

### Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 2021-2022

<p><b>Date:</b> Friday, November 19, 2021 <b>Time:</b> 12:00 pm <b>Location:</b> Zoom</p>	<p><b>Members Present:</b> Aimee Maclennan, Ākea Kiyuna, Alma Cremer, Carrie Butler, Carrie Mospens, Cheryl Pavel, Christine Quintana, Claudia Wilcox-Boucher, David Tsugawa, Debbie Weeks, Donala Kawaauhau, Donna Madrid, Drew Kapp, Glenn-Dee Kuwaye, Grace Funai, Harold Fujii, Jennifer Sims, Jesna Nissam, Joshua McDaniel, Kapena Landgraf, Kenoalani Dela Cruz, Kristine Kotecki, Leanne Urasaki, Lissandra Baldan Jenkins, Luria Namba, Luzviminda Miguel, Mari Giel, Meidor Hu, Michelle Phillips, Neva Supe-Roque, Noel Tagab-Cruz, Orlo Steele, Pamela Scheffler, Reshela DuPuis, Robyn Kalauli, Sam Giordanengo, Sandra Claveria, Sharon Dansereau, Susie DeSa Dill, Tagi Qolouvaki, Tamera Loveday, Toni Cravens Howell, Wailani Walker,</p>
<p><b>Call to Order:</b> 12:05 pm <b>By:</b> David Tsugawa <b>Mins:</b> Aimee Maclennan</p>	<p><b>Guests:</b> Chancellor Rachel Solemsaas, Tiffany Naea</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p><b>1. Ascertain quorum</b></p>	<p>Meeting called to order by Chair David Tsugawa at 12:06 pm with 34 Senators (including least 3 Executive Committee members) in attendance.</p>		
<p><b>2. Roll Call and Introductions / Guest</b></p>	<p>No roll call taken due to sufficient number of members in attendance. Attendance recorded via Zoom enrollment.</p>		
<p><b>Announcements</b></p>			
<p><b>3. Approval of the Minutes</b></p>	<p><b>Approval of the October 22, 2021 Minutes (Att. 1)</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve the October 22, 2021 Minutes (Fujii/Dansereau)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Comment – Please double check the members present. Tiffany Naea was listed as present. It was confirmed that Tiffany was present, but should be listed under guests.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion to approve Oct 22, 2021 minutes with minor revisions to attendance carried.</b></p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Minor change – Remove David Tsugawa from attendance and place Tiffany Naea under guest.</i></li> <li>● <b>Vote:</b> 31 Yay, 0 Nay, 3 Abstentions</li> </ul>		
<p><b>4. Senate Chair Report</b></p>	<p><b>1) Chancellor’s Solemsaas’ Report – VCAA selection timeline and PD/VCAA and VCSA Selection Process</b></p> <p>Chancellor Solemsaas provided a report on the VCAA and VCSA selection process to the Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Chancellor is requesting feedback regarding the description and selection process for the Vice Chancellor positions. Feedback will be collected by the end of the semester.</li> <li>● Through the month of April, an open and transparent process will be underway, starting with the selection committee.</li> <li>● As the finalist is chosen and the reference checks are completed, it is the hopes that the selected candidate will be proposed to the board by April or May.</li> <li>● A doodle poll has been created to collect any proposed PD changes.</li> <li>● The selection of the permanent director for Palamanui is proceeding. This position started in 2019 but was suspended due to covid. Hopefully by January or February 2022 the process will be underway and a Director will be selected for Palamanui by April/May.</li> <li>● Staffing positions have been requested to VP Lacro however, decisions regarding funding and available positions are ultimately decided by VP Lacro.</li> <li>● HawCC did get approval for two nursing positions and one carpentry position.</li> <li>● There is a staffing plan to assess the first of the top 10 vacant faculty positions that have been ranked in the restaffing plan/staffing priority.</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p><b>2) Request from Registrar's office Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last meeting there was an informational poll for feedback on the participation verification system from Senate. Chair Tsugawa has forwarded the Senate's comments and questions to Sherise.</li> </ul> <p><b>3) Senate Chair's Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toni Cravens-Howell is the current Vice Chair of the Academic Senate. There is an informal practice of having the Vice Chair become the next Senate Chair. This year, Toni has also become a department co-chair. According to our charter, it is not recommended that the Senate Chair concurrently serves as a department chair. Toni is planning to continue to be the co-DC for the department and no longer plans to step in as the Senate Chair for academic year (AY) 22/23. There are two options for how the Senate proceeds:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In Spring 2022, Toni can step down as the Vice Chair and the Senate can designate a new Vice Chair who can train under Chair Tsugawa.</li> <li>○ Toni can remain as Vice Chair for Spring 2022 and the Senate can extend Chair Tsugawa's position for one more year. A new Vice Chair can be elected for AY 22/23 then move forward to the Chair position in AY 23/24</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If you want to provide feedback on this matter to Chair Tsugawa, it will be put under new business for the December meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>4) Create a Task Force for CRC Proposal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the October Senate meeting there was discussion about the CRC proposal; Do we need to create a task force to create the CRC proposal?</li> <li>• Senator Funai provided an explanation of the proposed CRC task force to the Senate.