

Faculty Senate – General Meeting Minutes
12:15 PM, Monday April 3, 2017, Kauila 114

Senators

Present	Absent	Senator	Department	Proxy
X		Monomita Krishna	Art and Humanities	
X		Susan Jaworowski (Member at Large)	Business, Legal and Technology	
X		Edwin Timoteo	Continuing Education	John Santamaria after 2:00 pm
X		John Santamaria	Culinary Arts	
X		Mark Kunimune	Emergency Medical Services	
	Ex	Lynn Hamada (Vice Chair)	Health Sciences	
	Ex	Lani Suzuki-Severa	Honda International Center	Sheryl Fuchino-Nishida
X		Sheryl Fuchino-Nishida (Member at Large)	Hospitality	
	Ex	Reid Sunahara	Kahikoluamea	
X		Susan Inouye (Chair)	Language, Linguistics and Literature	
X		Michelle Sturges (Secretary)	Library and CELTT	
X		Gemma Williams	Maida Kamber Center	
X		Will Jonen	Math and Science	Susan Jaworowski after 2:00 pm
X		Judelyn Vallestros	Nursing	
	Ex	Candy Branson	Social Sciences	Susan Inouye
X		Cory Ando	Student Services	

Guests

Mae Dorado	Curriculum Committee
Kimberly Suwa	Curriculum Committee
Anthony Silva	Language, Linguistics and Literature, Arts & Sciences SLO Assessment Coach
Kelli Nakamura	Distance Education Committee
Kristie Malterre	Distance Education Committee
Helen Torigoe	Distance Education Committee
Kevin Dooley	Distance Education Committee
Bob Vega	Distance Education Committee

	Discussion	Action
Meeting Called	Meeting Called to Order at 12:18 PM – Chair, S. Inouye	
Opening by Chair	Reminders: Departments must decide on their Senators for next year (2017-2018) prior to the May 1, 2017 Senate meeting. New and continuing Senators should attend the May 1, 2017 Senate meeting. Immediately after the May General Meeting adjourns, the new Senate will hold an election meeting to determine who will the 2017-2018 Senate officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and At-Large members of the Executive Committee).	

	Also, departments should decide on all of their standing committee representatives as early in the Fall semester as possible. Faculty Senate Day falls in early September and all unit representatives need to be in place at that time to elect standing committee leadership.	
Approval of Minutes	<p>Minutes of the March 6, 2017 General Meeting had been distributed for review.</p> <p>MOTION #1: Motion to approve the March 6, 2017 General Meeting minutes.</p>	<p>MOTION #1: C. Ando (motion) S. Jaworowski (second)</p> <p>11 – Yes 0 – No 0 – Abstain</p>
Review Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting – January 25, 2017	Minutes of the March 22, 2017 Executive Committee meeting are available for review on the Senate website.	
Chair’s Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p><u>UH CES Implementation Update</u> The ACCFSC push to get the UH Administration to involve faculty in conversations about how the system will be configured and used has been successful. The UH Administration has agreed to slow down the process of implementation to allow more time for discussion and decision-making. Use of the eCafé system will be extended through AY 2017/2018, with UH CES to be implemented in Fall 2018. S. Inouye reported that the Senate’s Ad Hoc UH CES Committee has been notified that they are re-activated to work on customization of UH CES questions for Kapi’olani.</p> <p>At the March 24 CCCFSC meeting, UH VPCC John Morton said he would like the community colleges to discuss having some common questions in UH CES, possibly with respect to a common policy. However, since it is possible for each campus and even each department to have its own decision-making process in UH CES, it remains to be seen if the CC system can come to an agreement on shared issues.</p> <p>The decision-making process for the UH CES will get rolling in Fall 2017. Senators who know of faculty interested in being on the Ad Hoc UH CES Committee next year should contact S. Inouye.</p> <p><u>Key Points of ACCFSC Meeting, January 27, 2017</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <p><u>Framework for Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan (IAFP) draft - Lassner</u> A draft document creating a framework to integrate</p> 	<p>S. Inouye will ask someone from the Ad Hoc UH CES Committee to be a representative to the systemwide CC committee that will discuss common UH CES questions/policies for community colleges in Fall 2017.</p> <p>Senators should inform their departments that feedback on the IAFP</p>

