

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 2020 - 2021

<p>Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 Time: 2:00 pm Location: ZoomID: 834 8102 7984 Passcode: FS1-82820</p>	<p>Members Present: Aimee Maclennan, Alma Cremer, Anne Chung, Brenda Watanabe, Caroline Naguwa, Carrie Butler, Carrie Mospens, Cheryl Pavel, Chip Michels, Christine Quintana, David Tsugawa, Debbie Weeks, Donna Madrid, Dorinna Cortez, Luz Miguel, Drew Kapp, E.K. Flores, Elizabeth Shaver, Grace Funai, Grant Kaaua, Harold Fujii, Janet Smith, Jennifer Golla, Jennifer Sims, Jesna Nissam, Josh McDaniel, Kaipo Kauffman, Kaleopono Quintana, Kanoe Lambert, Karen Crowell, Kate Sims, Kenoalani Dela Cruz, Kristine Kotecki, Kuulei Kanahale, Laurel Gregory, Lew Nakamura, Lisa Fukumitsu, Lissandra Baldan Jenkins, Lucy Jones, Luria Namba, Luzviminda Miguel, Mari Giel, Meidor Hu, Michelle Phillips, Nate Roberts, Neva Supe-Roque, Noel Tagab-Cruz, Pamela Scheffler, Renee AK Dela Cruz, Reshela DuPuis, Robyn Kalauli, Sam Giordanengo, Sandra Claveria, Sharon Dansereau, Sherise Tiogangco, Tamera Loveday, Tanya Dean, Taupouri Tangaro, Toni Cravens, Trina Nahm-Mijo, Vivian Chin, Warren "Wailani" Walker</p>
<p>Call to Order: 12:05 pm By: David Tsugawa Mins: Aimee Maclennan</p>	<p>Guests: None</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
1. Ascertain quorum	Meeting called to order by the Chair at 12:05 pm with 72 senators (including 13 Executive Committee members) present.		
2. Roll Call and Introductions / Guest	No roll call taken due to sufficient number of members in attendance. Attendance recorded via Zoom enrollment. Two guests from Financial Aid.		
3. Approval of November 20, 2020 Minutes	Did not approve November minutes. They will go up for approval in the January 2021 Senate Meeting		
4. Senate Chair Report Attachments 1, 9, 10	<p>a. VCSA - Dorinna Cortez</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation Verification is defined and outlined in EP 7.209 • Student presence must be shown in an academically related activity by the late registration deadline. Presence is demonstrated by an action such as physically attending class, submitting an assessment, interaction with class/instructor, participating online discussion. • Presence does not include logging on. There MUST be some kind of interaction 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is about compliance with federal financial aid regulations. There are also Title IV requirements that the student must meet. • Verification open from 1/20/2021-1/25/2021 • If students believe that they should still be enrolled in the course, they must contact the instructor immediately. Please keep an eye on your email around this time. • Q. Will this policy replace the current no-show policy? A. Joni and the DC's are currently looking at it. • Q. Is there an appeal process for students who feel that they are incorrectly dropped from the course? A. Students will be advised to talk to the instructor. The instructor can re-admit the student by notifying Joni (or her designee). • Q. This semester, the students have shown up for the first few weeks and then they "disappeared" or "petered out". What do we do if that happens? A. In those cases, you'll want to do an early alert flag and/or reach out to the student to figure out what is going on. • Q. What happens if the student shows up the day after I submit the Verification certification? A. It would go to the appeals process. • Q. Will the lecturers also be notified of this situation? Is this a system or institution thing? A. This is a system thing. • Q. Will there be a pre-written paragraph that we can put into our syllabi? A. Dorinna will talk to Melanie and Joni about it. <p>b. CCCFSC Report - Vice Chair Toni Cravens-Howell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big announcements made: Participation/Verification is live for spring 2021. This will be mandatory. It will mimic our no-show/drop policy. • Required to input participation/verification week of Jan 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>20 – Jan 25.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation is up to the interpretation of the instructor. There are no set guidelines to define participation. • System wants to create a single academic-renewal policy (system level) • Erika said fall 2021, faculty can request face to face (f2f) courses. System suggestion is hybrid, but if faculty are comfortable, they are able to request F2F for fall. This is contingent on covid vaccines and the no presence of an outbreak. An outbreak over summer will cause all F2F listed courses to be converted to synchronous zoom courses. • Plans to meet budgets were submitted to BOR. They are not going to plan on making proportional cuts for us, so they are not doing percentage-based cuts. They will try to make system-wide cuts rather than per college. • UHPA will be consulted before any decisions regarding contract and cuts will be made. <p>c. Report on old business from last year: Leadership Training is now a College Council cohort (Attachment 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This semester, the Chancellor had arranged to have a leadership training cohort. The cohort met once a month to discuss possible ways to support leadership roles at our college. • Chancellor wants to continue this in the spring. She has asked for any input and contribution of ideas. If you have any ideas, please contact the chancellor. 		