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In the October Senate meeting, it was asked if the CRC should review an entire proposal or just the section that is requested</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>for change. It has been the practice of the CRC for the past year to review the entire proposal because, when they hit the submit button, they are approving the entire document. This has created a conundrum where the CRC is sending proposals back to proposers because the proposal requires updates or certain changes. Because the CRC is reviewing the entire proposal, it was also asked if this review would fulfill the 20% review? This is not possible, as there is already a 20% review proposal. Perhaps a task force is a possibility but, because it could potentially impact the 20% review policy. Maybe the EPC committee should look into this as part of their review of the 20% review policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Instead of a task force, should this be something that is brought to EPC for review and discussion and to brought forth to Senate for Vote?</li> <li>● Chair Tsugawa proposes that, at the December meeting, we vote to have the EPC look into this.</li> </ul> <p><b>5) QFE Integrated Planning Task Force</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Senator Grace Funai is also Chair of the QFE Integrated task force. There were several informational documents regarding the QFE linked to today's agenda</li> <li>● Senator Funai spoke to the Senate regarding the QFE Task Force: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The task force continues the discussion of redesigning the institutional effectiveness and the budgeted reallocation process. Budget has been the main topic this semester. There are key pieces missing from the budget plan, such as the opportunity for shared governance. The faculty and staff have an opportunity to provide input on the budget requests that are going through and help with prioritization. The requests and prioritizations of the faculty and staff are then shared with the Administration. The idea of shared governance is not that we have an equal vote at the table, but that we have an opportunity to, as a Kauhale, have</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>a discussion and open dialogue about the prioritization system. It gives us a voice but not necessarily a vote. The Chancellor is the final, ultimate decision-making authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does shared governance look like? Is it a committee in College Council? Is it a sub-committee under college council? Is it perhaps a separate Council under the Chancellor? What would our campus like to see that look like? Should the staffing plan also be something that this committee comment and make considerations on?</li> <li>• There is a document linked to the agenda on which you can share any thoughts or ideas that you may have regarding the QFE task force.</li> <li>• There will be another talk-story session regarding program and comprehensive reviews. If you have suggestions/concerns, please forward them to the QFE task force or join them at the talk session. Monday Nov 29<sup>th</sup>, 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm.</li> </ul> <p><b>6) College Council Report:</b></p> <p><b>6a) Chancellor’s Report at College Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the last CoCo meeting the Chancellor discussed her EQUITY report. It is one of three focusses that the chancellor wants us to pursue. There is data on how we can help with Equity for our students. Please provide feedback on the link in the agenda.</li> <li>• There are two positions: VCAA and VCSA up for selection. Please share your thoughts to Chair Tsugawa by Nov 30<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul> <p><b>6b) VCAS Report – Title IV Program Review Passed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our campus was under Title IV review and we passed.</li> </ul> <p><b>6c) VCAS Report – Staffing Reallocation Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ken gave a report on the staffing reallocation report. There is a link attached in the agenda. Three documents were provided, which helped to explain how Admin is going about staffing reallocation. Ken is still</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>seeking feedback from Faculty.</p> <p><b>6d) VCAA Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The interim VCSA gave a short report. There is a new referral form for when we want to refer students to the Academic Student Support Centers.</li> <li>• Thank you to Claudia/Sam for helping with Dean of Liberal Arts duties in Spring 2022</li> </ul> <p><b>7) ACCFSC Report: Meeting Friday 11/19/21: Day of meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Senate Chairs have been pushing the BOR to find some way to have faculty representation on the BOR. We do have a regent liaison; Ernie Wilson, who attends the meetings every month then fills in the Senate Chairs. There is currently a student representative on the BOR.</li> <li>• The Senate Chairs have found that President Lassner misspeaks for the Senate Chairs. The Chairs have requested that their liaison ask the BOR how they can get representation at the BOR meetings.</li> <li>• One Senate chair expressed concern about the BOR policy that states the President of UH has to address faculty regarding any covid changes. This hasn't been happening. They are finding a way to contact Lassner on how to ensure all updates regarding covid are expressed to faculty.