Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday August 23, 2011  
12:30-1:30 PM Palanakila 117

Members present  
Kay Beach (MAT/BUS), Paul Briggs (Off Campus Chair), Gerri Kabei (CCE/OCET), Ross Langston (Presiding Chair), Floyd McCoy (NAT SCI), Frank Palacat (SOC SCI), Carla Rogers (Student Affairs), Aaron Sala (HUM), Mary Segura (LANG), Mike Tom (SUP), Kathleen Zane (Recording Chair)  
Kathleen French (CCAAC Chair)

Guests  
Richard Fulton (Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs), Jeff Hunt (Director of Institutional Research), Jan Lubin (Director of Planning and Program Evaluation; Mission, Vision, Core Values Subcommittee), Brian Richardson (Dean of Academic Affairs Division II)

1) Call to Order: 12:40 pm

2) Introduction of Faculty Senators for 2011-12:  
Ross L. reviewed the responsibilities of Faculty Senators and announced some initiatives for the coming year. Faculty Senate communications will be improved through the email distribution (within 24 hours of a meeting) of an outline of items of actions to be taken. In the interest of making meetings more efficient, discussants of an issue will be limited to 5 minutes. Paul B. defined his office of off-campus chair as a voice from the University of Hawaii system to be shared with Faculty Senate.

3) Minutes from the meeting of 5/03/11, with the correction to Robert Barclay’s name, were approved.

4) Reports

A. CCAAC: (Kathleen French)  
Kathleen F. announced that the subcommittee meeting of policies and procedures for the curriculum committee will be meeting next week, regarding such issues as Curriculum Central.

B. Review of CIP, Renovation, and Projects of Campus Development or Improvement: (Jeff Hunt)  
Jeff H. distributed a tentative outline of policies and procedures for formalizing the process of review of CIP, renovation and projects pertaining to campus development or improvement, such as the renovation of buildings and other projects affecting the
cohesiveness of design and appearance of the campus. A flowchart was included. The intention of the review is to tie in the whole campus for oversight of projects and to involve all participants in a review of the cohesiveness of all projects. Some of the projects which should have been reviewed but were not, include the archways in Alaka‘i, the enclosed lanais in Na‘auao; lighting changes that needed to be redone; the re-roofing of certain buildings; Alakai driveway. Jeff H. affirmed that the procedure was a College-wide review process, not a decision tree.

Discussion in Faculty Senate included the distinction between the 2 documents of a template and a flow chart; the membership of the Design and Review Committees; the interaction between design and review; the input of the Aesthetics Committee; the locus of authority in the process. Ross L. suggested the inclusion of a time line; Jeff H. suggested a check to each step and welcomed further comments. Ross L. recommended that the Faculty Senate review the document when it has been completed.

C. Prioritization of New Faculty Positions: (Richard Fulton)

Richard F. presented a recently edited version of the document on the prioritization of new faculty positions and the reallocation of vacant positions, and asked for comments, concerns, and questions. Jan L. recommended that a rubric be established, to meet the standard of the Committee on Policies & Procedures. Richard F. responded that the Chancellor should have one for each position. Jan L. pointed out that the attributes that are supposed to be part of a position are not pertinent to non-teaching faculty. Focused on teaching faculty, except for its external requirements, the document doesn’t cover counselors, librarians, or support faculty. The Senate questioned whether there should be two rubrics and how best to rank among the categories in the absence of matching criteria. The suggested solution for providing a common source for the rubric is to refer to the Strategic Plan. Richard F. asked for suggestions about criteria and rubrics. A forum may be needed for consensus on where new positions should be created. Ross L. recommended that Faculty Senators take this matter back to their departments and request feedback.

D. ACCFSC/CCFSC: (Paul Briggs)

Paul B. circulated an updated draft of a UH non-discrimination and affirmative action policy document E1202 that has been prepared by the EEO/AA Office. The provisions of the policy have been expanded to include matters of harassment and retaliation. Comments in the WCC Faculty Senate discussion focused on the value judgments
implied in the term “offensive” and the issue of academic freedom as possibly conflicting with the determination of an offensive action or speech. Paul B. requested feedback from the departments by the next Senate meeting.

E. “Committee on Committees”: (Brian Richardson)

Brian R. reported on an ad hoc committee which met over the summer to discuss the types, policies, and procedures of committees at WCC. The work of this committee was the classification of types of committees, through sorting out their various charters, to formulate a general policy about “groups” governing the formation of formal groups, working committees and advisory groups. Matters of concern include specifications of how membership is comprised, the mission and work of the group, the formulation of its procedures and policies.

In response to an observation that there may be too many committees, Brian R. commented that the issues may be an inadequate structuring of groups and the need to clarify their decision-making processes in order to create more effective systems and committees. Brian R. emphasized that this is an ad hoc advisory committee.

5) Postponed business:

Reports from Planning, Budget, and Accreditation; Policies and Procedures; and Assigned Time Committees will be heard at the next meeting.

Ross L. requested Faculty Senators to prepare for assignments at the next meeting to the following subcommittees membership: Assigned Time, Policies and Procedures, New Initiatives.

6) Adjourned at 1:40pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Zane, Recording Chair