The following is an update to the ongoing discussion with the UHCC’s Culinary Arts Program Coordinating Council on February 19th, 2021.

I. BUDGET vs ALIGNMENT

A. General Discussion

During the discussion, the PCC noted challenges in implementing budgetary and academic changes due to the rigidity of the agreed alignment. The programs and attendees were unanimously opposed to the alignment as it does not take into consideration the unique program needs, location, student diversity, and distribution of workload to name a few. Due to the small number of student transfers seen between sister programs, several faculty believe that the previous format of program counselors working together to assist the transferring student was a most thoughtful process.

B. Campus Programmatic Impact Concerns

HawCC: We believe that the alignment poses challenges for each respective campus in the sense that each campus still maintains course offerings unique to that program and seems impossible to fully align statewide seamlessly. Current articulation agreement still has gaps in it for this very reason. As we’ve mentioned in the PCC meeting, we feel that the original way that the programs addressed student transfers by working with the counseling department and students on an individual basis was the most meaningful in terms of designing the right educational pathway for that particular student’s needs and goals. While I can see alignment being useful for programs identical to each other, this is not the case for our culinary programs across the state which have different student populations and facility capabilities. In our opinion, it will be very difficult to address new program budget initiatives without affecting the Articulation Agreement put forth.

MauiC: We feel as the rest of the programs all do, that all the campuses are unique in terms of lab classes and offerings. It is hard to fit us all into the same box. The alignment for all makes it hard for the smaller program and the cohort classes. We do agree on the sharing of the 3 lecture classes 111, 112, and 115 across the curriculum. If at all possible, we could also share the burden of the classes in terms of lecturers who are specifically teaching in that format currently (we have such an individual if need be). I believe that we can also achieve other alignments moving forward curriculum wise in terms of advanced degree with similar pathways.

KauCC: Look forward to seeing if the VPCC’s office will permit further adjustments to the CULN course alignment, if the reason for deviating from alignment is due to budgetary reasons.

LeeCC: Alignment for the sake of alignment is unnecessary and wasteful. I believe there is a great opportunity to offer articulated lecture courses (CULN 111, 112, and 115) statewide in a distance format. This will allow more flexibility and versatility for the individual programs to focus workload into more specialized areas and increase fill rate efficiency across the system for these courses. However, aligning lab courses (with the possible exceptions of CULN 120 and 150) is very problematic as each campus has
unique properties such as facilities, student needs, and campus needs. What works for a particular course in one program may not work in another. An intelligent, nuanced approach to articulation can benefit the budget. A "one size fits all" approach will be damaging in a multitude of ways.

**KapCC:** Although the PCC aimed for 100% alignment, that was not reached across the board due to uniqueness of student populations from campus to campus. Being that complete alignment was not reached and in consideration of the budget situation, will the UHCC system reconsider its position on alignment and approve curricular changes which are aimed at decreasing expenses by lowering TE overload. Case in point is teaching equivalencies which in AY19-20 amounted to nearly $72,000. This was directly related to alignment where KapCC lab class credits went from 4 to 5 (and subsequent TE increase). This also raised credits for the AS Culinary Arts degree to 73. We find alignment a disservice to the students as it has worked against allowing timely completion of the AS Culinary Arts degree seeking students. In respect to curriculum, it has affected our ability to pivot efficiently in and industry that is constantly changing.

**WinCC:** While WCC does not have a culinary program, it does have a food service program. Alignment is not an issue for us but having worked at KCC, LCC and now WCC, I do think that now is the time to align. If not now, when? If not us, then who? I would not be surprised to hear that this is not a choice for us in the very near future.

**C. Consideration**

Regarding “Alignment vs Budget,” the Culinary UHCC suggests allowing each program to adjust their curriculum as necessary to meet budgetary challenges even though they may fall out of alignment with present articulation.

### II. Centralization of Lecture Classes

#### A. General Discussion

Three initially, then an additional trio of articulated "lecture" classes are being considered for centralized Distance Completely Online (DCO). They include: (1) Introduction to the Culinary Industry (2) Sanitation and Safety (3) Menu Merchandising (4) Purchasing and Cost Control (5) Hospitality/Human Resource (6) Math for Culinary. Due to the distinct needs for each program, some found it to be a useful strategy while those with cohorts, found challenges in meeting students' needs due to various reasons. Rather than taking an "all or none" approach, the PCC noted the diversity of each program and has asked each campus to formalize their rationale. As noted in SEC-I above, strong consideration should be made in providing some level of programmatic and curricular autonomy under their purview of each program/campus when considering participation in a centralized lecture approach.

