Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday March 6, 2012
1:00-2:00 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), Patti Chong for Carla Rogers (Student Affairs), Mary Segura (LANG), Mike Tom (SUP), Kathleen Zane (Recording Chair)
Kathleen French (CCAAC Chair)

Guests
Doug Dykstra (Chancellor), Clifford Togo (Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services); Jan Lubin (Director of Planning and Program Evaluation; Mission, Vision, Core Values Subcommittee

1. Call to Order 1:02 pm
2. Approval of Minutes of the February 21st Meeting, as amended, was unanimous.

3. Chancellor’s Report
   A) WCC Operational Budget (Doug Dykstra)

   Chancellor Dykstra briefed the Faculty Senate on the current budget shortfall and its implications for supplies and equipment budgets. Addressing the modest enrollment growth this year, he reported that this Spring, the growth in enrollment was not reflected in student semester hours. He outlined the two main factors leading to the changes to the new projected balance. First is the need to establish an escrow account that shows that five per cent of the budget has been set aside in case of emergency. Previously the College had been allowed to use its working capital for the OCET operation of 750,000 dollars. The actual carryover funds from last year ended up purchasing 400,000 dollars of new equipment, but can’t be used this year.

   The second factor is the rise in electricity costs. Having budgeted a little over one million, but with a 441,000 dollar deficit for its electricity bill, the College no longer has the amount to pay it. Hence the administration is asking for the conservation of every amount of electricity. While there had been a cut-back in kilowatt usage, it has now increased again by 15,000KWH, because of the construction of the Learning Commons since the contractors are obliged to stress the system to find any defects in it.

   Floyd M. inquired whether the situation was unique to WCC and the response was negative, as it is a regional experience. He further asked if the budget set aside is held in an interest-bearing account and Vice Chancellor Togo responded that it is. Clifford T. added that the increased consumption of electricity is offset by the efficiency of the chill water loop system. Paul B.
inquired about the source of the decision not to use working capital. WCC has been affected the most because it is closest to the edge in its budgetary assets.

The single biggest cut must be made to new equipment or salaries will be affected. Rollovers to supplies are not allowed this year and student help will be maintained according to need. Supplies for immediate use only will be funded, but may not be stocked as inventory. The Chancellor emphasized that WCC cannot afford to fall below 5% in escrow funds or it will not meet the standard for fiscal stability.

Chancellor Dykstra announced the goal of an 85% fill rates in classes for next year and advised of the need to work on the problem of cutting low-enrolled classes and on making the right decisions when cutting classes. There should be an enrollment of 60% to see a course survive.

Mike T noted that the legislature allocation has gone up, and so has tuition, stating that, as a college, we need to fund everything and to manage doing so. He inquired about the impact on next year’s budget, and whether the College can effectively go another year without new equipment.

Chancellor Dykstra responded that Hawaii’s electricity is based on oil, elaborating on the long range implications of that fact for our budget. Vice Chancellor Togo referenced the purchase power agreement with a fixed purchase rate of power, adding that this second phase is still being negotiated. Mike asked whether there has been a consideration of the impact on our budget of opening the Learning Commons and what the budget was expected to be. Chancellor Dykstra acknowledged that while more money had been received, there was the greater expense of the “snap back” on salaries. He cautioned that new equipment will come at the expense of student casual hires, and supplies. He affirmed that political expectations required that the Learning Commons be opened as planned.

B. Non-discrimination Policy and Issues

Chancellor Dykstra informed the Senate that a possible discrimination grievance had not gone forward as it had not proved to be as dramatic as had been reported at second hand, but encouraged faculty and staff to attend the Train the Trainer workshop in March and to take proactive steps in support of LGBTI members of our community and in establishing WCC as a Safe Zone.

C. “Closing the Loop” Workshop

The Chancellor urged attendance at the workshop presented by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), Closing the Loop: From Course-Level Assessment to Institutional Planning, on Friday March 9 from 9 a.m. to 12 noon, to enable participants to better respond with proof and documentation for best practices validated by their own recent learning outcomes assessment.
4. Reports
   A. CCAC (Kathleen French)
      Kathleen F. presented the approved course proposals from the February 28th CCAAC meeting.
      1. New Course: SW 200
      2. Course modification: GEOG 101: Change in SLOs
      3. Course Modification: ANSC 190: Change in title, course hours, description, and SLOs
      4. New Course: ANSC 266
      5. New Course (un-archived): MATH 21A
      6. New Course (un-archived): MATH 21B

      All the above new courses and course modifications were approved unanimously.

