Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday April 19th, 2011  
12:40-1:30 PM Palanakila 117

Members present: Robert Barclay (LANG), Pam DaGrossa (SOC SCI), Gerri Kabei (CCE/OCET), Ross Langston (Presiding Chair), Malia Lau-Kong (HUM), Floyd McCoy (NAT SCI), Peggy Regentine (MAT/BUS), Tara Severns (SUP), Charles Whitten (Student Services), Libby Young (Off Campus Chair), Kathleen Zane (Recording Chair) 
Kathleen French (CCAAC Chair)

Guests: Jan Lubin (Director of Planning and Program Evaluation; Mission, Vision, Core Values Subcommittee),

1) Call to Order: 12:50
2) Approval of Minutes of April 5, 2011 deferred
3) Reports
   A. Senate Chairs Meeting with the Chancellor
      There was nothing of note to report.

   B. CCAAC (Kathleen French)
      Kathleen F. stated that there was no new CCAAC initiatives for the 4/19 meeting, but said there would be several for the 5/3 FS meeting. She proposed that voting on the curriculum items be deferred until the last meeting, although it is scheduled to be a non-business meeting. This proposal was accepted. Senators will be asked to vote on any CCAAC-approved changes by email following the 4/26 CCAAC meeting.

   C) Planning, Budget & Accreditation
      Tara S. and Jan L. reported on the ACCJC Conference.
      Jan L. informed us that, according to the new manual from 2011, WCC will need to do rewriting and disaggregating of the population according to age and other variables. Distance education courses are to be treated separately from other courses. Distance education courses include Waimanalo and Kahuku outreach, but not hybrid courses. Anything taught 50% online is considered distance education.
      Jan L. advised that WCC might be placed on warning. A weakness is that SLOs haven’t been used to make major changes to continuously improve programs. She also stated that 80% of institutions are on warning for reasons of governance and SLOs. Responses to GSIEC member and nonmember, and the evaluation of the GSIEC itself can be successful in fostering change.

      Libby raised the question of privacy and public information in evaluations. Jan L. clarified that Laulima is private and that the evaluation of a leader remains private while the evaluation of an office is a public matter.

   E) ACCFSC/CCFSC (Libby Young)
      1. Libby Y. reported that she had shared reactions from WCC regarding common numbering of courses with the Council. The consensus was that the currently worded proposal regarding
common numbering can neither be endorsed nor approved, but there is support for an all college committee to examine the matter.

2. On the issue of a migration to Google, the community colleges are split on an endorsement. There remains a question about whether people will move at a definite time. There has been no decision to shut down the current system entirely;

3. The question of academic rigor as a significant marker, besides sheer numbers of graduates, was raised. There is no signal that we are being rewarded for holding the line; we want regents as well as administrators to understand the pressures for holding the line so that all levels are involved. The Sunshine Law was referenced, in which a meeting where 3 or more Regents are present requires inclusion of faculty and needs to be posted a week ahead. There is a need to make an opportunity for everyone to be on same page.

4. Robert B. raised a question about the status of the trimester system that had been proposed earlier.

5. Jan L. reported from the Accreditation committee that the mission, vision and core values statement will be reviewed at the BOR May meeting along with that of Hawaii CC and cannot be printed in the catalog until it is approved.

F) **Assigned time committee** (Charles Whitten)

Charles W. raised the issue of membership on this committee, recommending that counselors be exempt, since the assigned time applicants are teaching faculty. He reported that there were 24 applications, all of which were recommended for approval by the Academic Deans. Charged with evaluating the applications as “high,” “medium,” and “no,” the committee ranked 3 applications as “high” and the rest as “medium.” The committee was not informed of administrative priorities or the amount of funding available. Charles W. noted that the field of applications was incomplete as only some department chairs and some curriculum chairs requested assigned time.

In the discussion that followed there was a consensus that the evaluation of assigned time applications needs a rubric and that there be better guidelines for applicants. The importance of documenting the result that was envisioned for the assigned time was acknowledged, as similar reports are already required for Sabbaticals. Discussion of procedures for evaluating these applications included having the Dean first evaluate applications from academic faculty; having faculty see the applications first and then the Deans; and having the departments review the applications for recommendation.

Another issue pertinent to the formation of all ad hoc committees was whether membership should be constituted by faculty senators or should be extended to members of the faculty. Ross L. recommended that there be no stratified committees.

As the Faculty Senate representative on Planning and Budget Council, Charles W. reported that there will be a vote on a 5 point scale on 106 requests. Jan L. added that some of these are inactive and some are to go to the assigned time committee. There is a new PBC policy that anyone may come to speak on behalf of a PBC Request.
4) Announcements and New Business

A. Ross L. announced that the next meeting would be a potluck when Lui will be presented with the framed resolution honoring his service and new senators and chairs will be introduced.

B. Kate Z. informed the Senate of the situation arising from a WCC facility usage and scheduling conflict between student functions and Creations in Catering. It was suggested that the caterer’s contract be requested for review by the Senate and that the matter be discussed with Chancellor Dykstra during the faculty senate leadership meeting to follow. After reviewing the contract, Faculty Senate may meet with Cliff Togo and Bernadette Howard about its interpretation. Gerri K. clarified that funding from the space rental is being used to support funding the position of the WCC facilities scheduler.

C. There was a discussion of the advisability of clarifying what constitutes an appropriate usage of UH email for our faculty and staff.

D. Suggested Faculty Senate outcomes for 2010-11
Data from the last GSIEC evaluation indicate a need for a means for non-faculty (students and staff) to submit questions and concerns to the senate. The creation of a “Submit to Senate” portal on the WCC Faculty Senate Website was suggested for the use of non-faculty. Input would be emailed to all Senators to vote on whether or not the Senate should consider/discuss these issues and take them back to their departments for further input. If the majority of senators approve, the item may be addressed by the Senate and taken back to individual departments for further input.

The issue of having a student representative on Faculty Senate was raised. It was clarified that a student might attend meetings by invitation or by request but not as a sitting or voting member.

E. Ross L. offered to send out some bulleted notes outlining the issues that faculty senators needed to take to their departments for discussion.

5. Adjourned at 1:55pm.