All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC)
October 21, 2016
9:00 - 11:00 am
Information Technology Center Room 105A
MINUTES

1. Call to Order at 9:03am
2. Approval of minutes from September 23, 2016 meeting

Minutes approved by majority show of hands

3. Reports
   a. Board of Regents Meeting - report by Susan Inouye/Marguerite Butler

Continued new tradition of hearing from Faculty Senate chairs. Susan given a last minute notice. Written testimony in support of UH Hilo Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. However, Student Government at UH Hilo was not given a voice in selecting the new Chancellor. UH Manoa has 32% graduation rate in 4 years. Was 17% about five years ago. Want to work on UH Innovation Initiative. UH Manoa Chancellor candidates will have public visits in November. See slides on BoR website. Concerns at ACCFSC that business people are deciding policy for UH System. Promoting transparency at UH. Lassner supporting fundraising for UH Innovation Initiative.

Role of host campus: Week before meeting emailed Chancellor about what to say. Chancellor had not hear about it. **Presented a Student Success Pathway. Characterising how programs are supporting students through their time at college. For example, counseling, keeping students on track, and job placement. Use it as an opportunity to hear something really great about our campus.**

How long given? Two minutes for Faculty Senate chair. In general, BOR does not like hearing generalities. Had to finalize the power points to give to BOR. Cannot do last minute improvements to the slides.

Business person giving the BOR guidance: Rickard Wacker. His slides are on the BOR webpage.

b. Community Colleges Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (CCCFSC)
c. Community College Updates
d. 4-Year Campus Updates
3. Unfinished Business
   . Discuss Best Practices for Strategic Planning (draft resolution to send out to campuses for comment or endorsement)
   a. Campus-Level representation on the BOR
      i. SEC Resolution calling for a revised committee structure for BOR

Split into two subcommittees for 4-year campuses and community colleges. Share it with each campus. UH Manoa is working on a resolution.

      ii. LCC Motion concerning faculty representation on BOR
   b. Voting/Discussion on Revised the Charter and Bylaws
   c. ACCFSC budget
      ii. New requests
      iii. Susan and Will cannot attend neighbor island BOR meetings this year. Other ACCFSC members willing to attend? Susan will attend KapCC on Oct. 20.
3. Standing Committees
   . Academic Affairs
   a. System Budget
4. New Business
   . Presentation by and questions for Hae Okimoto, Chair of the Course Evaluation Committee (9:30am-10am)

Background of new Course Evaluation System. For accreditation, program review, we need to have evaluations of all classes. Hae Okimoto is the Director of Academic Technologies, work for ITS. Committee had 50% faculty and 50% administrators and a student representative from Leeward CC.

Why was previous system inefficient? In some cases, the accreditation team wanted the evals of all the courses. In some departments, all courses were required to be evaluated. But eCAFE is optional. To share with division/department chair, the faculty had to press button to send. From students, they wanted the evaluation to be seen by someone other than the faculty. Although many faculty publish their courses, not all.

Any technical reasons why we need to switch? Need to configure to automatically send evaluations to division/department chair. Underlying code is just a modification of eCAFE. Had to merge all the courses from banner and peoplesoft (software?). At UHWO, cannot opt-out of the evaluation for eCAFE.

Why replace eCAFE? Mostly to have the results change, so that they are automatically pushed to division/department chair. And so that all faculty and all classes will be evaluated.

One department, still uses paper. Thought eCAFE was too inflexible. Sharing on web? Sharing within department? Can be shared in the department.

The aggregate information can be shared, depending on policies of that campus. For example, if everyone had same question across campus, then can share that.

One department has been tracking changes over many years. If questions change, then lose this ability. Possible to keep same questions. Some questions are campus-wide and determined by the campus.

Problem with fatigue with too many questions. Electronically, completion rate can be very low. New structure is mobile friendly.

Concerns with faculty representation. Concerns with "one size fits all". Faculty way of teaching not one of a kind. Any per campus representation cannot take into account variation.

Faculty have no issue with data within department. For aggregate data, how does this factor into tenure and promotion? This could be counter productive. Could fracture the campus mission that we are trying to strive for.