	<p>academic and facilities planning in the UH System was released by President Lassner’s office with a request for comment. The plan was in response to a BOR resolution asking the UH Administration to develop an integrated high-level systemwide academic and facilities master plan. The ACCFSC is collecting feedback from all campuses for inclusion in a joint response.</p> <p>In the UHCC section, on page 9, there is a statement that, “The deferred maintenance backlog at the CCs is scheduled to be eliminated over the next three years.” A Senator noted that this statement was received with skepticism in their department, especially given recent budget decisions by the Governor and State Legislature. The Senator added that, in consulting with VCAS Brian Furuto about the budget process, they learned that campuses are informed how much their fiscal year budget is in October of that fiscal year. Most of the general fund money goes to salaries so there isn’t much if any left for facilities maintenance. In that situation, the only way to accomplish the goal of eliminating a deferred maintenance backlog is to remove items from the list even though repairs are not completed. Another Senator observed that a factor not addressed in the plan is the impact of budget shortfalls on program accreditation. CTE programs receive extra pressure from external accrediting bodies to meet facilities and personnel standards regardless of local budget situations.</p> <p>A third Senator noted that the plan includes a real push for degree programs to be delivered online, (pp. 9-10). If Kapi’olani isn’t offering online degrees, there is a danger of other degree-offering institutions scooping students for their enrollment even if those must take Kapi’olani courses to complete the online degree.</p> <p>Additional feedback on the plan should be sent to S. Inouye before April 7, 2017.</p> <p>2. <u>RP 9.214 Teaching Assignments for Instructional Faculty</u> Some faculty have expressed concern about a part of the revised policy that asks for every campus to post everyone’s teaching equivalencies and curriculum vitae (CVs). A Senator noted that TEs are already shared publicly via a distributed spreadsheet. Faculty concerned about the CV requirement would like a say about what information is included out of concerns</p>	<p>should be sent to S. Inouye before April 7, 2017.</p> <p>Senators should inform their departments that feedback on the revised policy RP 9.214 should be sent to S. Inouye before April 7, 2017.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>about privacy and stalking. There are also questions about how the CV information will be maintained and updated. The policy only says it is the responsibility of the Chancellor to provide support for the information to be updated at least every 2 years.</p> <p>Additional feedback on the policy revision should be sent to S. Inouye before April 7, 2017.</p> <p>3. <u>E 5.202 Review of Established Programs</u> While most of the revisions to the policy are minor, there was some concern about changes to the wording of Appendix A, Item 4 (Evidence of student learning and student and program success). A list of indicators of program quality was expanded to include “alignment with Hawai’i economic demand,” which some Senators felt would be a hardship for Liberal Arts or Humanities programs. It was noted that the list in question was giving examples of possible indicators, not prescribing possible indicators.</p> <p>Additional feedback on the poicy revision should be sent to S. Inouye before April 15, 2017.</p>	<p>Senators should inform their departments that feedback on revised policy E 5.202 should be sent to S. Inouye before April 15, 2017.</p>
<p>Action Request #1617026 A.Chau– Proposed increase to TEs for Department Chairs</p>	<p>The Action Request follows up on an exchange from 2013 in which the Senate passed a resolution recommending an increase in Dept. Chair TEs and the Chancellor declined the proposed TE rates. The 2013 resolution stemmed from a recommendation from the Professional Rights and Responsibilities (PRR) Committee which, in 2012, analyzed the language on TEs in Policy 9.237 and found it to be garbled and contradictory. It is not clear that the documentation the PRR Committee compiled in support of the proposal was forwarded with the resolution. Also, in responding to the resolution, the Chancellor said he would provide additional justifications for his decision at a later date, but there is no evidence those explanations were provided. For these reasons, the current PRR Committee is asking that the Senate resubmit the recommendation accompanied by supporting documentation.</p> <p>Senators were reluctant to endorse the proposal since the supporting documentation was not available for review.</p> <p>MOTION #2: Motion to table AR #1617026 until May 2017 when it can be considered along with the supporting documentation.</p>	<p>S. Inouye and L. Hamada will follow-up with A. Chau about the supporting documentation.</p> <p>MOTION #2: W. Jonen (motion) J. Santamaria (second)</p> <p>14 – Yes 0 – No</p>

