

**Council of Community College Chancellors
Meeting Summary
April 20-21, 2005**

April 20, 2005
Dole St. Conference Room
10-12 noon

Present: Ramsey Pedersen (by phone), Ken Kato, John Morton, Leon Richards, Mark Silliman, Peter Quigley, Angela Meixell, Peggy Cha, Clyde Sakamoto, Rockne Freitas, Mike Rota, Mike Unebasami

David McClain, Sam Callejo, Carol Pang, Joanne Itano

CC System Reorganization

David McClain, in response to ACCJC concerns regarding the CC System leadership and Program Review, will announce to the BOR the creation of the VP for Community Colleges with the 7 CC Chancellors and the two Mikes reporting to this VP. A duo reporting to the President by the 7 CC Chancellors is also a possibility. David seeks the Chancellors' feedback on the duo reporting structure. He stated there is a lot to like about what is happening now with the current structure; there is an intent to "not go backwards". ACCJC believes the current system is "not performing".

The VPCC will attend the Council of Chancellors meeting ; the Council of CC Chancellors will include the CC Chancellors, VPCC, the Associate VPs and the President. The Cabinet will continue to have the 2 CC Chancellors as members.

The timing is: announcement on Friday at the BOR meeting; preparation of tables/graphs and functional statements; consultation with appropriate groups (there has been significant consultation with CC faculty already and David is meeting with Floyd McCoy today; unions and students also need to be consulted; and back to the BOR in June or July 2005.

David has discussed the Interim appointment with John Morton. The Interim VP may be a candidate for the permanent position.

Part of the financing will come from the appointment of Dan Ishii as Associate VP for Research (will be funded by RTRF funds).

Biennium Budget Committee

There were questions regarding who is on this committee and interest in revisiting the committee's composition.

Honda International Center

Leon Richards presented a report of the 2004 activities of the Honda International Center.

UHCC Leadership Champions

Peggy Cha reminded the Chancellors to submit nominations for the second generation of Leadership Champions by next week. These Champions will attend the CCLDI training at San Diego during the summer and the Tsunoda Fund will cover travel and the seminar fee. Cammie will coordinate the nomination process to CCLDI, so please get the names of the campus champions to Cammie as soon as possible. The deadline for sign up is early May.

Gregg Enos, Kauai FO, will work with the other campuses to process payments.

Outstanding CC Employee

This is the last year of funding for this award on a system basis. Please send your nominations to Cammie. It was suggested to ask the donor if he/she may be interested in continuing their support of this award with the proposed reorganization reestablishing the CC system.

Compass and Eng 21/102

Peggy Cha reported that the DOIS have developed the following timeline:

- Spring 2006 - implement all recommendations except those pertaining to Eng 21/102
- February 2006 - DOIS will send to CC Chancellors recommendations regarding Compass scores and Eng 21/102. Additional ACT data is being collected for analysis and review. Total cost is \$1645 to be divided among the 7 campuses.
- Fall 2006 - recommendations regarding Compass scores for Eng 21/102 to be implemented if a change is recommended and approved.

CC Chancellors approved the above process and suggested that faculty, advisor/counselors and testing coordinators be involved early in the above discussion so that issues of implementation are also considered. Any other comments are requested by Monday, 4/25/05 to Peggy.

CC Vocational Education Plan

Mike Rota provided a historical overview of Carl Perkins funding and how it is distributed in the state and a summary of the assurances statement signed by each CC Chancellor upon receipt of the Carl Perkins funding. Carol Pang outlined how funding decisions are made (CTE deans) and details about the current program. A review of the performance indicators of the UHCC as a system in Title I Achieving Standards shows increasing non performance (in 2001-02 6/7 indicators were met, in 2002-2003 4/7 indicators were met; in 2003-2004 2/7 indicators were met). In addition, at the end of year 1, about \$500,000 is returned unspent. This carry over money is reallocated to campuses for Program Improvement (RFP) projects. Typically, there are also lapsing funds (about \$50,000) at the end of year 2 which expire 9/30. There are intense efforts to spend the lapsing funds, however, some is returned to the federal government. Perkins funding is used to meet objectives outlined in proposals and may not be diverted to meet other campus needs.

In light of two years of non performance and fairly large sums of money being returned to the system office (carry over) and returned to the federal government (lapsing), the Office of the State CTE Director could step in to "monitor and provide oversight". Further discussion by the CC Chancellors is needed on this issue at a future meeting.

April 21, 2005

8:30 –10:00 a.m.

Windward CC

Present: Ken Kato, John Morton, Mark Silliman, Peter Quigley, Angela Meixell, Peggy Cha, Clyde Sakamoto, Rockne Freitas, Mike Rota, Mike Unebasami
Bernadette Howard, Joanne Itano

Program Review

DOIS offered to develop a common program review process for all CC campuses with a core set of elements. Campuses, in meeting their own needs, may add additional items to the program review process. Bernadette will take this back to the DOIS.

Important considerations in program review process:

- When program review reports are read by individuals outside of CC campuses (i.e. BOR), there should be sufficient consistency so the focus is on the report and not on the differences in format or approach.
- Results of program reviews must impact decision-making and campus and system allocations or reallocations. Results are to be linked to the budget process.
- Although program reviews are completed at least once every 5 years, Perkins funding requires annual reviews.
- May be helpful to involve IR Cadre and faculty in the development of the program review process.
- DOAS and DOSS also need to conduct program reviews for noninstructional programs. A consistent program review process (a minimum set of core elements) with instructional program reviews is necessary.

Core Set of Data

IR Cadre will prepare the Self study core data set so that it has the ability to be “drilled down” to the program level and be used for program reviews.

Important to develop the architecture of the data set that is needed. Begin with what is available, identify what future data is needed and plan for this data collection. Types of data needed: longitudinal data (much is already available), benchmark data and program data. Data is to be available on demand at an individual workstations/laptops and have the ability to be customized. SAS program may be of help here. Peggy is including purchase of this program in Kauai CC’s Title III application (5 year funding) and hopes to sign an ‘intent to purchase’ in May 2005.

Discussion with Linda Johnsrud has occurred regarding inputting certificates of completion in Banner so the graduates of these “programs” may be tracked.

CC System

What does the UH System need to know from the CCs to make the case for their value/importance? The response includes identifying the important State needs and how the CCs contribute to meeting these needs. The answer should also be data based. Outside of UH, CCs are viewed positively as meeting the workforce needs of the state. An area of vulnerability is not moving students (particularly minority) students through graduation. CCs are low cost and accessible, so students enter but not enough graduate. Within UH, the discussion regarding mission clarification is significant and it is important to build positive relationships rather than “pull away” from the system.

How do CCs communicate how we are doing as a system? Consider reporting on benchmarks established in each campus strategic plan and the UHCC Strategic Plan. Much of this data is already available through Cheryl Chappell-Long and her office.

TPRC Process

Mike U., Mike R. and Sandra Uyeno will meet with UHPA regarding “process” letter sent by UHPA.

Faculty Salary Schedules

With each faculty salary increase, the faculty salary steps have been adjusted to include this increase. The CC Chancellors agreed with Mike U. to continue to adjust the salary schedule with the increases until the bottom of the scale is at least \$40,000. At that time, this adjustment is to be revisited.

Unrestricted Fund Reserve Policy

Mike U. distributed information on this policy and requested feedback from the Chancellors. Of concern are the 9 and 11% faculty increases and its impact on the smaller campuses.