</li> <li>• There has been discussion about system-wide cross listing of courses. There is a document regarding this discussion linked in the agenda. If the cross-listing of classes across the system is a concern of yours, please read this document. The last pages of the linked attachment mention faculty concerns that have already been posted.</li> <li>• There was a Senate committee resolution 201 regarding the Tenure PIG that was conducted by the BOR last spring/summer . There was a lot of feedback provided by faculty. Thank you for voicing your concerns and providing feedback. A taskforce has been created and there is a link that will take you to their website. The taskforce can receive your feedback</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>using the emails provided in the agenda. If you email any feedback directly to the BOR, please make sure you head it “SCR 201 – Tenure Taskforce Feedback” so they know to forward your message to the Tenure Taskforce. Christian Fern does serve on this task force so we are well represented on this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to Chairman Moore, any proposed changes to tenure will not affect current employees. If the taskforce changes anything regarding the tenure policy, they will only affect those hired after the policy changes.</li> <li>• System is coming out with climate survey, which includes the faculty evaluation of Administrators (to come out next year). There are discussions with UH as to how we can provide feedback regarding the survey items. Some Senate Chairs voiced that they’d like to add items to the existing survey. If you want to know what items are on the surveys, you can look at the past 5 surveys that were conducted (Chair Tsugawa to send links to past surveys after the meeting). If you feel there are items that should be included/changed/revised, please provide feedback.</li> <li>• <b>Question</b> – The evaluation that we recently did (the administrator survey that went out through UHPA), that’s not going to be sent out to us because they have to make adjustments? <b>Answer</b> – These are separate things. UHPA does their own surveys. The surveys will be similar but they are separate.</li> </ul> <p><b>8) CCCFC Report: no report – Toni is attending concurrently with this Senate meeting.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Report</li> </ul> <p><b>9) Vice Chair Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ad Hoc Senate Charter Review Committee has been meeting regularly.</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>They are going through the Charter and continue to make revisions. The link attached in the agenda includes the revisions as of last week.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please look at the document and review the revisions made. You can email any members of the Ad Hoc committee to provide feedback.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5. Old Business</b></p>	<p><b>1) CRC – Ku’ulei Kanahale / Grace Funai (Att. 2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on the course and program proposal redesign – the Kualu form that is used to edit or make a new course or program is what the CRC is looking at streamlining and improving (making more user-friendly) for future use. There is a CRC subcommittee that has been working on this task and they have a few proposed changes for the redesign. Grace provided a link of the proposed changes to the course proposal form. This form includes a column for faculty to comment. The CRC would like to consider the faculty’s comments on the matter and are still accepting feedback. On Wed Dec. 1<sup>st</sup> at 3:00 , CRC will host a meeting to discuss and go over any concerns. The goal is to get this approved by January so that it can be implemented for fall 2023. Please do not submit proposals for fall 2023 at this time, knowing that the form is going to change. As a side note: The Kualu migration has been postponed, likely till next year, because the company that creates the software has undergone many staffing changes.</li> <li>• If you recall, CRC submitted a policy update to the EPC. The EPC worked hard to get feedback from its constituencies to come up with some changes. The EPC provided suggested comments and changes. One comment was that “this does not look like a policy as it includes many operating guidelines”. CRC realized that the operating guidelines should be removed from the policy and used to write a charter or operational guideline. CRC is asking Faculty to look at this document and consider them as the operating guidelines for CRC. They would like to vote to implement these operating guidelines at the next Senate meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One of the big changes to this document is the addition of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		



