FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Tuesday, March 5, 2013
1:00-2:00 pm Palanakila 117

Senators Present:

Carla Rogers (Student Affairs)  
Floyd McCoy (Natural Sciences)  
Frank Palacat (Social Sciences)  
Heipua Kaʻōpua (Recording Chair)  
Jane Uyetake (OCCE)  
Jody-Lynn Storm (Math/Business)  
Kathleen French (CCAAC Chair) Ex-Officio  
Liko Hoe (Presiding Chair)  
Mike Tom (Academic Support)  
Paul Briggs (Off-Campus Chair)  
Ryan Koo (Humanities)

Senators Absent: MJ Lewis (Language Arts)

Guests Present: Jan Lubin (Director of Planning and Program Evaluation), Patti Chong (UHCC Faculty Subgroup on Academic Policies WCC Representative)

1. Call to Order: 1:02 pm

2. Approval of minutes
   Motion to approve FEBRUARY 19, 2013 minutes submitted by Carla Rogers. Seconded by Paul Briggs. Motion passes via voce

3. Reports
   A. CCAAC - (Kathleen French)
      1. CCAAC Approved Curriculum from February 26, 2013
         - CoC in Plant-Food Production and Technology
         - Course Modification: ANSC 263
         - Motion to approve both curriculum proposals by Floyd McCoy; seconded by Paul Briggs. Motion passes via voce

   B. ACCFSC/CCCCFSC (Paul Briggs)
      CCCCSC:
      2. 2013 Legislature Update
         a. Things have not changed a whole lot; there is severe criticism from the Senate regarding UH autonomy.
            i. The HI State Legislature recommends a BOR training session on ethics.
            ii. John Morton feels we are still early in the legislative season. Four legislative bills are still alive; a few have died.
            iii. Tuition going into general fund has died; students testified against it.

      3. Accreditation Action Planning
         a. Results were received in January 2013
         b. UHCC System will put together a grid of similar recommendations to be shared with all of the campuses.
         c. John Morton feels that the recommendations are concrete and manageable and can be met by the October 15 deadline.

      4. Proctoring Exams for Distance Learning Courses – Gigi Drent
         a. Some instructors are not proctoring their distance learning exams.
            i. Some instructors did not need a password to log into their courses.
            ii. Issue with Laulima: other students can access the course; testing is not secure.
iii. Discussion re: lock down browsers. Cannot get out of it and do anything else.
iv. Needs to be some sort of quality control-system-wide policy.

5. UHCC Policy: Teaching Equivalencies Draft
a. Latest system draft on Teaching Equivalencies in UHCC System. It’s an UHPA thing; doesn’t go through FS. Letty Colmenares was one of the main architects and is on the UHPA board. Jan Lubin will send FS the link to the draft.
   i. Primarily impacting Natural Sciences, Art, Coop-Ed.
   ii. Goes into effect next academic year.
   iii. Course by course, add up to 27 credits, if over that, then overload, if under, need to talk to faculty member about what else they can do.
   ▪ Non-teaching and teaching equivalencies add up to 27.
   ▪ Assigned time will now be called Nonteaching Equivalencies.

a. LCC: General Education Board controls Foundations only. All standing committees must have a senator as a chair.
   i. Thinking of having these standing committees under Curriculum.

b. HCC: Gen Ed Board oversees the other boards. Reports are done for information level. CPC (Curriculum Committee) is ultimate arbiter of that course.
   i. Goes through Boards first, and then CPC for final approval.
   ii. Avoid getting courses without final approval.

b. KCC: Standing Committees meet once a month. Foundations and Designations are one board. Curriculum Central as part of the review process. Best not to have these as standing committees.
   i. From Standing Committee, it goes to Curriculum (rubber stamp/signature by Curriculum Chair, then it goes to Faculty Senate.

d. Gen Ed Board: oversight of general education requirements.

e. The other schools feel that it is best to not have these as standing committees, must have qualified people, not minimum quotas of participants.

f. Wrestle with question, cross discipline and cross department group what is the quality of our general educational requirements.
   i. Gen Educational Board-right now it is just piecemeal, not the whole forest. Assessing Gen Ed, how many students are completing it, is it college level?

7. Common Course Numbering 80% Definition – Paul Briggs
a. John Morton is moving ahead to adopt common course numbering at the CC level. Have own internal support. Wants to stay away from 80% definition and SLOs.

b. LCC was good when it was just alpha and number, and where are the results up to this point. Why not just focus on this and not include things like SLOs.

c. What do we mean by 80%? There are certain core of SLOs that need to be common for it to be the same course. Otherwise, it would be a different course.
   i. Differs from discipline to discipline.
   ii. Stay away from percentages.

d. For the CC policy, will not limit it to Foundations.
   i. Get at career and technical distinctions between the campuses.
   ▪ CTE issues.
   ii. Work it around the seven campuses.
   iii. Try to write out a policy, not use an arbitrary percentage.
iv. Courses that have the same number have the same requirements throughout the system.

v. Negotiate with UHM one-to-one, not seven-to-one.

