Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 2014-15

Date : Friday, 03/20/2015	Members Present: Marilyn Bader, Annie Brown, Gayle Cho, Malcolm Chun, Toni Cravens, Erick
Time: 12:00pm	Cremer, Sharon Dansereau, Kenoa Dela Cruz, Renee Dela Cruz, Harold Fujii, Garrett Fujioka,
Location: 388-103 EH, West	Chris Jacobson, Gabe James, Robyn Kalauli, Colby Koreyasu, Larissa Leslie, Jim Lightner, Pua
Hawaii B3, ACR	Lincoln Maielua, Darrell Miyashiro, Donna Moore, Carrie Mospens, Caroline Naguwa, Helen
	Nishimoto, Joel Peralto (Chair) Michelle Phillips, Noelie Rodriguez, Jeanne Ryan, Deseree
	Salvador, Jill Savage, James Schumaker, Kenneth Shimizu, Janet Smith, Wane Sugikawa, Joel
	Tanabe, David Tsugawa, Claudia Wilcox-Boucher, NoeNoe Wong-Wilson, Bobby Yamane
Call to Order: 12:03 pm	Guests: None
By: Joel Peralto	
Mins: Carrie B. Mospens	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION /	TARGET
		PERSON	DATE
		RESPONSIBLE	
1. Ascertain quorum	Meeting called to order by the Chair at 12:03 pm with 23 senators		
	(including 4 Executive Committee members) present.		
2. Approval of February 27, 2015	Motion to accept the February 27, 2015 minutes. (Fujii/Wilcox-	Motion	
Minutes	Boucher)	Carried	
	Motion carried unanimously by voice vote		
	Discussion: Noted by Chair Peralto that pages 3 and 4 have		
	additional comments pertaining to the proceedings of the		
	February 27, 2015 meeting.		
3. Report from Administration	Attachment 3		
4. Chair's Report	No report		
5. Standing and ad hoc			

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
Committee Reports a. Curriculum Committee	No Report		
b. Faculty Policy Committee	No Report		
c. Educational Policy Committee	No report		
d. ad hoc Writing Intensive Committee	No report		
e. ad hoc General Education Committee 5e (rev)	See attachment 5e (rev)		
f. ad hoc Distance Learning Committee	No report		
g. ad hoc Curriculum Central Committee	No Report		
6. Old Business			
b. Administration Eval/Assess Proposal Draft (FPC) 6b	Administration Assessment Survey presented to the Senate assembly. Document reviewed and explained that survey responses will be anonymous and collected via Survey Monkey. Question posed: How were the job descriptions obtained and were the descriptions vetted by the administration? The descriptions were obtained from public sources (i.e.: West Hawai'i Today)		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
d. HAW 5.701 Application for Graduation Policy (EPC) 6d-for deletion	Question posed: Can Mari Chang provide the descriptions? To obtain descriptions from Human Resources a release form would need to be completed. Can the Senate write a request to the Admin Team? Motion that the Academic Senate request that Chancellor Yamane provide job descriptions of the members of the leadership team to include: Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Dean of Career and Technical Education, Dean of Liberal Arts and Public Services, Director of Continuing Education and Training, Director of University Hawai'i Center at West Hawai'i, and Equal Employment Opportunity (Affirmative Action) Coordinator within 14 days of receipt of the request. (Brown/ Wilcox-Boucher) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote. EPC Chair James explained that per VCAA Onishi and Registrar Manuel-Cortez, HAW 5.701, as it is formatted as an online document, is no longer practiced. That which is practiced, is stated in the college catalog. Therefore, the EPC recommends deleting HAW 5.701 and formatting HAW 5.702 as policy. EPC to follow up with VCAA to determine who will be responsible for formatting (i.e.: structuring and wording the policy). Motion to delete HAW 5.701 which is obsolete. (Recommendation from EPC) Point of clarification: Did we (EPC) agree to do this for the fall? A time frame was not decided. Question posed: Will EPC update 5.701 or fold graduation requirements into HAW 5.702?	Motion Withdrawn	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
g. Memo from VCAA re: eCafe	Motion to modify the policy (HAW 5.701) to reflect current practices. (Nishimoto/Ryan) Point of clarification: isn't there already a motion on the floor? Motion withdrawn. Noted that the college needs to create a new policy to align with the UH System. Question posed: Can the EPC find the System policy and create one which aligns? Point of information: UHCCP 5.205 Notation of Academic Credentials is the corresponding System policy. Second motion withdrawn. Motion to send HAW 5.701 back to EPC for review and that prior to deletion, current graduation requirements and practices are set in policy. (Ryan/Nishimoto) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote. The FPC provided an explanation of the VCAA's request for the	Motion Withdrawn	
modifications (FPC) 6g (rev) i. Memo from E. Kalani Flores re: eCafe question 6g-i	addition of an eCafe question to address ACCJC requirements in Standard III. A. 1.C (p. 19). The FPC believes that a question soliciting student assessment of whether the student learning outcomes (SLOs) have been met by respective courses should not be added to eCafe. The committee maintains that other current practices assess how the SLOs have been met (i.e.: Tenure and Promotion Review Committees, Faculty Five-Year Review, Evaluation of Lecturers). Question posed: Is it possible that Faculty could pose their own rendition of the questions voluntarily? No, eCafe does not allow the formulation of questions. Questions come from an existing pool.		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	Noted that ACCJC specified college level action (tenure process = system). Suggestion made that our APO, Kalani Flores, ask ACCJC 1) whether the recommendation indeed requires college level and system level measurements of the student attainment of outcomes, and 2) whether they are flexible regarding indirect vs direct measures - or do they want to see direct. FPC to bring the aforementioned questions to ALO (K. Flores). Suggestion made that the FPC not ask the aforementioned questions of ACCJC so that the college has more flexibility.		