	<p>curriculum a specialist position. The job of the curriculum specialist position is to work with people submitting their proposals into the Kualu system, providing training for CRC members, managing the Kualu data base, trouble shooting, etc. There would be some succession and continuity between the CRC chair and curriculum specialist, with the CRC Chair taking the place of the outgoing curriculum specialist.</p> <p><b>2) DE – Leanne Urasaki (Att. 3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DE is continuing to review the distance education policy. All the committee members are accepting suggestions or feedback about the policy. ATE can send suggestions or feedback directly to Leanne since they don't have representation on the committee.</li><li>• The meetups have had a positive response. DE will continue to have a meetup during convocation week in January.</li></ul> <p><b>3) EPC – Lisa Fukumitsu (Att. 4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• EPC Chair was unavailable to give a report. Please read their committee report (attachment 4) and reach out to Lisa if you have questions or comments.</li></ul> <p><b>4) FPC - Alma Cremer / Neva Supe-Roque</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No Report</li></ul> <p><b>5) GEC – Kenoalani Dela Cruz / Kapena Landgraf (Att. 5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The GEC had a meeting with Sam to discuss the GE redesign proposal.</li><li>• GEC do have courses to submit for approval in new business</li><li>• On the committee report, it says that BIOL 124 was up for a 1-year tentative approval but the committee determined and recommends that this course will be up for full approval.</li></ul> <p><b>6) HAP – No'el Tagab-Cruz (Att. 6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No Report.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p><b>7) WI – Sharon Dansereau</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No Report</li></ul> <p><b>8) Sustainability - Drew Kapp / Kristine Kotecki (Att. 7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The list of spring sustainability focused classes can be found in the sustainability committee report. Please encourage your students to enlist in these classes</li><li>• The deadline to apply for an s-designation will be January 31, 2022 for the fall 2022 courses.</li><li>• There are links to the application in the sustainability committee report.</li></ul> <p><b>9) UHPA BOD update – Sam Giordanengo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The results from the rate our administrator survey have been received and are still being tabulated. They aren't quite ready to be released, but can be expected soon (there is no exact date). Our college scored second to the bottom in every category. The only college below us is UHH Leeward and west Oahu rated their administration highly.</li><li>• UHPA was consulted an outside firm to determine what kind of questions to use for the poll? The point of using an outside company for the survey was to be as unbiased as possible. The only bias is the UHPA paid for the survey.</li></ul> <p><b>10) GE Redesign Update – Sam Giordanengo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The redesign has been published and is currently open for comment.</li><li>• If we want to have a campus forum, we can do that so that the entire campus can come in and voice their concerns. Sam would be joined by the two faculty members who were responsible for writing this document. If that is something the faculty would like to do, you can contact Sam.</li><li>• Any changes to the document need to be approved by every single academic senate. If you have a concern that hasn't been answered, it doesn't mean that your concern has been disregarded and/or</li></ul>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>implemented. You can still ask for changes. Please contact Sam if you have any concerns or questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Question</b> – You know the six foundations that they are proposing? Are they new classes or are they classes that we already have? <b>Answer</b> – they are foundation classes You will notice things in there that aren't listed in the particular classes. We, as a college, will come up with a way to determine what classes fit in the categories for the foundations classes. Example, written communication foundations can be fulfilled by ENG 100. Because the CLOs / criteria for this foundation essentially match those of our ENG 100 class.</li> </ul> <p><b>11) Palamanui Updates (Tanya Dean)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tanya Dean is the lead Faculty liaison for the Palamanui campus. She will provide updates for Palamanui in future Senate meetings.</li> </ul> <p><b>12) Ko Updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Report</li> </ul>		
<p><b>6. New Business</b></p>	<p><b>1) Committee Proposals for Senate Vote (Att. 8)</b></p> <p><b>1a) CRC Proposals</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve all of the CRC Proposals as block (Butler/Fujii)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> <i>none</i></li> <li>• <b>Vote:</b> <i>26 yay 0 nay 5 abstentions</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Question</b> – Can someone share some information about the AS-NSCI-EES proposal since it's new? <b>Answer</b> – The general idea is that the ASNS currently has two tracks: one biology and one for the physical sciences. We are missing having a transfer track for students who want to get into conservation biology, agroecology, and similar fields. This program does that. During the 2020 covid campus redesigns, our ASNS degree was</li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion to vote on the CRC proposals as a block carried.</b></p>	