ACCFSC

1. **Curriculum Central** is exploring possibility of Kuali curriculum management with Curriculum Central; gathering information,
   a. Friday, March 15, 2013 meeting about this in Bachman 113. Curriculum Central administrator, faculty senate, and curriculum people.
   b. Commitment to hire a FT person to manage curriculum central from UH System. Server is in ITS. Transfer of data will be a part of this.
   c. Hope that Banner is integrated in this new system.
   d. For the time being, continue work with Curriculum Central.

2. **Legislative bills reducing UH Autonomy**
   a. Stephanie Kim, UH Director of Government Relations, will come to our next meeting. Six bills could impact UH autonomy. These bills get morphed into other bills.

3. **Should we add Quantitative Reasoning along with Symbolic Reasoning to graduation requirements?**
   a. UHM has this symbolic reasoning requirement. Students do not have to take MATH 100; can take PHIL 110 instead.
   b. Much discussion amongst the CCs as to the various math requirements.
   c. Some students are not getting through college because of the math requirement, which is a skills problem, not a GE problem.

C. **ACADEMIC POLICIES (Patti Chong)**

1. **UHCC Faculty Subgroup on Academic Policy**
   a) **Common Course Alpha/Title/Core Designation**: Resolution distributed. Cheryl Chappell-Long will create policy draft. Paul reported that UHM FS passed a resolution a year ago including alpha, core designations, etc. Patti reported some resistance to common SLOs; campuses seem to want to maintain their own SLOs. The contents (alpha/number, title, credit hours, placement scores/prereq, SLOs, and core designation) of the draft are included in resolution that was circulated to the FS. Core designation was added at the meeting. Please take this to your department to discuss. WCC FS should decide what part of the content we would like to support. UHCC FS will review the policy draft.

   b) **Pre-Requisite for Classes Identified as Writing Intensive**. Draft distributed. This is a draft of a policy for the UHCCs. It will standardize the WI prerequisite of “ENG 100 with a ‘C’ or higher.” This will match the WCC draft policy that began in Fall 2012. Sarah Hadmack, as the current WCC WI Board chair, will update the memo drafted by Brian Richardadson/Robert Barclay, to require that all WI courses require a “C” or better in ENG 100. Prior to this memo, only English WI classes required the “C” or higher prerequisite. Other WI classes only required that the student pass ENG 100.

   c) **Satisfactory Academic Status**: Draft distributed. Will apply to degree seeking students at their home campus. The 67% completion rate of the total credits attempted for that term is based on financial aid requirements. Please note that the draft policy is more stringent that the FA policy because the draft policy states 67% of the total credits attempted for that term, not the cumulative terms that the student has been receiving financial aid.

   d) **Academic Forgiveness Policy**: Common Elements distributed. Will create a draft based on what is agreed upon. WCC FS should take to their
departments to discuss what common elements they would like included in the policy. What elements we should keep those we should omit.

e) Numbering Convention: A draft of a policy will be created to address the numbering convention that is in place already. The numbers ending with -97/-98 will be used for experimental courses, -93 will be used for Cooperative Education, and -99 will be used for Special/Independent Study courses.

4. Old Business

A. Frosh Cohort Discussion Board Update (Carla): Lively online discussion ended on 3/7/13. Natural Sciences posted concerns that have been addressed. Another comment suggested making Frosh Cohorts a memo instead of a policy. Carla clarified that the proposed policy is based on 7 years of data demonstrating that Frosh Cohorts work. To be successfully implemented, frosh cohorts require block scheduling which is one reason a campus policy is crucial, the suggestion was made to include block scheduling as part of the policy. The next step is to clean up policy and present it to Faculty Senate. Fall 2013 Frosh Cohorts: BOT 130, SP 151, HSWT 107 (2 sections), HAW 101 (2 sections), PSY 100, ART 101, and ICS 100. Kathleen asked how students were previously placed into cohorts. Carla explained that students were encouraged by counselors to enroll in cohort classes although it was not mandatory. To add to the critical nature of assisting our students, the Graduation Rates for the Fall 2009 cohort (students enrolled prior to Frosh Cohorts being available) have just been published: WCC Transfer Out rate rose from 25% to 28%; Persistence Rate (still enrolled after 150% normal time to completion) dropped from 23% to 19%; and the Graduation Rate dropped from 10% to 5% (now the lowest in the CC system).

B. Assessment of SLOs in Faculty Evaluation: Jan Lubin stated that the assessment of SLOs in faculty evaluation is one of the five System Recommendations from the System Team visit in October 2012. According to VP of CC, John Morton, we are already looking at the assessment of SLOs in our faculty evaluation process. This will be extended to Post-Tenure Review and Evaluation of Lecturers. Kathleen asked whether or not this was referring to the process or the actual assessment, and Jan said that at Windward it was referring to the process, but that Dr. Morton was going to qualify this further because it is unclear, and you get different answers when you talk to ACCJC personnel.

5. New Business

6. The meeting was adjourned at 2:08 pm

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Minutes submitted by: Heipua Kaʻōpua
Recording Chair