	Noted that the bottom line is that students don't understand the question as Faculty and Administration do and that it will not necessarily provide meaningful data.		
	Question posed: In regards to the ACCJC requirement: What is "effectiveness in producing learning outcomes"? Could we consider tasking Faculty with a more comprehensive student survey as proposed in attachment 6g-i? Noted that these self-studies are important but that this question is ineffectual. Also noted that Faculty should already be explaining in their documents how they know their students are learning.		
	Motion to have the Faculty Policy Committee explore other options to eCafe. (Fujii/Wilcox-Boucher) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote. (Post discussion it was mentioned that while eCafe generally has poor student participation, paper and pencil versions of the past had much higher completion rates.)	Motion Carried	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
h. HAW 5.503 Credit/No credit policy (EPC) 6h	The EPC recommends deleting the following statements from the HAW 5.503 policy that would allow CR designated grades to satisfy graduation requirements:		
	-"4. Liberal Arts (AA Degree) majors may utilize the CR/NC option to satisfy area and elective requirements." (Page 30)		
	-"4. CR/NC option may be used to satisfy area and genera)" (Page 58)		
	Motion to eliminate "4. Liberal Arts (AA Degree) majors may utilize the CR/NC option to satisfy area and elective requirements." (Page 30) and "4. CR/NC option may be sued to satisfy area and genera)" (Page 58) from the college catalog. (Recommendation from EPC) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.	Motion Carried	
7. New Business	Motion to move new business to the top of the order. (Fujii/Cremer)	Motion Carried	
a. Curriculum Proposals 7a	Motion to accept new course proposal for ENG 106 Technical English for CTE Students. (Salvador/Fujii) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.	Motion Carried	
	Motion to accept program modifications for HwSt 260 to 1) change course title, 2) change description 3) replace prerequisites and 4) add HwSt 260 to program requirements to replace HwSt 240 and HwSt 250. (Salvador/Fujii) Motion carried by voice vote. Two abstentions	Motion Carried	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	Motion to accept program modifications for HwSt 261 to 1) change course title, 2) change description 3) replace prerequisites and 4) add HwSt 261 to program requirements to replace HwSt 241 and HwSt 251. (Salvador/Fujii) Motion carried by voice vote. Two abstentions	Motion Carried	
	Motion to accept program modifications to delete Math 50 and English 21 requirements from the Diesel Mechanics Certificate of Achievement. (Salvador/Fujii) Motion carried by voice vote. One abstention	Motion Carried	
	Motion to accept program modifications to delete English and Math requirements from the Carpentry Certificate of Achievement. (Salvador/Fujii) Motion carried by voice vote. Two abstentions	Motion Carried	
	Motion to combine course modification proposals for CARP 22, 41, and 42. (Salvador/Tanabe) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.	Motion Carried	
	Motion to accept course modification for CARP 22, 41, and 42 to add "C grade or higher" in CARP 20A and Carp 21A; CARP 22 and CARP 41; respectively. (Salvador/Fujii) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote. Noted that this is a formality to add requirements to the college catalog, for it was discovered that these requirements had been removed at some point. Similar modifications are forthcoming.	Motion Carried	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
 b. GE Designation for AAS Degree Proposal – Bobby Yamane 7b i. Motion to Affirm – GEC 7b-i 	Handout provided at Senate meeting – "GE Designation for AAS Degree Proposal". Senator Yamane states that the results of the general education (GE) designation process have had a negative effect on AAS degree seeking students and maintains that there is a need to create a new method of meeting the GE requirements, ensuring that they are meaningful and applicable to the needs of the community's industries.		