	<p>found to have very few graduates and the TEAM program tends to have low-enrolled classes. They had to find a way to put the transfer-track TEAM degree under ASNS so that it helps the numbers for programs rather than having them cancelled on our campus.</p> <p><b>Motion to approve the block of CRC proposals (Fujii/Wilcox-Boucher)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> <i>none</i></li> <li>• <b>Vote:</b> 30 yay, 2 nay, 3 abstention</li> </ul> <p><b>1b) GEC Proposals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reminder BIOL 124 is not for a 1-year renewal, but for a full renewal of 5 years.</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion to vote on the GEC proposals as a block (Supe-Roque/Fujii)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> <i>None</i></li> <li>• <b>Vote:</b> 29 yay, 0 nay, 2 abstentions</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion to approve the GEC (Fujii/Butler)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> <i>None</i></li> <li>• <b>Vote:</b> 28 yay, 0 nay, 2abstentions</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Question:</b> I know that, as Senate Chair you have to submit all of these courses in a memo on to the Vice Chancellor. Would it be helpful if Kapena and Kenoalani help draft that? <b>Answer:</b> Yes, that would be helpful.</li> </ul> <p><b>1c) HAP Proposals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Question</b> - Is this a renewal of a first time HAP designation for ART 111? <b>Answer</b> - Last year this course was approved for a 1-year HAP designation. This instructor was able to meet the requirements and concerns throughout that year, so this course is now up for full HAP designation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion to approve the block of CRC proposals carried.</b></p> <p><b>Motion to vote on the GEC proposals as a block carried.</b></p> <p><b>Motion to approve the block of GEC proposals carried.</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p><b>Motion to approve Hap designation for ART 111. (Fujii/Wilcox-Boucher)</b>  <b>Discussion:</b> <i>None</i>  <b>Vote:</b> <i>31 yay, 0 nay, 2 abstention</i></p> <p><b>2. Second reading and Discussion of Proposal change HAW 5.202 (Assessment Policy) to 4.202</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Reminder:</b> The next three items (2-4) are a discussion of the Senate as to how they would like Chair Tsugawa to vote on the matters at the next College Council meeting. Chair Tsugawa only gets one vote at the College Council.</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – My main concern (about moving policy HAW 5.202) is taking anything that has to do with academics outside the Senate. I’m all for assessment of anything that pertains to other parts of the college to be in the College Council side, but the curriculum assessment should remain within the Senate. Perhaps this means that we should have an assessment committee within the Senate? Then keep those that are outside the Senate (business office) within the College Council.</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – I agree with the above. We do need assessment for curriculum. Assessment is mostly about curriculum so, should this be held under the CRC?</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – Within the policy, the development, approval, and assessment of CLOs and PLOs is specifically assigned to the programs. The general education, specifically assigned to the Academic Senate. Faculty have extraordinary responsibility and control over the fundamental elements of assessment. But within the policy, everyone at the college is responsible for assessment (that’s in the beginning of the policy). If this body decides it wants to have a separate assessment committee and they want to remove curriculum assessment from the College Council assessment committee, then I’d think one of the things you’d want to hear from is one of the members from the College Council assessment committee. They assess at the program level, but also at the unit level. There is a diverse group of people on the committee this year, many are staff, that provide a lot of perspective on reviewing and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion to approve ART 111 for HAP designation carried.</b></p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p>evaluating the assessment reports. But if, indeed, assessment is about our Kauhale and supporting institutional effectiveness, then the Senate should take a proactive approach and suggest revisions for the current document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Comment</b> – I’m on the assessment committee for the first time this semester. I see what the above comment is regarding and they are correct. Your programs and units have to do assessment and they are written specifically by Faculty.</li><li>• <b>Comment</b> - I’d like to second the above two comments. I know that this proposal does not have to do with assessment committee perse. The assessment committee reviews assessments not just from different instructional programs, but from all other services. Which, to me, it makes sense that this committee is in College Council. We have strong representation from staff and non-instructional Faculty on the committee this year.</li><li>• <b>Comment</b> Are we still discussing this, and then we have an opportunity to go back to our departments to collect more input? Was there a plan to vote on this today? <b>Answer</b> – We were hoping that, as a second reading, we could move forward. There should have been time between last meeting and today to go out to your constituents. <b>Reply</b> - I do believe assessment is a Kauhale thing, but I worry that the assessment committee has largely been dominated and run by Faculty. When faculty attend College Council it has a broader and bigger focus than when we run Academic Senate meetings. I’d like to have a better discussion on what review and assessment is.