Title: Chancellor's Advisory Council Meeting Agenda
Place: Tamarind Room, `Ōhelo Building
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2014
Time: 2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

CAC Members: Maria Bautista, Esben Borsting, Kelli Brandvold, Dave Evans, Regina Ewing, Bob Franco, Kalani Fujiwara, Brian Furuto, Helen Hamada, Mary Hattori, Carl Hefner, Colette Higgins, Krista Hiser, Carol Hoshiko, Ann Ishida-Ho, Sheila Kitamura, Salvatore Lanzilotti, Gordon Man, Carol Masutani, Teri Mitchell, Linka Mullikin, Susan Murata, Christine Nadamoto, Karl Naito, Nawa`a Napoleon, Conrad Nonaka, Veronica Ogata, Patricia O'Hagan, Joe Overton, Louise Pagotto, Sunyeen Pai, Trude Pang, Leon Richards, Charles Sasaki, Ron Takahashi, Joanne Whitaker, Chi Kuen (Annie) Wong, Dawn Zoni and Jeff Zuckernick.

Members Absent: Mary Hattori, Carl Hefner, Krista Hiser, Gordon Man, Linka Mullikin, Nawa'a Napoleon, Conrad Nonaka, Patricia O'Hagan, Leon Richards and Charles Sasaki

Guest: Shirl Fujihara

Call to Order: Louise Pagotto

Budget Cycle Discussion and Vote: Brian Furuto
Three documents detailing the operating policies for the budget process was signed and approved to codify and structure the process: the Participation in College Decision-Making Process Policy, the Planning and Assessment Integration with Resource Allocation (PAIR) Policy and the CAC Charter. The Allocation Requests and New Proposal Form (ARF) was used as a vehicle to request funding from the budget. Each request needed to be justified as either an imminent health and safety issue or to address a need from an implementation plan such as the Strategic Plan, CPR, ARPD, or Annual Report. Next year, the process will start earlier, in December.

The ARFs were submitted by department chairs and unit heads, prioritized by the Deans and Vice Chancellors before being collected and compiled by the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services. There were 53 ARFs, which were ranked by the AGOs. The AGOs are Kalaualani, Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and Student Congress. The Budget and Planning work group met twice to review the ranking of the ARFs before making a recommendation to the CAC.

The total general fund allocation for FY 2014 is $22.137 million. Expenditures are $22.330 million (projected), which are mostly payroll and some utilities. Transfers are approximately $200,000. The end balance is -$193,000. The total in tuition and fees is $20.4 million with a beginning balance of $3.3 million. Revenues are $17.999 million. Expenditures are $17.994 million. Transfers are $3.379 million. (Transfers are services provided by and paid to the system such as risk management, Banner, enrollment, etc.) The total projected loss is -$1.239 million. Combining both funds, the total end balance is a loss of -$1.433 million.

To cover the loss, funds will be allocated from the Community College Special Fund (CCSF), which includes program fees, summer session tuition, facility fees, etc. The message is the college is spending more than we are bringing in and have been doing

so for the last three years. The losses in the last few years have been covered by the tuition and fees special fund reserve. Five to six years ago, the total in this fund was about $9 million. That fund has been depleted and we are now using a "rainy day" fund. However, we cannot continue to operate in this manner. The legislative session was a zero gain. They appropriated $5 million for the seven community colleges. However, there were salary increases and payback issues that needed to be addressed, which account for the additional funds provided.

Was the $1.4 million loss a matter of overspending or lower enrollment? Both. Revenue, which is tuition and fees is down for the fall at about -10% and we are overspending. Every campus is in the same situation. The Board of Regents has approved three more years of tuition increases. However, the Regents may roll back those increases for the fall of 2015. Already planned renovation of buildings will proceed as those projects are in a separate fund. However, new projects may be affected.

