

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 2015-16

Date: Friday, September 25, 2015 Time: 12:30 pm Location: 388-103 EH, West Hawaii D-183 ACR	Members Present: Marilyn Bader, Malcolm Chun, Sandra Claveria, Erick Cremer, Kenoa Dela Cruz, Harold Fujii, Grace Funai, Sam Giordanengo, Billie Jones, Lisa Kaluna, Jessica Lerma, Jim Lightner, Chip Michels, Carrie Mospens, Trina Nahm-Mijo, Helen Nishimoto, Joel Peralto, Michelle Phillips, Jill Savage, James Schumaker, Janet Smith, Joel Tanabe, David Tsugawa, Claudia Wilcox-Boucher
Call to Order: 12:31 pm By: Joel Peralto Mins: Carrie B. Mospens	Guests: None

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
1. Ascertain quorum	Meeting called to order by the Chair at 12:31 pm with 13 senators (including 7 Executive Committee members) present.		
2. Approval of September 11, 2015 Minutes	Motion to accept the September 11, 2015 minutes. (Fujii/Wilcox-Boucher) Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.	Motion Carried	
3. Reports from Administration	See attachments 3a, 3a-1, 3b, and 3c		
4. Chair's Report	No report		
5. Standing and ad hoc Committee Reports			
a. Curriculum Committee	No Report		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
b. Faculty Policy Committee c. Educational Policy Committee d. ad hoc Writing Intensive Committee e. ad hoc General Education Committee f. ad hoc Distance Learning Committee	See attachment 5b See attachment 5c No report No report No report		
6. Old Business a. Fast-track Policy Proposal (EPC) 6a b. Administration Eval/Assess Proposal Draft (FPC) 6b, 6b-1 c. HAW 7.505 Class Attendance, etc. Policy 6c, 6d d. HAW 5.701 Application for Graduation Policy 6d, 6d-1	Deferred Deferred Deferred Deferred		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
e. HAW 5.702 Graduation Requirements Policy (EPC) 6e, 6d	Deferred		
f. Awarding of Degrees/Certificates (EPC) 6f	Deferred		
g. Memo from VCAA re: Ecafe Modifications (FPC) 6g rev, 6g-1	Deferred		
h. HAW 5.503 Credit/No Credit Policy 6h	Deferred		
i. HAW 5.208 Residency for Graduation (EPC)	Deferred		
j. HawCC Student Government Issues 6j	<p>-Report received from VCSA Cifra relative to last semester's HawCC Student Government issues. A resolution written by the Executive Committee has also been attached to the agenda for reference. Chair Peralto noted that he is currently attempting to contact Kamaka Gunderson, who was mentioned in the report as a facilitator, to seek her perspective on the matter.</p> <p>-Commented that the report would be more complete if it included a detailed timeline that reflected activities, occurrences, and future action plans (as delineated by bulleted items in the document). Chair Peralto requests that Senator Wilcox-Boucher send him an email request to this effect, to assist with forwarding a recommendation to VCSA Cifra.</p>	<p>Senator Wilcox-Boucher</p>	<p>October 2, 2015</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p>k. Chancellor/Interim Chancellor selection discussion 6k</p>	<p>- Also noted that the VCSA is not named on the document. Chair Peralto asks that Senator Nishimoto to send him an email requesting that the VCSA's name be added to the report.</p> <p>-Mentioned that at present, the VCSA is soliciting student feedback on the proposed 2015 Student Government bylaws and constitution. Email sent to student body this morning.</p> <p>-Chair Peralto reviewed the details of attachment 6k.</p> <p>Motion made to increase the representation of Liberal Arts from 2 members to 4 and to increase the total membership of the CSC [Chancellor Search Committee] to 21. (Nahm-Mijo/Giordanengo)</p> <p>-Discussion ensued as to whether the motion should indicate "3" or "4" representatives. Emphatically stated that it may be difficult to coordinate meetings for 21 participants due to the workloads of all involved and the significant time commitment. The chair added that this request would need to go to VPCC Morton for final approval. Maintained that the way the representation is distributed doesn't make sense, specifically in terms of the limited number of representatives for the Liberal Arts Division, which is comprised of a large number of departments and faculty. Noted that time is of the essence, for after the selection process is completed, the College still needs to have an appointment by the BOR. This leaves very little time considering the new Chancellor is to begin July 2016.</p>	<p>Senator Nishimoto</p> <p>Motion Carried</p>	<p>October 2, 2015</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p>I. DevEd Initiative discussion (Executive Committee)</p>	<p>Additionally, from the Chancellor Search Advisory Committee Coordinator, a sub-committee will also be formed to conduct some of the work. Therefore, asking for 3 or 4 representatives may be moot.</p> <p>-Request to vote by hands. Decided voice vote okay.