I. Call to Order:

a. Attendance: See sign-up sheet

b. Review/Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting(s) – Minutes were approved unanimously by voice vote. N/A

c. Review/Approval of the Proposed Agenda – No changes to the agenda. N/A

II. Information/Reports (for Transmission)

a. Enrollment Management:
   N/A

b. Communications/Report from BOR/KCC Authorized Governance Orgs (AGOs)

   1. ASKCC - Annie Wong/ Kalani Fujiwara

   2. Faculty Senate - Susan Dik

   September 6 is Faculty Senate Day. The FS is now confirming its membership and Committee membership and is almost all completed.

   3. Kalāualani - Nawa’a Napoleon

   Kalāualani is planning an Aug 20 retreat; 2014 May 19-24 World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education – expecting 2,000 to 3,000 attending from all over the world. The Native Hawaiian Education Association will sponsor the event. Nawa’a will check with Ron Takahashi concerning food for the event. Kalāualani is an advisory council to the Chancellor but wants to do other types of activities.

   It was suggested that everyone should note the timing of the Conference in May, 2014; it occurs at the end of Spring semester and just before beginning of Summer session; do not schedule anything during that week.
4. Staff Council - Helen Hamada – Carol Masutani
Not in attendance/no report

III. Action Items

a. The Role of the PPAC – Clarified and Strengthened

1. Report out of Feedback from April 2013 Reflective Activity - Charles Sasaki

Charles disseminated the Thematic Summary of Comments from April 2013 PPAC Self-Reflective Activity

Charles reported on themes and offered highlights for each of the three questions asked. (See: 2013-8-11_Themes_Small_Group_Reflections_PPAC_meet_4_30_13_rev.pdf) A question about where the notes would go next led to the response about integration of the decisions made concerning the PPAC members’ assessment into the response to recommendation nine.

2. Chancellor’s Vision of Role of PPAC – Leon Richards

Salvatore presented the Chancellor’s vision for the PPAC, as the Chancellor was on medical leave. The presentation included the requirements of the ACCJC Recommendation 9 and a review of the governance structure established by the BOR as it relates to KCC. Finally, based on the results of the reflective activity assessment presented by Charles, the presentation included the Chancellor’s proposals to clarify and strengthen the role of the PPAC: (see: 2013-8-15_governance_kcc_and_ppac_LR.pdf).

a) Chancellor’s Vision for the Role of the PPAC

(1). Proposed to change the name of the PPAC to the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) in response to suggestions to insert “advisory” into the group’s name from the members on April 30, 2013 in order to clarify the role of the PPAC.

(2). Review of graphic showing authorized governance organizations (AGO) and standing advisory councils (StACs) clarifies the role of the PPAC as an advisory group in contrast to the AGOs which have BOR authority to advise and recommend in specific areas in the name of specific constituents.

(3). The PPAC will meet in the beginning of each semester for a briefing of the state of the College, e.g., budget, planning, enrollment, and other goals and objectives will be reviewed and discussions will occur concerning how to improve results. (clarify and strengthen role; establish agenda)
a. To clarify and strengthen the role of the PPAC members are reminded that they are responsible for two-way communication. The PPAC members play an essential role in the flow of communication between the Chancellor and the administration and the College’s department-, unit-, and organization- members. It is important that PPAC members disseminate and clarify the information presented at PPAC meetings to their department-, unit, and organization- members and that they report information to the PPAC that is appropriate for the group to discuss or referred to the appropriate individual or group.

b. If there is only information to disseminate, there will not be a PPAC meeting; information will be sent to members from the Chancellor’s office and VCs and deans will follow-up to ensure that members disseminate that information appropriately.

(5). To clarify and strengthen the role of the PPAC the Chancellor will create work groups within the PPAC; disappearing work groups will focus on specific topics, e.g., Technology, Budget, Assessment Issues.

b) PPAC FEEDBACK from the group re: Chancellor's proposal:

Ques: Are there proposals from other admin persons other than this one from the Chancellor? What do the other administrators think? Perhaps they have other ideas.

Response: It was explained that the Chancellor’s style is a collaborative one and that he did seek advice from the other administrators. It was explained that everything presented was discussed at Administrative Staff Council meetings and at the Administrative Staff Retreat on August 13 and recommendations were made to the Chancellor. The proposals presented are the result of those conversations and are the recommendations that represent the thoughts of the entire Admin Staff Council. All Admin Staff personnel where asked directly if this was the case. The VCAA spoke for the group and affirmed that it was the case and stated that now we could have a broader conversation by discussing the proposals and giving feedback, i.e., to advise.

- Point: Dialog on the accreditation recommendations, e.g., Rec 9 concerning the PPAC, started in February when we began looking at the PPAC and its role. Now is the time to add comments.

Ques: In the past, when DCs have asked for difference between VCAC and PPAC: policy making at PPAC and operations issues at the VCAC.
Point of clarification: policies are discussed and advised at PPAC not made.