	Motion to allow CTE programs to include GE designated courses applicable to the AAS degree only. The GEC will be charged with establishing the AAS degree GE process in consultation with the AAS degree program representatives and come up with a recommendation at the April Senate meeting. (Yamane/Fujii) 30 votes in favor, 4 votes against, 0 abstentions (secret ballot).	Motion Carried	
	Motion for secret ballot (Nishimoto/Savage) Point of clarification: this vote is on the motion only, not the proposal. Discussion ensued. Clarification requested as to what the problem is: Many students have completed program requirements but they are getting stuck at the Math and English requirements resulting in many incomplete degrees and certificates. A different process is wanted because the current process is not applicable to the needs of the industry and accreditation. These bodies do not require the requirements of the AAS. Also, the needed skills are embedded in the programs. Plus students have to take additional credits for		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	skills that are already being addressed in the program.		
	Question posed: Are there other campuses that have embraced thi similar philosophy? Other campuses do not have this problem. In California, for transfer they have different courses and criteria to transfer depending on the major. Point of clarification: The motion is to turn this over to the GEC to come up with an alternate way to determine courses? What is the purpose of the motion? To agree and establish a process that applies only to the AAS degree. And GEC can address the process of determining how courses meet the benchmarks.		
	Question posed: Are the prerequisites the same as 100? No.		
	Question posed: What prevents the program from doing this now? Now all courses approved by GEC have to apply to all degrees. Clarified that since GEC is a college wide committee, it is simply evaluating courses in terms of appropriateness to meeting GE requirements, and making recommendations. Question posed: What about other programs? Are they banned from GE designation? They all have to go through the current GEC process to meet benchmarks. Noted that it would be helpful to have the GEC work with the AAS stakeholders and other constituencies to determine implications of creating a separate GE process for the AAS degree. Explained that there is a sense of urgency for students who are "stuck" at the Math and English requirements. Point of		
	clarification: So you want the Ad Hoc GEC to review the proposal and determine a process and come back to the Senate? I want		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	approval of this AAS degree.	REST STUSIBLE	
	approximate angles		
	Friendly amendment offered: Motion to "review the proposal to"	Amendment	
	allow CTE programs to include GE designated courses applicable	Defeated	
	to the AAS degree only. (Ryan/Savage) 13 votes in favor, 21		
	against, and 1 abstention (secret ballot).		
	Motion for secret ballot. (Ryan/Savage)	Motion	
		Carried	
	In discussing the friendly amendment, the proposer stipulated that		
	he does not want the proposal to go to the GEC. He wants a vote of		
	confidence from the Academic Senate.		
	Question posed: What exactly would we be approving? To give CTI		
	the option of determining its own GE designated courses. CTE can		
	currently choose from the GE pool, but CTE wants another pool jus		
	for the AAS degree. The current criteria do not make exceptions		
	based on type of degree (i.e.: AAS vs. AA/AS).		
	Noted that the CEC made an internal motion requesting that the		
	Noted that the GEC made an internal motion requesting that the CTE GE proposal be routed through the GEC prior to senate action.		
	Point of clarification: Are we adding a third option? No. Reiterated		
	that the GEC makes recommendations about which GE courses fit.		
	that the GEC makes recommendations about which GE courses III.		
	In response to remaining confusion regarding the meaning of the		
	motion's first sentence, the proposer stated that the proposal is to		
	allow the AAS or programs to have a second list of GE courses that		
	are more applicable to AAS degree students. In example, ENG 106		
	may not be applicable as GE for the AA, but it could be applied to		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	the AAS. Similarly, Math 100 could be AA, whereas the AAS would allow an applied math option. The GEC will work with the AAS degree programs to come up with a process to address this path.		
c. Course Outline (Listing) Proposal – Deserce Salvador 7c	Withdrawn 3/19/15		
d. UHPA Update – David Tsugawa 7d	As our UHPA representative, Senator Tsugawa reported that UHPA has a new Executive Director: Kristeen Hanselman. Senator Tsugawa also urged fellow senators to be aware of the "Right to work" law. His report outlines the arguments for and against it. Also noted were open enrollment for the Island Flex Spending Program and JN Musto's retirement.		
8. For the Good of the Order	Please save the date for Earth Day on Friday, April 17, 2015 from 9am – 1pm at the UH Hilo campus. Volunteers get a T-shirt! Have a great spring break!		
9. Adjourn	Motion to adjourn. (Ryan/Wilcox-Boucher) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm by Chair Joel Peralto Next meeting Friday, April 24, 2015 12:00 – 2:00 pm, Bldg. 388, Room 103 and Polycom to West HI B3, ACR	Motion Carried	