#### B. Campus Programmatic Impact Concerns

**HawCC:** This seems like a good idea in concept as it can help with streamlining certain common fundamental courses such as 111, 112, and 115 which are lecture only courses. I would like to suggest that we initially try this model amongst individual islands (minus Maui College's current agreement with KapCC). I feel this streamlining by islands will offer a more controlled trail vs. trying to accomplish this statewide at the moment. If the UH system agrees to this strategy, there will need to be certain criteria set ahead of time to determine which campus and instructor will teach each of these courses to avoid full-time instructors being short on credit load.

**MauiCC:** As of right now, the classes discussed are taught by our very well-versed on-line instructor, so it would impact this schedule. However, if it helps modernize the Programs, and bring down the overall cost to each program, we are all for that. Suggestions for further class sharing could be the 271 Purchasing, and
potentially our CULN 100 math which we would be willing to share if other programs are needing a culinary math that does not meet the AS standards but meets the AAS standard.

KauCC: Who will have priority to teach the course, who will coordinate the course throughout the HCC system and how will the faculty member be chosen? How will we share tuition dollars? Appreciated learning at the PCC that some programs rely on their instructors teaching CULN lecture classes to maintain course load. Programs that need to teach their own CULN 111, 112, and/or 115 can hopefully do that, and won't need to give up teaching those classes at their campus.

*If it were determined that the respective courses would be a hub and spoke, and taught as DL, then the respective instructor would need to be well versed in DL instruction. For our program, with the courses needed to fulfill teaching load, we would not seek a lecturer to teach.

LeeCC: As stated, I believe there is a great opportunity here. The consolidation of lecture courses would allow the programs across the state to be more flexible and specialize in the unique needs of each of our students and communities.

KapCC: A centralized DCO of CULN 111, 112, and 115 is rational solution to manage fiscal concerns as a whole, and consequences should also be noted. It seems to be one of the identified modalities to manage costs suggested by system wide discussions and administrators. Some of the perceived challenges perceive would be the level of online teaching knowledge and training, high expectation of academic rigor, the ability to share tuition, and maintaining teaching load for fulltime faculty. In addition, there are challenges with national testing requirements (ex. ServSafe) but solution may be identified. It is our belief that jumping into a solution without due diligence may lead to many unforeseen circumstances which, during these unfortunate times, may not be corrected or reversed once implemented. We would like to see a beta testing of a centralized lecture class model with those culinary programs that feel it is their bet interest. Then assess the model, reevaluate for necessary changes and determine its viability.

WinCC: Centralization is a must and long overdue. The efficiencies that can be achieved cannot be denied. Will it be the best fit for every student? No. But we need to streamline our programs if we want them all to survive the changes that are coming. It is also a chance to drive the 25+ year old CIP vision and actually make it a reality in part. Centralize classes are the fulfillment of our mission and though they there may be growing pains, will produce a far more consistent student in the long run.

C. Recommendations

Regarding the “Centralization of Lecture Classes,” the programs are willing to consider this as a viable option and would appreciate the following considerations.

1. The PCC will coordinate which campus programs are able to participate in centralization of lecture classes along with which courses will be offered.
2. Those that are not able not participate will indicate rationale.
3. The PCC will conduct a feasibility study of the centralization of classes which input from the UHCC on measures.
4. Determination of tuition sharing. (Possible solution is that students register at their home campus; the centralized instructor teaching will be listed in Banner at each of the campus; each campus will create a Form 20 for their percentage; home HR or if HR is centralized, they will be notified for benefit needs.)

III. Defining Low Enrolled Classes

A. General Discussion
The PCC noted various definitions of "Low Enrolled Courses" across various campuses. The current definition as noted on Phase 1 Guiding Questions notes, "To what extent can low enrolled courses (<10) be scheduled more strategically and cost effectively?" Especially with the current issues surrounding social distancing, this could be 100% of a class. From campus to campus we have noted differences. Is the question using "less than 10" as a guide or is this something set by the UHCC system? Does each campus determine its own criteria? Is this meant for standard lecture classes? A little guidance would be helpful.

B. Campus Programmatic Concerns

HawCC: This "10 or fewer" criteria seems like a very poor way to determine what defines a low enrolled course. Each campus, especially the smaller campuses, have limited facility and lab spaces and resources, hence lower caps in their labs. On that same note, due to the pandemic and social distancing mandates for face-to-face courses, I find this "10 or fewer" criteria to be conflicting (especially for labs). For example, my kitchen labs for CULN 133, 220, and 240 can only house 6 students safely. I also believe meaningful technical education occurs with smaller classes or cohorts in order to facilitate an optimal, high level learning environment. I suggest that the system change to a percentage formula when determining low enrolled courses and also consideration for each individual facility and its capabilities.