</p> <p>-Motion carried by voice vote. 15 votes in favor, 3 votes against, and 3 abstentions.</p> <p>-A special Senate meeting is proposed for October 30, 2015 to discuss the Developmental Education Initiative. Chair Peralto expressed the need to address this issue as soon as possible since the initiative has been mandated to begin in fall 2016.</p> <p>-Some discussion ensued as to whether or not to create an ad-hoc committee to compile concerns regarding the process of this initiative (as opposed to the implementation) or to possibly send this issue to a standing committee.</p> <p>-Prompted by senators who wanted to know more about the rationale behind the initiative, it was explained that at issue is the fact that our current developmental education programs have not been successful. Therefore, following other national models that indicate positive results in developmental education, VP Morton desires the UH community college system to align and implement new curriculum models that have proven successful at other community colleges in the</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>nation thinking that some students will benefit from a redesign. However, a concern remains about those students who will not benefit from the accelerated/co-requisite models.</p> <p>-It was further clarified that at this point, there is not going to be a system wide model or a single model for all developmental education students. Each community college is addressing the initiative uniquely based on individual campus needs. For example, at HawCC, students will still have the opportunity to take individual courses rather than accelerated courses. Additionally, it was explained that both the accelerated learning program (ALP) model and co-requisite models are actually co-requisite models and that they don't actually accelerate the process. Whether students take ALP courses or two developmental education courses at the same time (co-req model), the number of credits and contact hours remains the same. Therefore, students in theory will become college ready in fewer semesters but not in less time.</p> <p>-Noted that there are two underlying concerns regarding this initiative: 1) the faculty should be the ones in charge of curricular decisions and 2) the validity of the proposal is suspect. For example, most of the studies are based on students that are nearly college ready already, unlike our students. And the data is based on statistics and description analysis that allow for correlations to be made but not causation. What are HawCC's specific statistics?</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>-Question posed: What is ALP? It stands for Accelerated Learning Program. http://alp-deved.org/what-is-alp-exactly/</p> <p>-Mentioned that “wrap around” support is also critical to the success of this initiative and refers to significant additional student support in areas of tutoring, case management, peer mentoring, supplemental instruction, extended hours for resource facilities, etc. However, it is also expensive. Can the College afford it? At present, some HawCC programs already provide such services through Title III grants. Per VP Morton, there is money to fund these needs. However, the College needs to identify the needs and request asks.</p> <p>-Mentioned that a community group is also addressing the issue of how to increase student success to meet local work force demands. It might be helpful to collaborate.</p> <p>Motion to propose a special senate meeting to discuss the DevEd initiative on Friday October 30, 2015 from 10:00am – 12 noon pending confirmation of availability. (Lerma/Nahm-Mijo)</p> <p>-Commented that the time of the HawCC Halloween party conflicts with the special Senate meeting. Determined that the proposed time stands.</p> <p>-Questions posed: Are we inviting stakeholders? Per Chair</p>	<p>Motion Carried</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>Peralto, this is only a Senate meeting. Moreover, it was emphasized that one of the arguments that we are making as an Academic Senate is that curriculum matters are the purview of the faculty, so we should keep the discussion to faculty.</p> <p>-Noted that student input would be important at some point.</p> <p>-Motion carried by voice vote. 23 votes in favor, one abstention.</p>		
