculty input, although few modifications were actually incorporated into the final document.
II. Senators called for specific provisions of the Strategic Plan that did/or did not meet faculty expectations.

Example 1: Creation of Academies. This is an example of an Administration initiative. Ultimately, faculty will be tasked with this objective, and resources will be allocated, but there was never an opportunity to discuss the value of this particular approach at KCC.

Questions: What is an Academy? Is it a good idea? Are we using Academy as a marketing tool? Are we replicating the Business Academy at McKinley High School? Why not just Pathway?

In the pursuant discussion of the Academy, knowledgeable senators stated that the inclusion of the Academy model had more to do with Carl Perkins and Government external funding, than with Administrative initiative. Failing to include particular educational models, may result in lack of support from external funds.

Question: Is the Academy going to create an artificial divide between vocational students and transfer students as in the past?

The Academy in its present iteration is much broader than vocational training. Currently, Farrington HS has an International Academy which interfaces academically with KCC.

Let’s get back to Specific Examples. The Academy discussion is valuable, but off track given the limited time today. Such discussion should have been part of the process in creating the Strategic Plan.

Question: What are the specific concerns of faculty regarding the Strategic Plan as it stands?

- One “global” idea before we return to specifics, The Plan includes many ambitious ideas, that are now problematic given the recent budget shortfalls. Where will the cuts take place? How is our campus going to support these ambitious endeavors in light of the current budget?

The sometimes overly high benchmarks and gradually inflated percentages of the final document were criticized by some faculty from the beginning. What are the ramifications if we don’t meet expectations in the current economic climate? What if the enrollment increase goals for certain groups, such as native Hawaiians, are stated, but the people don’t come? When these issues were brought up at the system level, it was suggested that certain items were included as lobbying points with specific legislators in mind to acquire votes for university funding.

Returning to an idea expressed previously, KCC is not in control of where the directives come from on the system level, and ultimately must comply. The Chancellors are being told what has to be done. Do the Chancellors actually have any flexibility? The decision-making process is essentially top down, and we are trying to invert the process. Chancellor Richards still must report to Vice President John Morton.

The Senate is a recommending body. However, it is the duty of the Senate to express the opinion of the faculty. We can state our opinions and recommendations to accompany the Strategic Plan document to the Board of Regents level.
III. Back to Specific Examples

- The mandate was a 3% increase in enrollment, and it was subsequently changed (Bob Franco?) to 5%. This is an example of change without faculty input.
- Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures brochure, #1, states a 6% to 9% increase per year. This would compound over time. How can the campus cope in terms of space allocation, course-offerings, and personnel?
- Why are there differences in percentages of growth between the System document and the campus document. Is the System document representing an average of which we are but a part?

Let Faculty Senate request a database explanation for each metric. Were percentages included willy-nilly or is there a statistical rationale?

Senators should specifically identify the numbers/statistics with which they have specific issues.

What about input from the community groups involved? Should they have a voice? What role did they actually play?
- Faculty Senate must solicit input/opinion from faculty representatives who attended meetings with community groups.

The Strategic Plan B2 states that we will increase Pell Grant participation.
- How do we increase Pell Grant participation? What are the Pell Grant requirements? Would increasing Pell Grant participation be based on counseling students? Potentially positive in bringing money to the College, but how is it accomplished?

The Strategic Plan A4E deals with E-Portfolios.
- Does this mean that all faculty mandated by Administration to create E-Portfolios?
- What portion of the tight budget will be dedicated to creation of E-Portfolios?
- Administrative decision may task one full-time faculty member to the E-Portfolio project, resulting in cuts of lecturers and course offerings to students in other programs.

Chair Davis stated that John Morton’s directive was to cut “discretionary funds” only. Full-time positions would remain funded, lecturers were the first in jeopardy of losing their positions. [KCC has statistically the most courses taught by lecturers in the system.]
- Is reassigned time “academic” or “discretionary”? Ask the question.
- How exactly have the state budget cuts affected KCC?
- Task the Faculty Senate Budget Committee to obtain specific information on how UH system budget cuts will be affecting KCC.

The Strategic Plan: Second Year Experience
- Faculty Senate and the College should obtain information on effectiveness of the First Year Experience, before embarking on the Second Year Experience mentioned in the Strategic Plan.


The Strategic Plan B4B
Providing certain programs is not a problem, but sustaining them is. A Perkins-funded program increased student grade-points by ½ to 1% overall, but funding has ceased. Instead of looking for new initiatives, more should be invested in programs proven to work.

**The Strategic Plan B4K**

- word missing

**The Strategic Plan A4J**

- word missing: “Potential [campus?] wide”

**The Strategic Plan B4O**

- word missing: “class off [campus?] potential location”

Consensus Statement: Programs that have statistically been shown to be effective should continue.

IV. Global Question: Where are decisions being made? Who decides priorities without our input?

Chair Davis reiterated that Faculty Senate is a recommending body. The Board of Regents is our boss. The President of the University has certain powers. As a body, Faculty Senate has to review and stay on top of issues, and appropriately recommend from the perspective of faculty. We need to maintain a cordial working relationship with administration — and not push our leaders into areas where they cannot go.

V. Input and Transparency: According to the Student Congress representative, John Cando, the Strategic Plan was sent to Student Congress for approval. One senator suggested that the Strategic Plan be sent to departments, but the consensus among most senators was that departments had already been invited to participate and comment, and that the Plan is currently accessible for all faculty on the front page of the KCC Web page. No further meetings with faculty department were deemed necessary.

**The Strategic Plan D7A**

- Sustainability should include Fiscal sustainability of existing programs as well as environmental sustainability.

VI. What of Humanities and the Arts with respect to the Strategic Plan.

- No mention of replacement for termite-eaten Maile Performance Building
- No mention of goals and objectives vis-à-vis performing arts
- Additions should be included under Performance Measure 8 of the plan. Add a B-Section
- Addition of performing arts objectives: Hawaiian music/art
- Addition to section F1A” Expansion based on need (due to increased enrollments)
- Addition to sections related to serving international students.

Discussion and ideas of individual senators respectfully summarized and submitted,

Carol Beresiwsky
Faculty Senate Secretary