<p>5. Old Business</p> <p>Attachment 2.1, 3, 4.0-4.4, 8</p>	<p>a) UHPA BOD update - Sam Giordanengo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Furloughs are being talked about. The Chancellor and admin are making it seem like a done-deal. However, a furlough will be negotiated. • UPHA and other unions are considering the Governor in violation of federal labor law. If we have a furlough, it 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>will be a legal furlough that has gone through negotiations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you will be financially harmed with a 9.7% pay cut or furlough, you are being requested to document it. The reps have these documents for you to fill out. • The attorneys would like to have 16 stories of hardship from the system that will be documented, with your name on record. They want to show the judge how this will impact and harm many of us. • Q. Is there someone we could go over our story with before it goes public? This way we can see if it's worth putting our story out there. A. When you submit your story, it will go straight to an UHPA executive who will send it to an attorney. The attorney will determine if your story is worth going public and will contact you. • Q. If our contract ends or is not renewed in July, can furlough then be implemented? A. UPHA is hoping for the best but is prepping for the worst. They are working on a strike plan in case it come to that. Erika has said that, if we don't come to an agreement by July, we should continue our current contract. • On Feb 20th the BOD and UPHA meeting will occur. They will have a better idea of where we are at in contract negotiations and/or a strike (or lockout) situation. • Q from chat: Since we haven't gotten the email memo from Erika yet, I'm concerned with everything that has been transpiring with the faculty and Ige's announcement. Unfortunately, it didn't come out before we got all together at this meeting. Because unity is so important, how can we have our concerns met on the memo so it can be seen, and how it will be answered? A. UHPA hasn't said anything about that so Sam is unsure of the answer. • Q. I'm hearing language about potential lockout/strike. Last time there were furloughs there was a vote for 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>minimal furloughs versus position loss. Has UPHA considered taking a straw poll to see if members were willing to take a minimal furlough reduction? A. we don't want people laid off. We will definitely consider furloughs (we understand that the state is dire financial crisis) but the state must enter negotiations to do this, as per our contract with the state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q. What are the consequences if the governor refuses to negotiate? A. For UPHA to take them to federal court. Federal law has been set on this type of negotiation so, if the governor refuses to come to the table and implements the furlough, the state has violated federal law and we'd go to court. The judge could go against the unions but UPHA has been saying that they want to sit down with the Governor and he's been refusing. That doesn't look good. <p>b) CRC - Ku`ulei Kanahale / Grace Funai (ATT. 2.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRC drafted a memorandum regarding a blanket request to change the C or Better in Eng 21 or Eng 22 to say CR. This is to be sent to Joni. • When you insert courses to the prerequisite field, if a letter grade is not included, the system puts a D or better automatically. CRC is proposing that system makes this an automatic C or better. • In attachment 2.1, they forgot to include the CO-CHW for CO-HSER. • CRC voted on sustainability proposal with reservations. There's been discussion and concerns with how the sustainability committee proposed to designate a course as a sustainability accredited course without the instructor approval or application. • Eng 21 / 22 was previously given a letter grade. In 2016 when the ALPS came about, the letter grade changed and now it's a credit/no-credit grading option. In Kual, 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>all of the pre-requisites for English say “C or better” for Eng 21/22. So, we need to change the terminology for the pre requisites as “a grade of CR in Eng 21/22”. To avoid having all courses make this change in verbiage, CRC is proposing to send out a blanket memo to change any course prerequisites that include of Eng 21/22.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment. There may be an issue with Veterans and their benefits if they receive an NC instead of a letter grade if they do not pass. • Comment. There are standalone courses, so it may be beneficial for instructors to have the option of letter grade or credit/no credit grading options. Please be mindful that not all English courses are ALPS. <p>c) DE – Carrie Buttler</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report <p>d) EPC – Brenda Watanabe (Att 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPC continues to do the credit by institution exam. They’ve asked committee members to take the proposal back to their department or division to make comments before bringing it to the Senate. • Working on policy 5.602 - Independent Directed Studies. • Policy 7.209 – Transferring Credits From External Locations. Some institutions design credits by the quarter semester. We need to align our system with others. <p>e) FPC – Alma Cremer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report <p>f) GEC – Kenoalani Dela Cruz / Kapena Landgraff (ATT. 