   B. ACCFSC & CCCFSC (Paul Briggs)
      1. Common Course Numbering
         Paul B. reported that this proposal is to be sent out for approval by the UH Faculty Senates and will be decided upon in April. He asked for departmental feedback and requested that the statement be taken to departments for their approval.
      2. FDLAC
         Paul B. conveyed FDLAC’s request for a determination of when and to what degree online courses require paper tests. The difficulty of doing science tests online was acknowledged.
      3. Salary information for personnel broken down by groups was sent by email and the Faculty Senators were asked to take this back to their departments.

   C. Planning, Budget, & Accreditation (Ross Langston)
      Ross. L. referred to Chancellor Dykstra’s presentation. Floyd M. asked how assigned time would be affected by the budget and the Faculty Chairs were charged with discussing the matter in their meeting with the Chancellor.

   D. Assigned Time Committee (Paul Briggs, Frank Palacat, Kay Beach)
      The committee reported that there were no requests to consider.

5. Old Business
   A. Proposals for matriculation fees and for automatic degrees
      As there were no responses on these proposals reported from the departments, Ross L. called for comments even though the input may have no effect and asked the representatives to poll their departments once again. Paul B. reported that John Morton has confirmed that these measures have to pass through the BOR before being implemented.

   B. Indigenous-Serving Institution Task Force
      Chancellor Dykstra has called for 2-3 “outside” faculty (in addition to the Ke Kumu Pali representatives who have already been chosen) for service on a taskforce to oversee
the campus implementation of the Hawaii Papa O Ke Ao recommendations. As there were no volunteers, these faculty members will be selected at random today.

C. Encouraging Participation of First-Semester Freshmen in Learning Communities (Carla Rogers for Student Services)

Gerri K. suggested the need for more Learning Community workshops, and a discussion was begun about whether the Learning Community should be required of all freshmen taking both Math and English in the same semester. Support for the measure should be further discussed in the departments.

6. New Business:

A. Concerns regarding online voting and discussion board (Mary Segura)

Mary S. reported concerns expressed by her department about the online polling process, suggesting that a policy for the use of the Discussion Board be re-circulated or created. There is a concern that proposals have gone directly from the discussion board to policy without a vote from Faculty Senate, as in the case of the Committee on Chartered Groups policy on committees. Ross L. commented that Faculty Senate doesn’t preside over everything, but has limits on its purview. He suggested that, while Faculty Senate should vote on policy, in the given example of the Committee on Chartered Groups, the formation of the Committee itself was not a policy.

In response to Mary S.’s comment about proposals not being voted on by Faculty Senate yet still becoming policy, Kathleen F. read the policy for creating policies to the Faculty Senate and pointed out that the policy does not state the need for Faculty Senate to vote on new policies, especially policies not directly related to instruction.

Mary S. asked about the policy governing the use of the Discussion Board in making decisions. Ross L. responded that some items come through the Faculty Senate for its advisory input but have not come to a vote. Floyd M. made the point that the Discussion Board is merely a tool to inform the campus and to maintain transparency.

Mary S. asked about the impact of the Discussion Board’s transformation from being run by a Faculty Senate member to being run by an administrator. Mike T. pointed out that the Discussion Board is not in fact run by an administrator, but that Dean Richardson merely performs the task of webmaster, and does not edit or select the content that is posted.

It was observed that the old form of a discussion board under New Initiatives provided opportunities for anonymous contributions, whereas it currently allows greater participation by more people. Paul B. asked how long an item stays posted and the response was two weeks.

Patti C. posed the question of the impact made by posting expression on the Discussion Board. Ross L. observed that when the Faculty Senate representative is asked to take an issue back to the department, not every individual gets to provide input. The example was given of Floyd M.’s
proposal to prohibit the use of electronic devices during tests which was posted on the discussion board to help better formulate the proposal.

Ross suggested developing guidelines or policy for the use of discussion boards, and the option of anonymous posting. These concerns will be relayed to the Chancellor at the following meeting with the Senate Chairs.

7. Adjourned at 2:17 pm.