Answer: In terms of how long (how many questions), committee was not looking at questions. Instead, at the structure of the evaluation system.

Should there be UH System questions? No.

Should there be campus questions? Are there questions at faculty level? Campus can choose. Campus questions - you can have or not. Campus can decide on the hierarchy. Then, either school or department or division. Then, at faculty level. Can do personalized questions per course. Nothing that says what kinds of questions and where. The structure is there and the campus can decide. Need to have discussions on campus and see what campus wants.

Concerns with response rate. One faculty had low response rate, so negative response from admin. When had eCAFE, response rate was low. Cannot mandate. Not optional. One thing trying to do is to make it mobile friendly. Maybe this will help the response rate. On the flip side, response rate can vary on eCAFE. 97% to 17%. If students felt it had an impact, then they filled it out.

According to UHPA, the evaluations belong to the faculty. It is not supposed to be used against the faculty. Some concerns about students who have bad grades and trying to get back at the professor. We can make our own questions, but where do the questions go? Answer: Hopefully, will have these conversations on the campuses. Results can be submitted as part of tenure and promotion.

Proposal still to have open-ended responses? Concern that could be derogatory. Are they automatically sent to division? Can check into this.

At UHWO, chair does not want to be responsible.

Response rate concerns. Can get some crazy comments. Can be dismissed. Need to find a new input route. Way of doing it in classroom at a set time and see if response rates are higher.

Practical for all campuses to see to what extent these are in the hands of faculty. Demand full customization power. Each campus has its own. Including what to do with data. Can customize completely? Yes and no. Yes - a level of customization. No - negotiation. Do we want to make sure that all writing intensive courses have these one or two questions. Automatically populate in. Not sure. Can make it so at division level.

Purpose is to get feedback to instructor so can improve course. Instead, we want course assessment and course analysis. Goal should be for education.

Discussion increasing response rate. Financial incentive? Students GSO talked with bookstore, if fill out survey, give out two iPads? Bookstore was willing to incentive. Has to be anonymous. Cannot evaluate 3 or fewer students. Maybe can put all student names into a folder and pick at random for a prize.

UH Manoa Senate voted against this. Purpose of instrument is unclear. If feedback for course for teaching, then this is very valuable. But different than assessing learning. Which is different than assessing course effectiveness. And different than program effectiveness. Who has ownership of the data? In real life, some faculty are getting hurt by this. Lot of bias built in. lower evaluations for women, minorities, non-native speakers. Admin is moving forward without approval of faculty. Could be show-down. Answer: Cannot answer. Should ask Risa and David.

Leeward CC's concerns.
Questions for Hae Okimoto, Chair of the Course Evaluation Committee
1. The following Faculty Senate concerns with the CES are to be shared at the next ACCFSC meeting:
a) Use of new course evaluations for job performance rather than self-improvement purposes
b) Subjectivity of the sample questions
c) Publication and use of the evaluation data
d) As proposed, the new evaluation system is a contract issue which is under UHPA purview. Faculty Senate should not discuss further until UHPA responds.

Answer:
Was not a concern from the UHPA. They were asked.

Do we want to craft a resolution? No. Take back information to each campus. KapCC - opposes. Have made some resolutions in the past. Can be powerful.

Maybe have the committees at each campus come together? No.

Would like to get UH Manoa resolution. Will upload to shared folder.

Give suggestions

      b. Update on campus strategies for customizing UH CES
      c. KapCC's Senate will take up the issue of **Curriculum Alignment** (see VCAA TE Memo and TE Notes and To-do's)

Not many campuses have heard of this document. The timeline is too short. Change to December 2018. Concerns that admin is aligning courses, without faculty involvement. Faculty is in charge of the curriculum, not admin. Curriculum takes time. Ask Faculty Senates to request a deadline change to December 2018. Can take the non-instructional day as a chance to align the courses.

      d. Finish by 10:30 to have break out for 4-years
   5. Adjournment

Notes:
1. William: make a google folder for ACCFSC - everyone put in documents
2. Send out a link to everyone for Best Practices...