<p>7. New Business</p> <p>a. Curriculum Proposals</p> <p>b. Proposed changes to TE reallocation for Chair/VC (Executive Committee) 7b</p>	<p>None</p> <p>-Chair Peralto introduced the following motion as brought forth by the Executive Committee:</p> <p>Motion to request discretion in reallocating teaching equivalencies (TE) for senate chair position. Motion made to approve the reallocation of teaching equivalencies between the senate chair and the senate vice chair, AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIR, and working in collaboration with the vice chair; the reallocation of teaching equivalencies will be for at least three teaching equivalencies (TE) and not more than six teaching equivalencies (TE) per academic year for this senate purpose.</p> <p>-Concern that given the list of duties justifying this request, the</p>	<p>Motion amended</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>number of hours do not equate to TE. Additionally, the description is not well defined. Question posed: Does the vice chair have the freedom to say no and can he/she only follow the charter? Chair Peralto replied yes and other senators expressed support for the motion because it stipulates a mutual agreement between chair and vice chair.</p> <p>-Point raised that tenure status could complicate a “mutual” agreement.</p> <p>-Suggestion that motion should include a time frame (ie., “for the xx-xx AY”).</p> <p>-Noted that under the circumstances, the chair would be redistributing TE to the vice chair so duties would need to be clearly defined. Moreover, the Vice chair could not use duties as service to the school.</p> <p>Motion to amend motion on the floor to include a time frame for this academic year. (Fujii/Wilcox-Boucher) Amendment carried.</p> <p>-New motion reads:</p> <p>Motion to request discretion in reallocating teaching equivalencies (TE) for senate chair position. Motion made to approve the reallocation of teaching equivalencies between the senate chair and the senate vice chair, AT THE DISCRETION</p>	<p>Amendment Carried</p> <p>Motion Carried</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>OF THE CHAIR, and working in collaboration with the vice chair; the reallocation of teaching equivalencies will be for at least three teaching equivalencies (TE) and not more than six teaching equivalencies (TE) for the 2015-2016 academic year for this senate purpose.</p> <p>-Chair Peralto explained the rationale for this motion stating that the duties of the Senate Chair are overwhelming and many time conflicts arise out of the number of meetings the Senate Chair is required to attend.</p> <p>-Queried: Is it essential that the Senate Chair attend all of the scheduled meetings? Chair Peralto replied, “good point.”</p> <p>-Emphatically noted that the reallocation of duties needs to be very clearly defined and consistent. Chair Peralto replied, “that is the intention.”</p> <p>-Noted that this model could encourage more participation from faculty to come forward as Senate leaders. Currently it is difficult to get participation because the workload of the Senate leadership is substantial.</p> <p>-Request for ballot vote. (K. Dela Cruz/Savage)</p> <p>-Motion carried unanimously by ballot vote.</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
c. Proposed changes for additional TE for secretary (Executive Committee) 7c	<p>-Chair Peralto introduced the following motion as brought forth by the Executive Committee:</p> <p>Motion to request teaching equivalencies (TE) for senate secretary position. Motion to approve at least three teaching equivalencies (TE) and not more than six teaching equivalencies (TE) per academic year for this senate responsibility.</p> <p>-Noted that 1) the motion would require a charter amendment (which requires 20 signatures); 2) the motion notes secretary duties that are not indicated in the Senate charter; and 3) the motion would change the role of secretary to a primary duty versus service to the school.</p> <p>-Mentioned that more clarity is needed in terms of what constitutes Teaching Equivalencies (TE).</p> <p>-Request made that Chair Peralto project the duties of the secretary as stated in the Charter on the ELMO. Chair Peralto proceeded to read the secretary duties and noted that the charter does not include the detail currently involved in the process of documenting Academic Senate proceedings (i.e., converting/uploading documents to the Senate blog).</p> <p>Motion to send the motion back to the Executive Committee to follow correct procedure within the charter and present back to the Academic Senate with charter signatures.</p>	<p>Motion Withdrawn</p> <p>Motion Carried</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p>d. Proposed changes for lump-sum allocation of TE for senate duties (Executive Committee) 7d</p>	<p>(Fujii/Smith)</p> <p>-Concern mentioned that the administration may not support the TE for the secretary. Chair Peralto clarified that the senate is only changing the secretary duties in the charter at this juncture.</p> <p>-Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.