

## Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 2016-2017

<p><b>Date:</b> November 18, 2016  <b>Time:</b> 2:00pm  <b>Location:</b> 388-103 (Manono),  D-183 ACR (West Hawaii)</p>	<p><b>Members Present:</b> <b>Annie Brown</b>, Gordon Ching, Sandra Claveria, Rick Cowan, Erick Cremer, Karen Crowell, Sharon Dansereau, Tanya Dean, Kate DeSoto, Harold Fujii, Grace Funai, <b>Sam Giordanengo</b>, Meidor Hu, Colby Koreyasu, Larissa Leslie, Chip Michels, Luzviminda Miguel, <b>Darrell Miyashiro</b>, <b>Carrie Mospens</b>, Trina Nahm-Mijo, Kelly O’Leary, <b>Michelle Phillips</b>, Deseree Salvador, Jill Savage, David Tsugawa, Leanne Urasaki, Brenda Watanabe, <b>Claudia Wilcox-Boucher</b>, Bobby Yamane</p>
<p><b>Call to Order:</b> 2:04pm  <b>By:</b> Sam Giordanengo  <b>Mins:</b> Michelle Phillips</p>	<p><b>Guests:</b> None.</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
1. Ascertain quorum	Meeting called to order by Chair Giordanengo at 2:04p with 14 senators (including 3 Executive Committee members) present.		
2. Approval of October 28, 2016 Meeting Minutes <b>Attachment 1</b>	<p><b>Motion to accept the October 28, 2016 minutes. (Fujii/Claveria)</b></p> <p>Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.</p>	<b>Motion Carried</b>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
3. Chair's Report	<p>The Chair reported that the person in charge of the new Course Evaluation System (CES) Committee for the UH System can only answer technical questions but can't discuss how the policy will affect different parties. She will be coming to campus in the future to answer questions, and faculty will be notified when. It looks as though CES is coming, but Senate has until August to let our Administration know how we would like it to be used on our campus. Senate could potentially approve a set of questions to be discussed, including but not limited to: How would we like to use the survey on our Campus? Will this be used to assess student learning?</p> <p>Interested parties can read minutes from a recent CES meeting (see Attachment 3 under FPC committee). In general, Academic Senate Chairs would like to get more information, and are considering getting resolutions from each of the 10 campuses, compiling them, then presenting to the Board of Regents (BOR).</p> <p>Academic Senate Chairs are allowed to go to BOR meetings, but are asking for transparency, and would like to have a meeting with BOR specifically regarding this issue. BOR is also currently working on TEs for labs and lectures, but no formal decision has been made.</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
5. Standing and ad hoc Committee Reports  a. Curriculum Review Committee  b. Educational Policy Committee <b>Attachment 2</b>  b. Faculty Policy Committee (FPC) <b>Attachment 3</b>  d. ad hoc Writing Intensive Committee  e. ad hoc General Education Committee  f. ad hoc Distance Learning Committee  g. ad hoc Sustainability Committee	<p>None.</p> <p>See attachment. The Fast Track policy will be presented at the December meeting.</p> <p>See attachment. It was asked that the Chair find out who was on the UHH representative for the UHCC meeting. <i>For discussion, see Chair's report above.</i></p> <p>No report.</p> <p>No report.</p> <p>No report.</p> <p>No report.</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
h. ad hoc Academic Senate Charter	<p>Chair Giordanengo reported that the goal of the committee is to have a final draft of the new Academic Senate Charter to DCs by early January, so that by the February Senate meeting it could be presented to Senate as a formal agenda item.</p> <p><i>Question:</i> Would it be better to use the Executive Committee to vet the charter as opposed to DC's? The document will go to the Executive Committee on their December 2 meeting, and the draft will then be shared with departments via the DCs.</p> <p><i>Question:</i> When was the Academic Charter reviewed last? A full revision has not been made since the 1996, but smaller amendments were made as recently as 2014.</p> <p><i>Question:</i> Should there be a provision to review the Academic Charter regularly? It was suggested to include that the Vice Chair should look through it every 2 years and with the Executive Committee, determine if any discussions should be brought to Senate. A second suggestion was made to make bylaws, because these would be easier to change than the Charter.</p>		