</li><li>• <b>Comment</b> – I’m not saying anything about the committee and how hard they work. I understand their hard work and am not taking away anything that they are doing or the quality of the work that they do. Please don’t misinterpret these comments. There is not an assessment committee report like we do with other committees. When assessing classes and the process of assessment, those are done outside the purview of this body. When GEC wants to change their procedures, they have to come to Senate and we vote on it. Same with the curriculum committee. This is not true for the assessment committee.</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Question</b> – Are you going to ask the Senate for another postponement for this vote at College Council? You can propose a postponement to CoCo, but they do not have to vote in agreement to postpone. Is there a provisional option if CoCo votes not to postpone the vote? <b>Answer</b> – I would say that I’d have to abstain from voting because we, as a collective body, have not come to a decision on this matter.</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – As College Council Chair, I will choose to defer the vote. I do not have to ask the CoCo to vote for deferment. Of the Coco seats, there are six faculty members. It’s not like faculty do not have representation. These constituencies also involve counseling. Its not just HR. What I hear, is that there is an assumption made that the only important assessment is the instructional assessment . Where does that leave academic support and Edvance? <i>A discission of the changes to this policy were discussed further by Senator DuPuis. All changes within the policy can be seen in red. The policy is attached in the agenda. Please take not of the section regarding responsibilities.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Motion to request that Chair Tsugawa ask the College Council for a deferment of the vote regarding the transfer of Policy HAW 5.202 to HAW 4.202 (Dela Cruz/DuPuis)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> <i>None</i></li> <li>• <b>Vote:</b> <i>10 yay, 0 nay, 2 abstentions</i></li> </ul> <p><b>3. Second Reading and Discussion of Proposal: Dissolution of KAIAC</b></p> <p><b>Motion to request that Chair Tsugawa vote yes to the dissolution of KAIAC at College Council (Funai/Butler)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Question</b> – if KAIAC is dissolved, when we have need for data assessment or similar duties that KAIAC did, will we have to create task forces every time? What is the plan once</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion to request College Council’s deferment of the vote regarding policy HAW 5.202 carried.</b></p> <p><b>Motion to request that Chair Tsugawa vote in favor of the dissolution of KAIAC carried.</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>KAIAC is dissolved and how will the campus move forward with these tasks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Answer</b> – There was a position that was used to pull the data and information necessary for the KAIAC to meet. Without the existence of this position, where would KAIAC receive the information that they need to meet. If there’s no position to lead the group or pull information, why have the group?</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> - KAIAC was the advisory group but were never responsible for providing data. They were an advisory group that produced reports and analyzing data. They were not collecting raw data. That function, according to the Chancellor, is being handled by System through the dashboards that they are providing us. We do have a database administrator that is responsible for pulling data but he is not an analyst.</li> <li>○ <b>Question</b> – Could we revise KAIAC instead of removing it? This way we don’t have to work to reinstate it later? <b>Reply</b> – I would be extremely grateful if this was an option. I would encourage Senate to consider this</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – I also like the idea of revising KAIAC. We have data, it is presented to us, but where is the analysis of it? It feels like there’s a big hole in interpreting data. Data is really important and I’m in support of the idea above (of revising KAIAC)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Vote:</b> 12 yay 9 nay 7 abstention</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Second Reading and Discussion of Proposal: Creation of CCSSE Task Force</b></p> <p><b>Motion to request that Chair Tsugawa vote in favor of the formation of the CCSSE task force at College Council (Dela Cruz/Fujii)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> - I feel that this is another situation where we lose a position and nothing is put in its place and then we are expected</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion to request that Chair Tsugawa vote in favor of the formation of CCSSE task force carried.</b></p>	
--	---	--	--