		0 – Abstain
<p>Action Request #1617027 C. Matsuda – Request to Rescind UHCCP #4.203</p>	<p>AR 1617027 was submitted on behalf of the Math and Sciences Department. It asks that UHCCP #4.203 (Institution-Set Standards), specifically the sections on Course Completion and Degrees and Certificates Awarded, be rescinded. UHCCP #4.203 sets minimum standards, such as a 70% course completion rate, without including any evidence showing that such a rate “equates to degree success, completion, or employment.” The policy also does not take into account factors that make a one-size-fits-all 70% course completion rate unrealistic, (e.g. economic and demographic changes affecting enrollment, open-access enrollment policies, the Acceleration Initiative for Developmental Education), and/or ill-advised, (i.e. courses that have to maintain strict standards “to provide students with content necessary for downstream achievement.) AR 1617027 proposes other solutions that would allow the community colleges to meet accreditation standards without resorting to a blanket policy.</p> <p>The Senator for Math and Sciences noted that in his department there are some courses that never reach a 70% completion rate due to the nature of the content and the purpose of the course. (For example, most students taking Anatomy & Physiology are aiming for a Health Sciences or Nursing program and must have a high mastery of the material, even if that results in a lower completion rate for the course.) Strategies that would be needed for a 70% completion rate, (watering down standards or scaring away students who clearly can’t complete the course), would be unacceptable. The Senator noted that faculty can’t control student readiness or student commitment. In fact, community college open-access policies mean those institutions must take on a greater number of high-risk students.</p> <p>Another Senator observed that another problematic aspect of the UHCCP #4.203 standards is the aspirational values that set expectation for constant growth—an attempt to apply a business model to a higher education environment. In reality, some programs can’t undergo constant growth due to facility limitations, economic limitations, demographic limitations, personnel limitations, etc.</p> <p>Senators discussed the possibility of holding a campus forum to discuss issues raised by AR 1617027 but holding a forum would push any formal response from the Senate to the May 2017 meeting, which would be too late to place the issue on the ACCFSC agenda for discussion before the final BOR meeting in June. The Senate decided instead to send a resolution to the ACCFSC to start a systemwide discussion of the issues. Senators were not comfortable endorsing all of the content in AR 1617027, (such as a section implying poor advising on the part of counselors</p>	<p>S. Inouye will forward a resolution based on Motion #3 to the ACCFSC.</p>