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REMINDER – 02/01/2021 deadline for GEC proposals • No report, the attachments were just an FYI to read. 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>g) HAP – No`el Tagab-Cruz</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report <p>h) WI – Sharon Dansereau</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REMINDER – 02/01/2020 deadline for WI proposals • No report <p>i) Sustainability – Drew Kapp / Debbie Weeks (ATTs. 4.0-4.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been major revisions and simplifications on the proposal that were submitted to the CRC. Revisions were made in the application process. There was S-designation on both the instructor and the course-level which has been revised. All applicants will require a memo from their DC in support of the S-designation for their course. • The basic requirements include 12 credits and 1 class from social science, 1 from natural science, 1 from HWST and a “wildcard” to build a diverse coverage of the concept of sustainability. • Q. Can you talk about the measurement of the sustainability issue within a given course? How much of the course topics need to cover sustainability? A. None of the campuses use a numerical percentage to represent the coverage of sustainability content. They use terms such as “ the course must look at the issues through the lens of sustainability” and “sustainability needs to be a thematic topic of the class”. • The applications will be reviewed by a council of peers who will assess whether or not the class will meet the requirements for the concepts of sustainability. • Q. Will the instructor have information on their syllabi about the sustainability designation? A. Yes, it will be a requirement. 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p>6. New Business</p> <p>Attachments 5, 6, 7</p>	<p>a) Committee Proposals for Senate Approval – CRC (ATT. 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRC proposals. In addition to the listed proposals in attachment 5, CO-CHW and CO-HSER are also up for approval. • Motion to vote for all CRC proposals as a block. (DuPuis/ Giordanengo) • Discussion: None. • Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>0 nays, 0 abstentions, unanimous yay</i> • Motion to approve the block CRC proposals (Nahm-Mijo/Dela Cruz) • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For explanation; The new certificate in Community Health Worker (CHW) is 18 credits. It would be composed of the new courses 101, 135, and it includes four courses that are already on the books. These include 140, individual counselling, case management, and the two-semester 192/292 which is the seminar and field work. We have to change numbers from 192/292 to 193/293 to align to system. The field work courses course numbers have been changed, but the courses themselves have not. • Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>0 nays, 0 abstentions, unanimous yay</i> <p>b) Emeritus second read – Sam Giordanengo (ATT. 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UH system has provided a blanket policy regarding how the Emerita/Emeritus is done. A resolution was created in order to make a more detailed policy on how Emerita/Emeritus is decided, including input from faculty. 	<p>Motion to block vote the CRC proposals has been approved</p> <p>Motion to approve block of CRC proposals has been passed.</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q. How is this policy different from the current policy? A. The policy in place omits all faculty input on these decisions. This new policy tells the Chancellor that faculty want to have input on this decision. It actually states that the Faculty Policy Committee working with the Senate will come up with recommendations. • Q. Who makes the ultimate decision on the emerita/emeritus after the recommendations are made. A. The chancellor. • Q. What perspectives can faculty contribute that administration may not already be aware of? A. This is going to be for a C5 professor that has served with distinction. It comes down to someone who is still active, is a mentor, and is a person whose peers (other faculty) would like to honor. • Q. In the College Counsel, which committee is responsible for creating the policy? A. College Counsel representative voted to put a hold on the policy until Faculty Senate could respond. College Counsel will approve the submission of this proposal to the Chancellor who will ultimately approve or deny this proposal for implementation. • Comment – I’d like to see a policy that would also let the department submit recommendations for the position. Commenter would like to include wording that allows the department, division chair, or policy committee to have input on the Emerita/Emeritus position. • Motion to amend the resolution to add “or department or Division Chair” after “forwarded by faculty policy committee” (Dupuis/Quintana) • Discussion: None. • Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>0 nay, 0 abstention, unanimous approval.</i> 	<p>Motion to amend the resolution carried.</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve the resolution as amended. (Giordanengo /DuPuis) • Discussion – none. • Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>0 nay, 0 abstentions, unanimous yay</i> <p>c) 11-month to 9-month Conversion Resolution – Sam Giordanengo (ATT. 