HawCC- Palamanui: We are in agreement with HawCC

Mauic: This is a sticking point for all Programs, and asks the question, what defines capacity. At the current Covid protocol it is hard to define. What is safe? Who determines this? What is good for some are not necessarily good for all, or one size fits all. We should be able to try and figure out with the campus health experts what determine this so we do not end up canceling classes and losing more students in an environment that has a decline in enrollment already. It should be equitable and perhaps possibly in a rubric that makes sense not in an over-arching decree from the administration.

KauCC:
Low enrollment should be based on a percentage maximum class size allowed. Also, as a cohort there will always be a reduced class size due to attrition for any 200 level classes.
KapCC asks for a 67% fill rate to run a class. This is adhered to in most situations, but a few classes run below 67%.

LeeCC: The notion of a low enrolled course being defined as less than 10 is short sighted to say the least. In a course such as CULN 223 where the cap is 12 due to facility and safety reasons, 9 students would be considered “low enrolled” where it is, in reality, a 75% fill rate. We should advocate for percentage-based judgements not simply numerical. When we have low enrolled courses, we must justify to our DC and Dean why those courses should continue to run. For our program a curriculum redesign is needed to help address some of our low enrollment issues, but largely I believe that we need to drive enrollment to address this issue long term and big picture.

KapCC: At KCC, the criteria for cancelling a class is based on a minimum fill rate of 67%. This has been a directive by the campus that has served as a guide. Our administration does provide the opportunity to explain why a class will need to be operated with a suboptimal fill rate which is much appreciated. We need to be responsible when making these decisions in terms of understanding graduation needs, make up of class as international student tuition is almost triple of residents, and even understanding community perception.

WinCC: This question is difficult and potentially a loaded one because there seems to be different metrics for Associate level programs as compared to the Advanced Professional Certificate program. If our current and short-term situation is truly fiscally dire as we are being told and decisions are cost driven, academic year 2021-22 will tell us a lot. Will there still be support for APC courses that are under-enrolled, training students for jobs in fields that research show there is no growth potential for in Hawaii? I am curious. It will tell us about the priorities as they relate to the culinary program enrollment criteria and if it is an across the board requirement or if it is just applicable to some programs.
C. Considerations

Regarding “Defining Low Enrolled Classes,” we understand that this is a broader discussion that requires greater UHCC system input. Regardless, the PCC suggested the use of a percentage model based on capacity in determining a low enrolled course similar to what KapCC is currently utilizing (67% or more). A granular look should be considered in understanding areas such as student graduation needs and class make-up as part of the decision process to run a course.

IV. BLENDING OF CREDIT AND NON-CREDIT

A. General Discussion

Identifying possible models for blending of credit and non-credit student to fill courses.

B. Campus Programmatic Concerns

HawCC: I think our lecture only courses (111, 112, & 115) are a possibility. I would hesitate in having non-credit students being in the same production lab courses as the other students before they fulfill their Safety and Sanitation course. Another challenge would be that our program runs as a cohort. If these non-credit students enroll in the courses mentioned above, and then decide to formally enroll into the program, this will affect their credit load, and potentially their financial aid.

MauiC: The Program is not in agreement with the idea of using the non-credit to teach the credit curriculum. There is a difference in rigor with which we teach the degree seeking classes, that it is hard to quantify at which the non-credit classes are taught. Do they meet the same threshold of accreditation expectations? We should be thoughtful and progress with an idea of a value added and not a blend. A sharing of space, perhaps not at the same standards, but potentially as an advancement.

KauCC: Regarding non-credit, we are similar with HawCC and agree with their reasoning.

LeeCC: It may be worth exploring the development of certificates that target industry professionals. Whether credit or non-credit, we can use this student population to fill in a selection of the low enrolled courses, especially the 200 level courses which is where it seems we all have the issues with mainly due to attrition. Prerequisites would be a potential issue and will likely need to be vetted on a case-by-case basis, perhaps based on years and/or quality of experience. There is potential here to both help fill courses and also to utilize this as advertisement to potentially gain new students.