	<p>contributes to low completion rates). In the end, the Senate decided to endorse the first proposed alternate solution, that completion rates for courses be determined independently for each course, rather than setting blanket standards.</p> <p>MOTION #3: Given the impact of factors such as community college open access policy, decreasing enrollment due to economic and demographic factors, and the stringent requirements of some disciplines, the Senate opposes proposed institution-set standards in UHCCP 4.203 and recommends that each course identify its completion rate and identify strategies for improving course completion that do not compromise academic standards. Courses differ drastically in scope and depth, therefore courses should be considered independently.</p>	<p>MOTION #3: M. Sturges (motion) S. Jaworowski (second)</p> <p>14 – Yes 0 – No 0 – Abstain</p>
<p>New Business: 2017 College Assessment Strategic Plan</p>	<p>The College Administration has released its strategic plan for college assessment with a request for feedback. A Senator observed that it is again a top-down policy with little input from regular faculty. Another Senator mentioned having found concerns shared via email by the Math and Science (Math/Sci) Department very compelling. Other Senators asked if they could see the email.</p> <p>The Senator from Math/Sci said that there is a sense in his department that assessment doesn't really assess student learning and that the tools given for assessment don't match the way many faculty assess courses. There has been discussion in the Math/Sci Dept. that SLOs are unrealistic and don't relate to the way students really learn. If a student receives a passing grade but fails to achieve all SLOs for a course, should that student fail the course? He added that the way faculty assess their courses is very personal and mandating that there be one way of assessing courses is not practical. The Senator said that if the College needs the assessment data it is requesting for accreditation, there should be an honest conversation—that this is the way things have to be done for accreditation to be renewed even though it is not actually how you do assessment.</p> <p>One of the SLO Assessment coaches observed that there are a lot of assumptions and misunderstandings about what assessment is. The coach said that, in their experience, there has never been a rule that faculty can only do assessment one way—you assess the course your way and write a report about it.</p> <p>The Math/Sci Senator responded that even that approach is too prescriptive. First, the instruction to assess a course implies faculty haven't been doing it. Then you give them a form to fill out—assuming things about how they do assessment. The Senator said how he would do assessment is get together with OFIE and for three years of students see how many got into their programs, what was their grade and their GPA—information that is a much more relevant assessment of success. Did they transfer to UH? Did they get a job? The Senator said that, to him, is assessment.</p>	<p>S. Inouye will put a placeholder on the CAC agenda for the May 2017 meeting, so she can report the Senate decision to the CAC prior to the CAC vote.</p>

	<p>Another Senator observed that you can't say there is a causal correlation between completing a course and getting a job. The Math/Sci Senator answered that you can't assume there is no correlation either.</p> <p>The SLO Assessment Coach observed that there are fundamental differences between grading and assessment. They added that different departments and courses do similar kinds of things. The idea of assessment is to collect evidence to guide decision-making on how to improve courses—we're all assessing our courses, we just have to explain what we're doing. The coach noted that there has been discussion of getting away from the current framework and doing some experimenting. But the idea of assessment still has in it basic concepts: it's continuous, it involves data, conversations with faculty, and documentation.</p> <p>A second SLO Assessment Coach observed that one of the problems during the last 5-year assessment cycle was the idea that departments had to assess every outcome. But some outcomes are more important than others. Some outcomes change—as they should—in response to assessment results. In some cases, departments never got 5 years of data because the SLOs changed. The coach expressed concern that this problem is being repeated in the new plan. They observed that the Senate SLO Assessment Committee advocated for the idea of putting forward meaningful assessment. The ACCJC accreditation standard says you must assess all courses, not assess all SLOs. The College should look at the problems with the previous data and listen to what the SLO Assessment Committee is saying.</p> <p>The first SLO Assessment Coach noted that while the SLO Assessment Coaches and the SLO Assessment Committee were consulted on the plan, their participation did not mean they endorsed the plan.</p> <p>The Senator from Math/Sci said that his department is asking that the Senate formally reject the assessment plan. The Chair asked that the Math/Sci Dept. submit an action request formally requesting that the Senate reject the plan. The Chair also encouraged everyone to attend the Assessment Plan forums.</p> <p>Timeline: There will be two CAC-sponsored forums on April 19 and April 20 in the Tamarind Room for people to communicate their concerns. The plan will be taken to the 5/2/17 CAC meeting for approval. The Senate can decide whether or not to endorse the plan at its 5/1/17 meeting.</p>	
<p>New Business: Memo-Voting Rights of FS Chair</p>	<p>S. Jaworowski submitted a memo proposing that in the Senate Constitution, Article II.2.C (Quorum and Voting), should be revised to delete the rule, "The Chair shall vote only to break a tie." S. Jaworowski argued that the rule robs the department represented by the Chair of a voice in governance. She cited numerous examples of governing bodies, (e.g. the Hawaii State Legislature</p>	<p>S. Inouye will contact the Election Committee about holding a referendum on the proposed amendment.</p>