Of the 53 ARFs, 9.5 positions were requested at a cost of $630,000. The programmatic costs were $3.3 million, which is $3.905 million in total costs. The AGOs were asked to rank no more than one-third of the ARFs as high, one-third as medium and the others low. High ranking was given a numeric value of 3, medium was 2, low was 1 and no vote was a 0. Only one request was ranked a high priority by all four AGOs: the inventory management system for the college's computers.

The Chancellor will receive the recommendation from the CAC and will respond with a decision for the final budget allocations and an explanation, if he decides to deviate from the CAC recommendation. This provides transparency and accountability to the budget process.

The recommendation from the Budget and Planning Work Group:

Due to the shortfall, no requests using general or TFSF funding will be approved. The request for an inventory management system will be supported as long as it can be funded using other resources, such as Title III.

The Budget and Planning Work Group recommended changes to the budget process: a possibility of giving more weight to certain AGO rankings over others. Another recommendation was to evaluate all the computer labs on the campus to determine whether some may be consolidated or eliminated.

The inventory management system called KACE is a software program and a server. It tracks the age of the computers, how often the computer is being used, the versions of OS, security systems installed, etc. CELTT is currently doing a physical inventory of the computers on campus using barcode tracking. There is an upfront cost and annual recurring costs, which will be included in the CELTT five-year budget cycle request. This will assist the centralization process and will provide assessment data to make informed decisions. Does CELTT have the personnel to manage the system? CELTT will resource that internally. Is CELTT fully staffed? No; however, active recruitment is in process. There is a possibility to fund this with the carryover Title III funds.

The CAC voted by a show of hands, to endorse the recommendation from the Budget and Planning Work Group.

Comments on improving the budget cycle process
Several requests made through the ARFs are federally mandated or required by a department's accrediting agency and will need to be funded. This should be indicated on the form. ARFs should not include position requests. The Technology Plan will need to be funded in part to show the technology plan is a college authorized document. A suggestion was made to indicate on the form which of the requests are mandatory and which are less urgent.

Another suggestion was to have a deeper discussion on the strategic plan and our scorecard to determine the priorities and needs of the institution before making allocation requests from individual departments or areas. Also, prior to the submission to the AGOs, department chairs, deans and vice chancellors could have the option to remove an ARF.

There was a suggestion that the Budget and Planning Work Group should only be members of the CAC.

Next Steps:
- Convene several meetings to communicate the budget process to the campus
- Training for the five-year budget cycle. This is the most important step in managing the budget going forward.

Authorized Governance Organization (AGO) Reports

Student Congress: Annie Wong
The student congress office is moving. There will be a meeting to discuss the decision to stop producing the planners for students. In the past, the Board of Student Publications was funding the production of the planners.

Faculty Senate: Veronica Ogata
The executive team is updating the public website for more accessibility to the faculty. The Student Success Council has 25 members. The Student Success executive council committee of eight members is meeting in the summer. They will make decisions on increasing signage and increasing collaborative learning spaces on campus. Title III carryover funds will be used to fund these.

Staff Council: Helen Hamada
The staff council is planning a health fair for staff toward the end of July.

Accreditation & Assessment Work Group Report: Sunny Pai
Louise Pagotto convened the first meeting on April 17 with subsequent meetings on May 15 and July 1. Monthly meetings are scheduled until December. The faculty senate ad hoc SLO committee proposed a possible Assessment Management System (AMS) to the faculty senate to be implemented by AY 2016. Bob Moeng and Tony Silva presented a proposal for a system-wide AMS at the VCAA meeting. Three campuses were interested in possibly collaborating with us.

The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) has been sending out updates from ACCJC to the CAC and the Accreditation and Assessment Work Group on revised policies and the revision of the Standards and Eligibility Requirements to be officially applied in spring 2016. A few revisions include the option for a seven-year cycle for colleges who pass accreditation standards with an exceptional review. Of the 21 Eligibility Requirements,

only five need to be addressed. 16 have been integrated into the Standards. There is a proposal to significantly change the sanction policy by adding the possibility of applying for restoration of accreditation. This is based on the case of City College of San Francisco.