i. ad hoc Campus Expansion <b>Attachments 4 &amp; 5</b>	<p>Senator Cowan reported that the Committee's research had revealed that the Komohana extension might not be the best move because of the expense to move the campus up there. The DOT land also in question may or may not be available and/or may have ground contamination, and the building across from the current Manono campus may be in contract already. The most reasonable option to expand the campus may be to develop and improve this property – especially the unused lot in the back. There is currently a lot of</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>underutilized space, but solar arrays would need to be approved because it is located under flight patterns. See attachments for further information.</p> <p>During the “Meet with the Chancellor” meeting in October, Chancellor Solemsaas suggested that her vision is to move several down programs from upper campus, but there may be issues with office space and more than one faculty to an office. It was suggested to Senators to let her know of this is a concern. The committee ascertained that they should see if everyone understands what’s happening and conduct a survey to determine how people feel about different expansion options and issues that may be involved with each.</p>		
<p>6. Old Business a. Fast Track Policy: Minor Changes</p>	<p>None.</p>		
<p>7. New Business</p>	<p>None.</p>		
<p>8. For the Good of the Order a. UHPA update <b>Attachment 6</b></p>	<p>It was reiterated to make sure that UHPA has a personal email address??, so that Senators can get access to google groups and messages. The website also has information for interested parties. Senator Salvador will email Academic Senate members and can share additional information.</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p>b. UHCCP #4.203 Institution Set Standards (Draft) <b>Attachment 7</b></p> <p>c. Other <b>Attachments</b></p>	<p>This attachment was sent out as an FYI only. It is a revision of the strategic plan, as presented by John Morton. Any concerns can be expressed by email to the Chair and will be put on the Senate agenda in January for discussion. It was reiterated by the Chair to please read the policy.</p> <p>Clarification was requested by the Senate between the relationship of this document and evidence for the accreditation process, which asks that we have a set of “institutionalized standards.” It was asked of the Chair that he find out how other institutions feel about the policy and report back to Senate.</p> <p>1) Two other late attachments were sent out as an FYI:</p> <p>a) The first was for a suggested revised committee structure of the BOR by UH Manoa. They suggest that there should be two subcommittees - one with 4-year interests and one with 2-year interests. John Morton’s position would then become the President of the CCs. Manoa is asking that we either endorse their suggestions or add to them. This will be discussed during the January Senate meeting. The current BOR structure and bylaws are online for comparison.</p> <p>b) The second attachment is a “best practices” suggestion to System and the BOR from Leeward CC stating that strategic planning is listed as goals for the colleges, but without discussion</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>for how they want to see them achieved. Will be put on agenda for January. This document is supposed to be similar to a white paper, and is not intended to be a resolution, but could be evolved into one if determined that it would be helpful. A comment was made that there is no date or source on it. Chair Giordenango will find out this information and report back.</p> <p>2) A question was raised on the floor: Do we have an update on the discussion of Foundations? The Chair hopes to have it put on the January agenda, but it might be February. Currently, the discussion is primarily taking place in Liberal Arts, but he is asking that Senate make a statement because Liberal Arts classes also affect Trades, etc. There was a request for pros and cons of Foundations vs. our current system of General Education. The DCs are trying to put this together for dissemination.</p> <p>3) Update on STAR GPS: Overall feedback seems positive in general and registration has been good in comparison to last year and we are also ahead of other community colleges. The program identifies a pathway but counseling is currently working through some issues such as what students should do if sections they want of a class are closed, or due to limited GEC courses. Senator Funai thanks all senators for their advising, cooperation, and feedback. The Senate also thanked Senator Funai for trainings, and her hard work. She reiterated that more training will be available in the future, but it is still important to show students that courses don't have to be taken in the order presented.</p> <p>4) Pau Hana (Fall Semester) has been set for December 16, 2016 at The Hilo Burger Joint, 5pm-?? In the meantime, an anonymous donor is</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	willing to sponsor pupus and drinks at Coquis around 4pm today and Senators were invited to attend.		
9. Adjourn	<p><b>Motion to adjourn at 3:08pm. (Claveria/Dela Cruz)</b></p> <p><b>Next Meeting:</b> Friday, December 9, 2016 2:00-4:00p. Location: HawCC 388-103 (Manono), D-183 ACR (West Hawaii).</p> <p>The next meeting will be a special Senate meeting for course approvals proposed by the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC), Education Policy Committee (EPC – Fast Track), and the ad hoc General Education Committee (GEC). Any other new business items will be on the January 27, 2017 agenda.</p>		