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brought forth because administration made 11-month employees justify why they should remain in their current positions and not be transferred to 9-month position. • Q. The administration has already submitted their report stating that the 11 month employees should not go to 9 months. Is the resolution still necessary? A. Even though the chancellor has said it won't happen, Admin could still, very well make this happen. There are concerns with misinformation coming down from the administrators. This resolution is a clear statement to the chancellor and Erika that, before you do this or change your mind, this resolution is in place. If you can meet all of the conditions in the resolution, then we can talk. • C. The chancellor's memo separates the 11 month employees into 2 categories. The twelve, 11-month faculty members that are part of student affairs were not mentioned in conversion. That leaves nine, 11-mo faculty members (academic support, Edvance, and one instructional faculty) who are still being told that it is unknown if recommendation to 9 month will happen or not. • C. This may not be the document to make the change that we want in order to support our 11 month faculty. The language in this document may make individuals feel defensive and have the reverse outcome from what 	<p>Motion to approve the amended resolution carried.</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>we are trying to achieve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q. If the resolution passes, does it go directly to the chancellor? What's its route? A. it will go to the administration (Chancellor) if passed. • Q. If not this resolution, or a rewrite of it, what are other avenues of achieving the end goal (of supporting our peers)? A. What would really help the faculty to protect themselves is to understand our own contract. If administration does something that goes against our collective bargaining agreement, we can take it to administration and point out that they cannot make the action. We can be responsible for knowing what our personal rights are, even if we aren't responsible for anything administration says or does. • Comment. This document is essentially making a preemptive statement that says "don't preemptively go against our contract". • Motion that the 11-month to 9-month Conversion Resolution be sent back to the members for revision (volunteer process) and brought back to the Senate at a later meeting. (DuPuis/Nahm-Mijo) • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. This resolution was placed a while back and may now be a moot point. It's shocking that salaries are being attacked when there are many other ways of balancing the budget . Many ideas for reducing the budget shortfall and saving money have been brought forth. The lack of creativity from administration on this subject is shocking. • C. Strong language may not always be the way to go. • Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>7 yay, 20 nay, 7 abstentions</i> 	<p>Motion to revise the resolution has not been passed.</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to pass the 11-month to 9-month Conversion Resolution in its current state (Supe-Roque/Smith) • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. The movement made to make people justify their jobs was insensitive and hurtful. It sounds like we are leaning toward a vote of no-confidence in the admin. If this is to remediate behavior in order to encourage administration to act differently, is this document really enough or do we need to entertain a vote of no confidence? • C. A vote of no confidence is kind of the “nuclear option”. It would be more than a resolution, that would need evidence to support the vote of no confidence. Admin is currently making life uncomfortable, but is admin truly demonstrating that they are unable to do their jobs? It doesn’t feel that we are currently at that step. • Q. Is this document more to encourage remediation? A. It would be great to have a talk with the heads of the departments with Erika. It would be nice to give her an update. This resolution is really to ask the admin to present the Kauhale with alternatives to save money fix the budget without attacking positions. • C. We made a report of money-saving ideas. Many of these options were removed, by ourselves, in the final report. What is our focus? Perhaps we need to ask that the decisions regarding the 11mo to 9mo transition are given more consideration than a 30-minute argument for each individual’s position. 	<p>Motion to accept the resolution in its current state carried.</p>	

Academic Senate Meeting
12-11-2020

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>22 yay, 6 nays, 5 abstentions</i> d) Recordings of College Council meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College council has asked for input from Faculty Senate regarding whether or not the recordings of College Council meetings should be made public. We will take it to a Senate vote to get all Senators' input. • Faculty senate vote: <i>Should recordings of College Council meetings be made public?</i> • Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 yay, 10 nay, 6 abstention 	<p>15 senators vote yay, 10 senators vote nay, 6 senators abstain from input regarding the public release of recorded College Council meetings</p>	
7. For the good of the Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Palamanui <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None b) Ko <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 		
8. Adjourn	<p>Motion to adjourn. (Giordanengo /Nahm-Mijo)</p> <p>-Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm by David Tsugawa.</p> <p>-Next meeting Friday, January 29, 2021 @ 12 pm, via Zoom</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn meeting carried.</p>	