Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) Meeting: 10/23/2014, 9:00-10:30 a.m.
Hawai‘i Hall 309

AGENDA

I. Call to order
II. Business:
   1. Feedback on Strategic Planning Efforts to Date
   2. Discussion: Linking the UH Mānoa Plan to System Strategic Directions
III. Next Meeting
IV. Adjournment

ATTENDANCE

Reed Dasenbrock (co-chair), David Ericson (co-chair), Kathy Cutshaw (VCAFO),
Peter Arnade (Dean, A & H), Jerris Hedges (Dean, JABSOM), Francisco Hernandez
(VCS), Ashley Kawagishi (ASUH), Duane Stevens (faculty, SOEST), Cecily Ornelles
(faculty, COE), April Goodwin (OVCAA)

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER- 9:05 a.m.
VC Dasenbrook and Dr. Ericson began the meeting with introductions.

DISCUSSION

• Feedback on Strategic Planning Efforts to Date

Dr. Ericson asked the group to share their thoughts on the strategic planning efforts
to date. It was noted that a GSO representative was not in attendance. April agreed
to contact the president of GSO to identify a representative and arrange a time for
VC Dasenbrook to meet with GSO to discuss the work of the SPC.

Dr. Ornelles shared her view that it is important to see the results of the work group
sessions within the overall planning efforts. VC Hernandez expressed his concern
that the action steps should be embedded in the real work, and that someone
needed to be assigned to lead the work. He further stated that many of the
suggestions from the work groups were premised on requests for additional
funding, but that the work needs to be doable even given current (and future)
budgetary constraints. Work group members, including some from Student Affairs,
used participation in the work groups as an opportunity to get more money, but
struggled with feasibility- they created an entirely separate structure and positions.

Dr. Ericson agreed and emphasized the fact that it is essential for the right people to
be in place to move the work forward. This was not previously the case.
Dean Arnade raised the issue of whether the activity of the committee and work groups was clearly connected to implementation. He suggested it may have been more of an exercise in updating progress indicators than taking actionable steps toward achieving goals. He further noted that the strength of the former approach was that shared governance was at play, however, there was a disconnect- it was not an actionable plan.

Dean Hedges raised the question of whether the plan has the correct balance between graduate and undergraduate emphasis? How do we best articulate with other parts of the system (campuses, System)?

Ms. Kawagishi pointed out that the ASUH reps did not see the undergraduates in much of the plan- they did not see any movement on the things discussed in work group sessions, nor were the meetings well articulated with the executive committee meetings. The students would like to see greater transparency in action steps and outcomes based on all input provided. Another committee member agreed and added that for each item there should be timelines and constraints.

VC Dasenbrock said that the previous plan showed, “ways to spend money,” the new should be, “ways to acquire new resources and save money.”

Dean Arnade recommended the work groups be retired out of the concern that they were too siloed and not effective in putting forth actionable items. Dr. Ericson added that the work group model disconnects resources from objectives and the work became untethered from reality. VC Hernandez suggested that one possibility would be to ensure that each workgroup have a VC to provide clearer direction.

- **Linking the UH Mānoa Plan to System Strategic Directions**

VC Dasenbrock noted the relevant externalities to be considered as next steps are determined. These include the following:

1. The WASC interim report is due March 2015. This requires a description of what has changed on campus as a result of strategic planning (Susan Hippensteele will provide this in December/January). This will conclude “Achieving our Destiny.” WASC has been especially concerned with System-Mānoa relations.
2. UH System’s four Strategic Directions need to be more than simply crosswalked to the Mānoa plan- we need to define our goals within the four directions.
3. By March 15th, the committee needs to outline a new strategic plan. How do we adopt and adapt the System Strategic Directions plan to our plan?

He further noted that the previous plan was disconnected from the System plan, in addition to a disconnection between the strategic planning executive committee and
the work groups. There was a lack of visible progress (in large part resulting from small budgets). Moving forward, planning efforts need to be the right balance of visionary and achievable/actionable. He proposes an “adopt and adapt” approach to linking the UH Mānoa plan to the System Strategic Directions which would contain 8 action items/goals - 2 for each of the Strategic Directions. VC Dasenbrock opened the matter up for discussion.

All committee members agreed that the “adopt and adapt” approach is the best way to move the strategic planning work forward. VC Hernandez and Dean Hedges stressed the importance of defining Mānoa’s leadership role in a high-performing system and the need to develop its singularity within the System Strategic Directions. Dr. Ornelles said that this would make the plan more achievable. VC Cutshaw pointed out that the Strategic Directions are broad enough that they can be used to bring forward the Mānoa strategic plan and that several of the action items and related metrics could be put on a dashboard for transparency/reporting. CTAHR could lead the sustainability piece.

NEXT MEETING

Before the next meeting, April will send the new version of the SDI to the group and contact GSO regarding reps and an opportunity to speak with Reed. VC Taylor, Dr. Stevens, and Dean Hedges will focus on the “High Performance” strategic direction and determine two Mānoa goals and related metrics. VC Dasenbrock will continue communicating the new approach to different campus constituents - beginning with ASUH and GSO.

ADJOURNMENT - 10:31 a.m.