Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday October 18th, 2011

12:30-1:30 PM Palanakila 117

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

Guests  Brian Richardson (Dean of Academic Affairs, Division II)

1) Call to Order: 12:45 pm

2) Approval of Minutes-October 4, 2011  meeting deferred

3) Reports

A. ACCFSC/CCFSC (Paul Briggs)

Online Learning Strategic Plan: Paul B. provided background to the online learning strategic plan, which became an agenda item after it had been shared with the whole group. Brian R. reported that an online learning strategy is an accreditation issue because an online equivalence to a face to face experience is required. The system can leverage resources better than an individual campus can, as campus events are not documented and the resources are unknown. Hence, this is an attempt to organize a system level training program, using WAC as a good model. As a system-wide initiative, it can get more funding than an individual campus. Brian R. stated that this is a draft, rather than a procedure for adopting the plan.

Paul B. asked for a clarification of the direction of this initiative envisioned by Peter Quigley. Brian R. responded that because it’s a strategic plan, not a policy, there is a plan to identify certain goals. Floyd M. asked if the training is basically for technology; Brian responded that it also involves pedagogical training with the overall goal of coherence for teacher development. Carla R. remarked that there was nothing referring to student training. Brian stated that this is addressed by #2, but Carla responded that this only represents a goal, rather than any learning achievement. Paul B. added that this issue is addressed on page 5. Brian reiterated that each campus has some form of training, but that there is nothing coherent across the system.

Ross L. raised the issue of the slow speed of Laulima, and Brian R. responded that this is an infrastructure issue and is far from ideal. It was suggested that this matter of processing be raised with Letty Colmenares on the FDLAC and with David Lassner who is in charge of DLAC. Brian R. surmised that it was slow because of large documents being downloaded particularly at the beginning and end of the term.
Floyd M. estimated that 50% of DE students fail and asked about quality control. Brian R. stated that there are peer reviews on a college level, but none that are system-wide. He added that there may be a third party review and a system evaluation, and that Faculty Senate may want to recommend a system level peer review, noting the difference between making it a requirement or an option. Brian R. reported that at LCC, an instructor cannot teach an online class without having gone through preparation, as is the case for WAC.

Frank P. pointed out that there is a difference between psychology courses among different campuses and questioned whether there are requirements for how a course is taught. He remarked that a certain freedom of pedagogy needs to be maintained so students have choices.

Paul B. commented that Peter was asking for feedback not approval. Possible recommendations might be a peer review across the system or the enforcement or creation of requirements. Ross L. recommended standard formatting for online course. Recommendations should be sent to Brian R. or Peter Q. Inasmuch as other colleges handle online teaching differently, Floyd M. suggested that Peter Q. could review examples from other colleges. If a student wants an AA online, shouldn’t there be a separate online college? Mary S. questioned whether someone already teaching on-line would be grandfathered in without training or whether there might be an online class on how to teach online.

B. CCAAC (Kathleen French)

Kathleen F. asked for questions or comments on the curricular changes that were approved by CCAAC on October 11, 2011 and sent to Faculty Senators for review:

CCAAC Approved Curriculum Proposals from Oct 11, 2011
1. New Course: MATH 232 - Calculus IV
2. New Course: HIST 230 - Pre-Modern European Civilization
3. New Course: ANSC 290 - Veterinary Technician Exam Review
4. Course Modification: ANSC 140 - Introduction to Veterinary Technology (Change of course number)
5. Course Modification: ANSC 251 - Applied Pharmacology for Veterinary Technicians (Change of course number)
6. New Course: ANSC 258 - Clinical Laboratory Techniques II
7. New Course: ANSC 261 - Anesthesiology & Surgical Nursing for Veterinary Technicians
8. ASC Modification: Bio-Technology (slight change to the outcomes)

The motion to accept all changes detailed above was unanimously approved.

Ross L. requested that, because of time restrictions, Faculty Senate vote online for approval of the Veterinary Technician AA degree by sending Paul B. an email.

The motion to accept voting online in this circumstance was passed unanimously.

Carla R. asked for clarification of the regulations concerning animals on campus, and the sharing of laboratories. Ross responded that laboratory areas were confined, and he will be sending out a draft copy and any changes required.
C) Planning, Budget & Accreditation (Ross Langston)

Ross L. reported that the new PBC Request Form appears ready for use.

D) Policies and Procedures: no report

4) Old Business

A) Inclusion of administrators: on a regular basis in a portion of the Senate meetings

Department representatives reported a negative consensus. The Senate informally agreed not to have administrators regularly included, but to continue the current practice, of including them on an invitational basis for specific matters under discussion.

B) Online Balloting for DPC Elections:

Ross L. reported that DPC elections had not been conducted online this year, and requested more feedback, so there could be a formal poll next time.

C) Hoolaulea Recognition:

There were no volunteers to write up such an acknowledgement for presentation. Kay B. expressed the opinion that a formal acknowledgement was unnecessary, but if done, it should be an initiative of the administration.

D) Online Learning Committees: DLAC and the strategic plan

Floyd M. requested reopening the discussion about the online initiative and inquired about Faculty Senate’s role in this matter. Since Letty Colmeneres, our representative on DLAC, does not meet with us, it is unclear to whom our feedback would be reported.

Ross L. inquired about the seeming redundancy of online groups and committees. Paul B. clarified that DLAC is administration driven whereas ACCFSC’s jurisdiction is FDLAC, which is faculty led. He also clarified the committee process with DLAC’s handling being preliminary to Faculty Senate discussion.

5) New Business

A) Assigned Time Requests: reminder of deadlines

B) Noting of Student Credentials:

Carla R. reported that Student Services is not in favor of this measure because it might affect a student’s financial aid eligibility if she were to finish the degree while getting her nursing requirements out of way. In addition, it interferes with students’ autonomy and self advocacy. Ross stated that the measure affects the number of graduates with degrees.

C) Proposed Transaction and Service Fee Change
Frank P. restated John Morton’s reasoning that this measure represents an investment in a student’s lifetime. Ross added that since most official transcripts are going to be available on-line, the manual processing of hard copies would become unnecessary. Frank P. asked if these initiatives are becoming policies, and what the next level of approval will be. Carla R. stressed the need for discovering the point at which the initiative is in the process. Kay B. reminded the Senate that Patti Chong had indicated in her presentation at the last meeting that these were guidelines, not policy. She added that although this measure sounds favorable as a policy for students, it does not address the financial aid or Banner issues. Frank P. asked whether the process would be automatic if it becomes a system policy. Carla responded that transcript evaluation is done manually.

Ross proposed that further discussion be held till there is a time reference for approval of the measure. At that point, Jeri Imai could be invited to discuss it in Faculty Senate. Carla R. reminded the senators that the more things are automated, the more we need to think differently.

D). Kay B. asked for a clarification of the **deadline for assigned time applications**. Carla asked for a definition of assigned time and its procedures.

E). Kay raised the issue of a **lack of communication during the recent power outage**. It was suggested that the campus alert system be used in such cases and that one could sign up for text messages to be sent. Frank stated that such campus alerts were set by and for the entire UH system.

**Adjourned at 1:55pm**

Respectfully submitted

Kathleen Zane, Recording Chair