	<p>to fill in the gaps. This seems to be an ongoing trend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ <b>Comment</b> – I’d like to ask what the goal of the task force is? To create change and real improvement or is this taskforce just being used to write a fancy report without actually bringing forth any real improvement? If it’s not going to make a difference, I have too many things to do. What is the likeliness that this committee will make real change?</li><li>○ <b>Comment</b> – I’m on the CCSSE taskforce. We are trying to put it into the Ka’ao framework. I’m not sure what direction this is going in. <i>If anyone has questions you can reach out to Senator Kawaauhau</i></li><li>○ <b>Comment</b> – for many years counselling utilized CCSSE data. They changed their services many years ago based on the data. The data could be used better, but we do use it.</li><li>○ <b>Question</b> – why are we voting on a task force that already exists? <b>Answer</b> – This has been raised with the Chancellor and she replied “well we have to get the work done”. This does seem like a backwards process and I have concerns.</li><li>○ <b>Comment</b> – If we vote to get rid of CCSSE, please consider a way to get rid of data.</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● <b>Vote:</b> 15 yay, 6 nay, 5 abstentions</li></ul> <p><b>5. First reading of Proposal – Creation of a Lecturer Interview Committee (Senate Standing Committee)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Senator Giordanengo provided an explanation for his proposal (attached in agenda):<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ There have been instances of individuals hiring their friends/family/associates at HawCC. The question came up from a junior faculty, why don’t lecturers have to go through the same process that faculty have to go through? The union was consulted to make sure that this proposal is not in conflict. This proposal ensures that anyone who wants to be a lecturer has to fill out their application on the Neogov portal. If a DC deems it necessary to have a lecturer, this committee would look at the</li></ul></li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>lecturer pool and pick the top candidates that they think would meet the qualifications and be a good fit in the department. The committee would provide the DC with a list of the ideal candidates. This would ensure that we have the best person for the job. This is not looking at any current DC, but is based on past practices. It gives a good check and balance that the people doing the hiring are doing what's best for our students. This is not removing power from the DC's, but has the potential to remove some pressure from the DCs by filling out certain paperwork. This process starts and ends by the DC, but the committee would help with hiring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Comment</b> – This is a great concept. However, for us in the ATE division we struggle to gain lecturers. If we had to go through this process, I don't think we'd even have lecturers. This past semester we had a faculty member quit and there were no lecturers to pull from. I agree that it is great to be fair, but we don't have the luxury to have 10+ lecturers to choose from.</li><li>• <b>Comment</b> – Since this is a first read, this is something good to consider. We will have time to consider this circumstance and talk about it in the next reading.</li><li>• <b>Comment</b> – My concern is also that, if the committee sends forward a recommendation and the DC disagrees. What happens? Does it go back to the committee to look again? It makes more red tape. The selection really should be someone in the department, not two people outside the department. The selection should go to someone within the department. <b>Answer</b> – The idea is not to say that bad things have happened (or are currently happening), but there have been instances where our college has been used as an “employment agency”. <b>Reply</b> – If this is not a problem now, why make more red tape?</li><li>• <b>Question</b> - Why would two of the members be from another department when it should be the other way around? Also, the procedures for hiring lecturers are much stricter with HR than it used to be. We have to ensure that the lecturers meet MQs and are qualified to teach the course. Even after a candidate is selected, HR will vet the</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>applicant and decide if the individual is qualified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – I am empathizing with CTE that nursing is having a hard time finding lecturers in the pandemic</li> <li>• <b>Question</b> – What is the idea behind having two people outside the department select the candidate? <b>Answer</b> – It seems like a better check and balance having the opinions of individuals outside the department. <b>Reply</b> – I feel that the expertise within the department would be the most helpful to have.</li> <li>• <b>Question</b> – If it’s a Senate standing committee, would it need to have representation from all members of the senate including GSS? <b>Answer</b> – I wasn’t proposing a standing committee, but it would be more of a select committee (one step down from standing committee and one step up from an ad-hoc, which has a sunset).</li> <li>• Reminder that this is first reading. We have lots to discuss. Please take this back to your departments and we can discuss this more at the second reading in December.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>7. For the good of the Order</b></p>	<p>1) For the Good of the Order: November Food Distribution on Tuesday,11/23/21 at 12-1pm. Palamanui on Wednesday 11/24/21 12-2pm.</p> <p>2) Erica received a letter from the student’s college president from Kapiolani College. The letter has been forwarded by chancellor Solemsaas, please read the letter that is linked in the agenda.</p>		
<p><b>8. Adjourn</b></p>	<p><b>Motion to adjourn (Fujii/Cravens-Howell )</b>  <b>Vote to adjourn: No formal vote taken.</b>          -Meeting adjourned at 2:47 pm by Chair Tsugawa</p> <p><b>-Next meeting: Friday December 10, 2021 12:00pm via Zoom.</b></p>	<p><b>Motion to adjourn carried. Meeting adjourned at 2:47 pm.</b></p>	