Next steps: the follow-up report is moving toward its third draft. The visiting team will be on campus in early November 2014, the annual report is due March 31st, 2015, the midterm report is due October 2015 and preparations for the 2018 self study will begin in the summer of 2016.

Five-year Faculty and Lecturer Evaluation Guidelines for KCC: Louise Pagotto
Two new policies were established by the UHCC system. In the policies were directives to the campuses to create procedures for implementation. The draft procedures were sent to the CAC. Some feedback was received an incorporated into the final version.

Individual departments will create their own guidelines. However, faculty members must be evaluated against the requirements of their rank. This process is a professional development guideline for faculty members. If a faculty member does not complete the evaluation, he/she will be referred to an administrator. No review by the union is necessary. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs asked the departments to submit their framework for evaluation to be shared with the other departments.

There was a request to add the effective date of the review of August 1st to the document.

The CAC voted by a show of hands to endorse the Five-year Faculty Evaluation and Lecturer Evaluation Guidelines with an amendment to include the effective date of the review.

Enrollment Management & Marketing Work Group Report: Dawn Zoni and Carol Hoshiko
Registration for the fall is down -8.8%. However, it has improved from -11% a few weeks ago. In addition, over 1,000 students will be attending the New Student Orientation (NSO). There are several more weeks of NSO registration. Postcards will be sent to students by end of the month. Current KCC students will also call them. KISC will call those who will be purged from the system to let them know. There was a request to the department chairs to ask faculty members to call students in good standing who are in their departments but have not registered yet. The lists of those students will be sent to the program counselors and a department chair. A quick link to the registration URL will be on the postcard.

Six rough-cut television ads about KCC were shown to the CAC. Matsumoto and Clapperton produced the videos with assistance from Brandon Higa and many others from the KCC 'Ohana. The Enrollment Management and Marketing Work group were active in the process. On the KCC website, there will be a marketing landing page to monitor the impact of the marketing campaign. There will be an insert in the Star Advertiser on July 9 with the URL to register.

Technology Work Group: Karl Naito
The technology plan is being vetted by the ALO and Accreditation and Assessment Work Group to ensure that it meets the accreditation standard. The technology plan has had several revisions and has been shared with the technology work group and other

constituents across the campus. The technology plan is a college plan, not a CELTT plan. It is a living document. Once the plan is adopted, it will be reviewed annually or more often, if necessary.

An important concern is how the college will fund the upgrades and maintenance of the technology infrastructure of the college going forward. In May 2014, the Chancellor approved an allocation of $350,000 from Title III funds for technology. The CAC Technology Work Group and CELTT will continue to develop the Campus Technology Plan and plans for the expenditure of the $350,000 allocation. The $350,000 plus the March 2014 allocation of $150,000 have allocated approximately a half-million dollars on technology at KCC within the last six months.

A suggestion was made to frame the technology plan with a three-year vision starting with immediate needs and bigger planning issues that are longer term. This will inform the budget cycle as well and provide broader vision for the college. One of the longer term projects is to expand the data network to increase the amount of data that flows through the system.

A request was made to create two or three metrics for the 2015-2021 Strategic Plan. In that way, the technology plan will meet the accreditation standards and will be aligned with the strategic plan.

Announcements:
- Teri Mitchell is the new Chair of the CAAC
- KCC was named the top 20 Culinary Schools in the country
- A vehicle was donated to the college to be used for catering off campus
- A food truck will be coming to KCC

Next Meeting: Tuesday, September 9, 2014 @ 2:30-4:30 p.m.

CAC Documents can be found on Quill.
Go to (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/home), select "Governance: Shared and Participatory" (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/governance), click on the "Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) formerly known as Policy, Planning and Assessment Council (PPAC)" link, log in to get to (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/ppac.html).

Submitted by Joanne Whitaker
2014-6-24_CAC_Minutes_final.docx