</p> <p>-Chair Peralto introduced the following motion as brought forth by the Executive Committee:</p> <p>Motion to request a lump-sum allocation of teaching equivalencies (TE) to the senate executive committee for senate duties and responsibilities. Motion to approve in concept, and upon approval from the senate, to work with administration on the details of the allocation process (for TEs among senate personnel); the total allocation of teaching equivalencies provided to the senate for this purpose will be for at least thirty (30) teaching equivalencies (TE) and not more than forty (40) teaching equivalencies (TE) per academic year for the senate purpose.</p> <p>-Concerns noted: 1) the motion is ill defined relative to how TE will be distributed and 2) the list of duties is not in accordance with the charter.</p> <p>-Question posed: Does the charter need to be changed? Chair</p>	<p>Motion Defeated</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p>e. Motion to proceed with Admin eval/survey (FPC) 7h, 7h-</p>	<p>Peralto replied that the executive committee is asking for the concept to be approved. The next step would be for the Academic Senate to ask administration if they would be open to the idea. If the answer is affirmative, then the Academic Senate would need to change the charter. The bullet points were not intended to be set in stone, but are used to justify the motion. However, it is conceded that the duties should be reflected as currently documented in the charter.</p> <p>-Commented that the issue of TE brings up the question of how admin even determines assigned time and who gets what. Where is it written? Stated that the VCAA decides and probably uses other campus procedures and the union contract to make determinations. (Noted that UHPA conducted meetings with VCAs to come up with a definition of TE.)</p> <p>-Other questions regarding the motion include: 1) What's the distinction between service to the college and compensation? 2) How transparent would this process be? Who makes the allocation decisions? 3) Would allocations be fair and equitable? Is this a matter for HR?</p> <p>-Request for ballot vote (Savage/Giordanengo)</p> <p>-Motion defeated. 4 votes in favor, 6 votes against, and 3 abstentions.</p> <p>-Follow up report given by Faculty Policy Committee Co-Chair Cremer regarding the implementation of the Admin</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
1	<p>eval/survey.</p> <p>-Confirmed by Peter Kay (UHPA Chief Technology Officer) that Survey Monkey is indeed confidential.</p> <p>-Our Institutional Analyst has notified the Chancellor that he will not administer the Admin survey and did not address the confidentiality question posed by the Faculty Policy Committee.</p> <p>- Question posed: Will UHPA be administering an admin eval? Yes. It will be out within a week.</p> <p>-Question posed: Will we be getting results or will they share the results anonymously with admin? Results will be available on the UHPA website and shared with administrators.</p> <p>-Concern expressed that the two surveys might be redundant; however, it was clarified that the formats are very distinct with the HawCC survey only containing two open-ended questions.</p> <p>-Question posed: The UHPA version will have no comment section? Correct.</p> <p>-Question posed: How will the FPC be ensuring anonymity in terms of the results? The results will be categorized into themes similar to how the Bullying Survey results were compiled. And admin will have an opportunity to respond. To ensure anonymity, FPC members will sign a confidentiality</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>agreement similar to what is signed by those serving on hiring committees.</p> <p>-Suggested that the results be posted on the Academic Senate blog site (requires UH logon).</p> <p>-Commented that the results of the survey could possibly be used as public meeting interview questions for potential chancellor candidates.</p> <p>-Suggestion made to also let staff make comments about admin strengths and weaknesses. Chair Peralto recommended that the FPC consider this suggestion. However, it was noted that the Academic Senate has no jurisdiction over the staff.</p> <p>Motion to move forward with the HawCC admin eval/survey (Fujii/Wilcox-Boucher)</p> <p>-Concerns that the results will be copious and time consuming to compile.</p> <p>-Suggested that faculty complete the survey on a personal computer rather than a college computer. This will be emphasized on the survey as well as the fact that Survey Monkey is confidential.</p> <p>-Motion carried by voice vote. 17 votes in favor, one abstention.</p>	<p>Motion Carried</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
8. For the Good of the Order	-3 rd annual honey festival tomorrow at Nani Mau Gardens.		
9. Adjourn	<p>Motion to adjourn. (Fujii/K. Dela Cruz)</p> <p>-Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.</p> <p>-Meeting adjourned at 2:45pm by Chair Joel Peralto</p> <p>-Next meeting Friday, October 23, 2015 12:30-2:30 pm, Bldg. 388, Room 103 and Polycom to West HI D-183, ACR</p>	Motion Carried	