Discussion: Department Chairs want to have a clear statement/guideline of the difference between VCAC and PPAC.
- Point: maybe members should be asked to write down what their roles are? What do you do with info you get - Put it in a drawer? A lot of stuff could be done via email and shared with constituents.

- Point: We are considering having a really different way to operate: work groups meeting often, the full PPAC less often.

- Point: need cyclical pattern: meeting to set agenda for the year, managed differently, having working groups with the best people in them, (need manager to manage groups).

- Point: meet once as an entire body at the start of the semester (like “state of the “state”). Then let the working groups work and when they are ready to report, the group comes together to review.

- Point: I like the statement to differentiate between PPAC and VCAC.

- The administration can do more to reduce confusion between PPAC and VCAC roles and the issue of redundancy of presentations, e.g., do a better job of separating what goes on the agenda of these groups. We can do a better job at separating policy issues and operation issues in order to clarify the differences between the two groups and determine where a presentation should be given, i.e., one group or the other.

- Point: may need to revise the PPAC document.

- Ques: How will policy, planning, assessment be done - at some other group?

- Answer: These things are going on all over the campus assessment - in departments & OFIE, planning in ARPD, CPR, etc., planning for LRDP. The PPAC will continue to advise the Chancellor on all the issues brought before it, including issues that concern policy, planning, and assessment. That is not changing. The name is being changed in response to the issue of clarifying the role of the PPAC, i.e., that it is “advisory.”

- Point: the only body that creates official university policy in the UH System is the BOR. (In fact, this is more of a meta-viewpoint as unit-specific policy is made within the UH System in order to carry out BOR Policy, e.g., for planning KCC through several iterations involving PPAC, revised its CPR policy, K5.202.)
In addition to the information generated by the reflective activity assessment, the Chancellor will review today’s comments and the five proposals and present his decisions concerning the proposals for the PPAC at the September 3rd meeting.

b. Collaborative Activity: ACCJC Report - Bob Franco (45 minutes)

Bob reviewed the College’s IIM successes including ARPD, Comprehensive Program Review, Tactical Plans integrated into CPR, and the fact that all are connected to the Strategic Plan.

Bob disseminated the responses to the ACCJC Recommendations 1 to 8 to individual groups, as the two previous activities addressed Rec 9. After 20 minutes reading time, the groups discussed four questions:
  1. Does the narrative fully address the Rec?
  2. What needs to be added?
  3. What should be deleted?
  4. What other suggestions does the group have for improvement of the narrative?

Bob collected the comments for integration, where appropriate, into the Recommendation responses that will be presented at the 8/22/2013 Faculty/Staff Convocation.

Milton stated that in six years the General Fund vs Tuition and fees has changed from 70%-30% to 51%-49% respectively. For 2013-14 our total funding from both sources will be approximately $36.6 million. The college has to pay for the unfunded faculty increase in salary that has already started being paid to faculty.

Question: Do we have to plan for cutbacks this year?

Answer: This year we may be able to cover collective bargaining costs but next year will be more difficult. An appropriation was made to community colleges in general but we do not know if it will be released.

Question: What effect is lower enrollment having?

Answer: Currently, fewer students (-8%) but the average SSH is higher; therefore must keep classes full – enrollment management at the departmental level is critical.

Question: Can we expect more funding from the Legislature?

Answer: Whether legislature will cover faculty salaries in an appropriation is unknown.
Question: The College took in $18.4 million but spent $19.6 million in Tuition and Fees in FY 2013?

Answer: Yes

Question: General Fund appropriation for 2014 is .5 million less than in 2013. Why?

Answer: A University system reduction is then assigned to campus level. Kapiolani CC receives a smaller percentage of its total revenue from Legislative appropriated funds than do the other community colleges. The funding amount for 2014 is expected to increase based on $4 million that will be dispersed from UHCC system office.

Question: Can campus go to legislature and ask for funds for Wifi expansion?

Answer: Due to fiscal situation, there is no opportunity to ask for more funding. Therefore, there is now a disconnect between planning process and external funding resource process; it used to be that one looked at plans and itemized what one needed – compiled – submitted to Governor – submitted to the Legislature; but no longer. Now Performance-based budgeting is the only way to earn more funds and this system is based on performance in very specific areas according to specific measures of performance.

Comment: Campuses have been discouraged by UH System from going into the legislature for funds for their individual campus.

Comment: Recently, John Morton’s figures compared international students at KCC funding vs. the other campuses. Therefore, there should be increased funds available due to KCC’s International students.

Response: Our increased tuition and funds revenue is a blessing and curse, some of our G funds are given by UHCC to other campuses that do not have the ability to obtain T&F funds.

Announcements (All)
- Thursday, Aug 22 Convocation

Next CAC Meeting Date: September 3, 2013 (Topics will include Role, Membership, & Participation related to the PPAC)

*PPAC Accompanying Documents can be found by going on Quill (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/home), through the “Governance: Shared and Participatory” site (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/committees), and logging-in to the “Policy, Planning, & Assessment Council (PPAC)” site (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/ppac.html).

Submitted by Salvatore S. Lanzilotti
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