KapCC: Understandably, class dynamics, prerequisites, skills, and academic rigor play a role in having an aversion to a blended class. There may be an opportunity to work with this blending in reverse. At KCC, there has been informal discussion regarding the addition of “elective” courses to the curriculum. By creating these “boutique” courses. Boutique in the sense of a defined scope with a short one-credit duration. For example, food focus on food photography and social media, baking focus on artisanal bread, an entrepreneurship focus on opening a business, food and beverage with a beer making class, culinary with indigenous foods, and food science with development of taste. This is what sparks student’s interest and could bring in non-credit aspects into the classroom be it an industry chef or a home cook.

WinCC: I believe that there is a great deal of potential in this area but it is a complex issue. It should be explored after the dust settles as a vehicle for revenue generation as well as an enrollment driver. “Curious about a career in culinary arts? Come spend a week walking in a chefs shoes” ....$495.00
C. Plan

There are valid challenges in bringing in non-credit students into credit classes especially when it comes to labs. However, various non-credit models could serve as a gateway into the credit side culinary program or serve to bolster the current programs by adding courses in specialized area of interest. Our plan is to develop models targeting these potential blended classrooms.
V. Additional Opportunities

1. Focused Partnership with DOE on Recruitment and Early College

LeeCC: Having grown up in Pearl City, attended Kapiolani for Culinary school, and also having worked on both campuses, I have a unique perspective on the communities and needs of each. It is my belief that the communities that we serve are very different due, in large part, to socioeconomic disparities. I believe that the students here at Leeward CC are largely the workforce of our industry. Our students are, in many cases, already working and looking to get their degree and pursue economic opportunities as quickly as possible. In contrast, many of Kapiolani’s students are looking towards management positions and focusing on the 4-year program. I would like to see our program focus on partnership with the DOE (especially as they are in the process of articulating their “pathways” to better guide their students) and position ourselves as the clearest and most efficient pathway to the industry. This could be accomplished in the following ways: Above mentioned partnership with DOE with a focus on recruitment and Early College courses to “capture” enrollment. This would give students quicker access to the lab courses where we have much greater retention rates than situations where the student cannot get into a lab course in the 1st semester due to it being filled.

KapCC: We are working with the Hawaii Restaurant Association Education Foundation (HRAEF) in creating a model for the ProStart Culinary curriculum in DOE schools. The aim is to utilize our Ignite Internship program as a mechanism to provided needed internships for DOE students, along with mentorship with college culinary students and providing summer track program to develop students who are seriously considering culinary as their academic and career pursuit.

HawCC- Palamanui: Once the Covid pandemic is in the rear view window, we will launch our Fundamental Cookery culinary 120 to the Hawaii Community College summer program. The students will gain the basic culinary fundamentals of cookery as well as sanitation, baking, dining, knife skills, college experience and the real life skills of the foodservice industry. The proposed program is designed for 12 students from the West Hawaii high school district from grades 9-12. In the Hawaii Community College catalog for culinary 120 course, this 5 credit course delivers as (2 lectures, 9 lab). The students will be provided with knife kits, hats and HawCC Palamanui logo aprons while participating in the program. This program will offer high school students an opportunity to start their college degree through Early College while attending high school.

2. Short Track Certifications

LeeCC: Development of “Professional” Certificates to focus on the needs of industry members who are now looking at increased competition in the job market as a result of the closure and struggles of many establishments. Re-configuring of existing CA’s and COs to more closely align with student and potential student needs. One example is the Dining Room certificate which is currently 2 semesters worth of courses. This does not reflect the needs of a student (likely a current industry professional) who would like to improve their skills/knowledge and do so in a way that allows them minimal interruption to their current schedule.

KapCC: In our attempt to modernize our curriculum and also noted in section IV-B, elective course can be managed to provide various certifications including our plan for a Court of Master Sommeliers Level I certification.

VI. UHCC Culinary Programs Plan of Action Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>Plan #1</th>
<th>Plan #2</th>
<th>Plan #3</th>
<th>Plan #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HawCC/Palamianui</td>
<td>Early College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MauiC</td>
<td>Centralized Lecture Courses</td>
<td>Reduction of credits, not necessarily T.E’s</td>
<td>DOE Partnerships</td>
<td>Professional Development Courses for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KauCC</td>
<td>Maintain Cohort Status</td>
<td>Centralized Lecture Courses that will maintain current scheduling of classes</td>
<td>Industry Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeeCC</td>
<td>Centralized Lecture Courses</td>
<td>DOE Partnership</td>
<td>Professional Certificates/Credentials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-development of curriculum to include elective courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KapCC</td>
<td>Centralized Lecture Courses</td>
<td>Reduction of Credit (TE)</td>
<td>HRAEF &amp; DOE Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Elective Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>