	<p>and the Hawaii State Senate), whose rules state that the Chair can vote and noted that in bodies where there are rules about a tie-breaker vote, (like the U.S. Senate), the tie-breaker is never a member of the body.</p> <p>MOTION #4: Motion to amend the Senate Constitution by deleting the language “The Chair shall vote only to break a tie” from Article II.2.C (Quorum and Voting).</p>	<p>MOTION #4: E. Timoteo (motion) J. Vallesteros (second)</p> <p>13 – Yes 0 – No 1 – Abstain</p>
<p>Action Request #1617024 K. Dooley – Request Feedback from Senators on draft DE Plan</p>	<p>The draft campus Distance Education (DE) Plan was distributed to faculty in March. K. Dooley reported that the DE Committee has not gotten much feedback about the plan. He noted that the Chancellor is determined that the DE Plan be authentically a campus document, not the sort of top down planning that faculty often complain about. The goal is to incorporate all feedback and have a final version that will receive campus, (including Senate), approval in May.</p> <p>K. Dooley asked Senators to go back to their departments and dig for feedback. All faculty can comment on the document by going to the online version at https://docs.google.com/a/hawaii.edu/document/d/1omk1m3SBuM1fUofQf9kGMrKRSbDWvkCr7XRg1KeZzwM/edit?usp=sharing</p>	
<p>Action Request #1617028 K. Dooley – Essential Practices for Teaching Online Courses</p>	<p>The DE Committee has developed a document, <i>Essential Practices of Faculty and Lecturers Teaching Fully Online Courses</i>, that provides a checklist of minimum essential elements an online course should have. In future, the Committee would like to develop a list of best practices, but as a starting point, they have developed a list of absolute minimum practices. The checklist is a tool for an instructor or a department to use in evaluating a fully online course, to make sure it meets minimum campus standards. The goal is to have a base level of consistency in all fully online courses. DE Committee asks that the Senate resolve that the <i>Essential Practices</i> checklist be adopted by the Faculty to apply to all courses offered distance mode.</p> <p>Senators discussed why the tendency is to put so many more requirements on teaching online courses as opposed to F2F courses. A number of reasons were cited. Federal regulations are stricter for online courses, where there has been a higher degree of questionable practices. Also, some things, (like faculty-student interactions), happen more easily or naturally in F2F than online, so it can be good to have reminders for online where it is easier to neglect some basic things. One member of the DE Committee observed that stricter regulation of F2F courses is coming. Establishing the minimum checklist for online courses now could give the campus a head start in establishing recommended</p>	

	<p>practices for F2F courses in the future.</p> <p>K. Dooley noted current online classes will be grandfathered in. When they come up for 5-year review, they can be evaluated in terms of the minimum standards. Several Senators questioned this plan, since at present the curriculum review process at Kapi’olani does not consider suitability of delivery method as part of curriculum review.</p> <p>Senators asked for some revisions. In the rationale section for the standard, “Respect diverse talents and learning styles,” they asked that the statement, “Instructors are to help students recognized and employ their optimal learning style,” be deleted or be re-worded to be less prescriptive. In the standard, “Communicate a course pace and pattern of work,” they asked that the statement “For the instructor, it serves to define the boundaries between online class activities and the rest of their life,” be re-worded to more clearly express the idea that this section is about sending a message to the student about what they can expect from their instructor, since an instructor for an online shouldn’t have to be on duty 24 hours, 7 days a week. The DE Committee said it would make the revisions in the document (both in its independent form and in its form as an appendix to the DE Plan).</p> <p>MOTION #5: Motion to approve the document, <i>Essential Practices of Faculty and Lecturers Teaching Fully Online Courses</i>, with requested revisions.</p>	<p>MOTION #5: E. Timoteo (motion) J. Vallesteros (second)</p> <p>12 – Yes 0 – No 1 – Abstain</p>
<p>Committee Updates: Curriculum Committee</p>	<p>M. Dorado reported that the Curriculum Committee met twice since the last Senate General Meeting and had approved 4 proposals. The committee is anticipating another big batch of proposals and wanted to know if the Senate would like to receive the courses separately as they are approved, or receive them all in one batch. The Chair asked that the Curriculum Committee send all proposals in one batch. Deadline for the Curriculum Committee to send proposals to Faculty Senate is April 17, 2017.</p> <p>M. Dorado reported that at the UH Systemwide Quali Curriculum Meetings, they are being told to prepare for KSCM going on hiatus for the summer for system modifications. QualiCo is saying that everything in the curriculum review workflow needs to be withdrawn in order to be unaffected by the system modifications. However, some members of the group with IT experience are saying it would be wise to create backups of all proposals left in the system during the hiatus. There has been no official date given for the start of the hiatus, nor has there been a statement on what changes will be made other than adding in some elements concerning distance education.</p>	

