1) Call to Order 12:40pm

2) Approval of Minutes - Sept 7th Meeting

MOTION TO ACCEPT MINUTES OF SEPT. 7, 2010 [1ST LESLIE L.; 2ND APRIL S.; UNANIMOUS]

3) Reports

A) New Initiatives (Robert Barclay)
Robert B. said there are currently no new initiatives to report. He plans to send out an email reminder about the forum very soon. Eventually, he would like to see the forum incorporated into the WCC website. Currently, it is housed on a commercial website. Jan Lubin agreed to find out what the server specifications are so that Robert B. can find an appropriate forum software package that will work on the WCC server. Robert B. agreed to continue with committee.

B) CCAAC (Kathleen French)
Documents of changes to policies and procedures were sent. Change Vice Chancellor’s office to VCAA; will change more when goes to Curriculum Central. Ross L.: why does the CCAAC P&P have a section explaining how to get new courses into SOC for Spring when, in past, its policy has been to only allow classes into catalog and SOC if they cleared curriculum the spring before?”

Review process for new course:

For inclusion in the Catalog and Fall SOC:

a) Proposer must submit to Dean before end of Fall Semester
b) CCAAC must review proposal and submit to Faculty Senate by 1st meeting of Spring semester.
c) Courses must complete the entire curriculum review process by the end of the second week in March to be included in course catalog or Fall SOC.

For inclusion in the Spring SOC:

a) Proposer must submit to Dean before end of Spring Semester
b) CCAAC must review proposal and submit to Faculty Senate by 1st meeting of Fall semester.
c) Courses must complete the entire curriculum review process by the end of the second week in October to be included in Spring SOC.
There are challenges with having just electronic catalog information since Counselors need hard copy dated for reference. Jan L. clarified that each catalog is a contract; students and faculty are obligated to adhere to the rules of the catalog (i.e., course requirements, CIL requirements, pre-requisites) for the calendar year in which the student entered the college.

Motion to approve policies and procedures: [http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e7/e7208.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/svpa/ep/e7/e7208.pdf) [1st Kalawaia; 2nd Robert B.; unanimous]

Motion to approve new course: HWST 115 Mo`okū`auhau: Hawaiian Genealogies [1st Jan L.; 2nd Malia L-K.; unanimous]

Kathleen French asked the FS for clarification on the procedures for amending academic subject certificates and certificates of achievement. Her request for clarification was based on a recent draft memo sent to her by Ross Langston. The memo requests changes in the speech and chemistry requirements for the certificate of achievement in veterinary assisting. Specifically, he would like students who have taken higher-level speech and chemistry courses (e.g., chem 161 and speech 251) to be able to count these classes towards the certificate, rather than back-tracking to take lower level courses (chem 151 and sp 151) currently required by the certificate. (Someone) stated that changes for most campus certificates can be granted by submitting a memo to the CCAAC (who will then vote to accept or reject the chances) but since the CA in Vet Assisting is a BOR approved certificate, Ross L. may have to get additional approval to make the change. Ross will work with Jan L. to see if additional approval is necessary.

C) Planning, Budget & Accreditation (Jan L, reporting for Tara Severns): no report

E) Mission, Vision & Core Values (Jan L. on behalf of Bonnie Beatson) Since the last meeting, in which two drafts of the MVCV statement were circulated, Ke Kumu Pali has submitted a third version by email. Chair Kalawaia Moore said Ke Kumu Pali didn’t want anyone to feel alienated, but had attempted to open up dialogue with something more inclusive, though open to editing. Ke Kumu Pali was in accordance with the core values statement included in 9/7 draft. Tara’s respondents didn’t like having Native Hawaiians singled out; Pam D. suggested wording it as a “special” commitment to native Hawaiians, since there is a need to acknowledge high numbers of Native Hawaiians on WCC campus. Libby Y. noted that the Ke Kumu Pali version touches on all major areas of UH planning; Ke Kumu Pali chair reiterated the need to avoid sounding exclusive. Malia L-K reported that Humanities were split between version 2 and 3. More may consider Ke Kumu Pali version if it were word-smithed. Peggy R. indicated that “low income” and “affordable” are redundant; Floyd M. asked why it was necessary to restate, since it is aligned with system goal. Strategic plan not on the web community college and system strategic plans; Jan: why not let campus decide? Floyd suggested a plebiscite.

Jan L. reported that many liked the 3rd version, yet still regarded it as exclusive; insertion of “special commitment” may be appropriate.
Ross passed out diagram of path of the MVCV statement. Once a draft is chosen by faculty senate, it will then be forwarded to various committees for input and eventually to the campus as a whole.

Faculty senators were asked to present all three versions to their departments and return next time with input.

4) Unfinished Business


B) ETC Discussion of specific concerns to bring to Chancellor’s meeting later: Concern was expressed that such actions not be presented as a *fait accompli*; more communication needed; clarify if and why “failed” programs don’t need reviews (last 5 yrs show decline of enrollment and growth of budget). Meetings need to be inclusive; faculty should be informed when and how, if there was a pattern of decline. It was suggested that solutions were not tried, suggestions for improvement not heard, but that unnecessary positions had been added. Program reviews could be requested from the Chancellor. Questions to be asked included: Where is money from to run adult basic education classes and how to sustain them? How and when will ETC classes be rolled over into OCET?

5) New Business

A) CIL Requirement:
Ross L. handed out a copy of the new CIL webpage created by Brian R.

Faculty senators were asked to return to the next meeting with input regarding the website, after which it will go live.

The administration doesn’t want to fund CIL exam in perpetuity, are asking the faculty two questions 1) Do they want to keep the CIL requirement? 2) If so, the faculty should identify other courses that can count for CIL credit. As another alternative, it was suggested that 3 ETC faculty not teaching on Wednesday could take over the grading of the CIL exam.

Jan L. clarified that student must meet requirements set out in catalog in year of entry; what to do in short term and do we want to keep the exam on books? She recalled meeting and forum about the CIL and that a later email stated there was not enough of a vote to validate. Further discussion involved: the problem of re-growing our core requirements, while being told to have more graduates; the test must be funded; it poses a stumbling block for graduates; CIL needs to be taken at onset, not at end. What is goal?
B) Libby proposed idea of creating a Shared Governance Subcommittee. Discussion was postponed.

C) Faculty Senate GSIEC Evaluation was handed out by Ross L. Comments on outcomes are expected at next meeting.

Meeting adjourned 1:40.