Meeting Adjourned	2:51 PM – Meeting Adjourned	
Minutes Taken by	Michelle Sturges (Secretary)	Next Meeting: Monday, May 1, 2017 <u>Location: Kauila 114</u>

DRAFT

Faculty Senate General Meeting

February 6, 2017

Motion #1

Department	Vote
Art and Humanities	Yes
Business, Legal and Technology	Yes
Continuing Education	Yes
Culinary Arts	Yes
Emergency Medical Services	Yes
Health Sciences	Yes
Honda International Center	Yes
Hospitality	Yes
Kahikoluamea	
LLR and CELTT	Yes
Maida Kamber Center	Yes
Math and Science	Yes
Nursing	
Social Sciences	Yes
Student Services	Yes

Motion #2

Department	Vote
Art and Humanities	Yes
Business, Legal and Technology	Yes
Continuing Education	Yes
Culinary Arts	Yes
Emergency Medical Services	Yes
Health Sciences	Yes
Honda International Center	Yes
Hospitality	Yes
Kahikoluamea	
LLR and CELTT	Yes
Maida Kamber Center	Yes
Math and Science	Yes
Nursing	
Social Sciences	Yes
Student Services	Yes

Motion #3

Department	Vote
Art and Humanities	Yes
Business, Legal and Technology	Yes
Continuing Education	Yes
Culinary Arts	Yes
Emergency Medical Services	Yes
Health Sciences	Yes
Honda International Center	Yes
Hospitality	Yes
Kahikoluamea	
LLR and CELTT	Yes
Maida Kamber Center	Yes
Math and Science	
Nursing	
Social Sciences	Yes
Student Services	Yes

Motion #4

Department	Vote
Art and Humanities	Yes
Business, Legal and Technology	Yes
Continuing Education	Yes
Culinary Arts	Yes
Emergency Medical Services	Yes
Health Sciences	Yes
Honda International Center	Yes
Hospitality	Yes
Kahikoluamea	
LLR and CELTT	Yes
Maida Kamber Center	Yes
Math and Science	
Nursing	
Social Sciences	Yes
Student Services	Yes

Motion #5

Department	Vote
Art and Humanities	Yes
Business, Legal and Technology	Yes
Continuing Education	Yes
Culinary Arts	Yes
Emergency Medical Services	Yes
Health Sciences	Yes
Honda International Center	Yes
Hospitality	Yes
Kahikoluamea	
LLR and CELTT	Yes
Maida Kamber Center	Yes
Math and Science	
Nursing	
Social Sciences	Yes
Student Services	Yes

Motion #6

Department	Vote
Art and Humanities	Yes
Business, Legal and Technology	Yes
Continuing Education	Yes
Culinary Arts	Yes
Emergency Medical Services	Yes
Health Sciences	Yes
Honda International Center	
Hospitality	Yes
Kahikoluamea	
LLR and CELTT	Yes
Maida Kamber Center	Yes
Math and Science	
Nursing	
Social Sciences	Yes
Student Services	Yes

Motion #7

Department	Vote
Art and Humanities	Yes
Business, Legal and Technology	Yes
Continuing Education	Yes
Culinary Arts	Yes
Emergency Medical Services	Yes
Health Sciences	Yes
Honda International Center	
Hospitality	Yes
Kahikoluamea	
LLR and CELTT	Yes
Maida Kamber Center	Yes
Math and Science	
Nursing	
Social Sciences	Yes
Student Services	Yes