Senators Present:

KALAWAIA MOORE (PRESIDING CHAIR)
DAVE KRUPP (OFF-CAMPUS CHAIR)
JENNY WEBSTER (RECORDING CHAIR)
Deacon Hanson (Math/Business)
Ellen Nagaue (Academic Support)
Floyd McCoy (Natural Sciences)
Jane Uyetake (OCCE)
Jenny Webster (Language Arts)
Kaʻala Carmack (Humanities)
Kathleen French (CC Chair) Ex-Officio
Kathleen French (Social Sciences)
Lisa Gillis-Davis (Student Affairs)

Senators Absent: none

Guests Present:
Janine Oshiro, Desi Poteet, Libby Young, Robert Barclay, Jan Lubin, Toni Martin, Frank Palacat, Kalani Meinecke and Ross Langston

1. Called to Order: 1:05 pm

2. Approval of 5/6/14 Minutes

Motion to approve the May 6th, 2014 minutes submitted by Jenny Webster; seconded by Dave Krupp. Motion passed via voce.

3. Approval of 9/2/14 Minutes

Motion to approve the September 2nd, 2014 minutes submitted by Kathleen French; seconded by Jenny Webster. Motion passed via voce.

4. Reports

A. ACCFSC/CCCFSC Dave Krupp’s Faculty Senate report on the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) Retreat September 5, 2014. For details on report, see attachment.

B. Curriculum Committee – Kathleen French reported that the Curriculum Committee unanimously passed a Resolution of sorts regarding the incredible amount of work that Brian Richardson has done for our committee as the appointed representative of curriculum from the Office of Academic Affairs:

"Brian Richardson, as the appointed representative from the Office of Academic Affairs, has been an effective liaison between the committee and the administration who performed key administrative functions, including the development of a new curriculum process, and demonstrated keen facility with both policy and technology. He is to be commended for his achievements in support of the curriculum at Windward CC."

Kathleen also reported that ANTH 152, Culture and Humanity (this proposal was approved, but
will only be offered when it receives its Foundations designation so that it aligns with other ANTH 152 courses in the system).

Kathleen also reported that there are six courses proposed to be modified to comply with the system policy of common course numbering.

Motion to approve modifications submitted by Floyd McCoy; seconded by Jenny Webster. Motion passed via voce.

C. Hawaiian Asian Pacific Board – no representative was present for a report and it was noted that the last representative has resigned; thus, we need a new humanities representative for the board along with a new social sciences or math and business representative. Senators in humanities, social sciences and math and business will bring this issue to their departments and ask for a volunteer to serve on this board.

D. Writing Advisory Board – Dave announced that the first meeting is this afternoon.

E. Aloha Committee – no representative was present for a report

F. Foundations Board – no representative was present for a report

G. Old Business
   a. Jan Lubin reported that she got feedback from Language Arts to create an index for the Accreditation Follow-up Report, but that she is awaiting recommendations and approval from faculty senate.

Motion to approve the Follow-up Report was submitted by Floyd McCoy; seconded by Dave. There was one abstention by Kathleen French that it might be too late to offer any suggestions on the current report.

b. It was suggested that faculty senate put together a working committee to evaluate the follow-up reports in the future. Dave Krupp, Kalawaia Moore and Jenny Webster volunteered to read the Follow-up report, create a summary for the rest of faculty senate and respond to Jan Lubin before Friday.

c. It was noted that meeting was running over schedule and that we should move issues on the agenda and extend the meeting to hear our guests out. Motion made by Kathleen; seconded by Kaʻala Carmack and Motion passed via voce.

d. The issue of the removal of Brian Richardson, Dean of Division II
   Kalawaia reported on the meeting between the chairs and Chancellor Doug Dykstra on 9/2/14.

The chancellor was presented with the following questions:

1. Is it possible to clarify the process by which administrators are evaluated, and to establish a communication procedure that facilitates expanded faculty/staff and student feedback as an early step in the disciplinary process?
2. Given the recent outpouring of public support for Dr. Richardson, may we have a more detailed statement on processes that led to his firing?
3. Is it possible to reconsider Brian Richardson’s termination, or to find him an alternative position on
Also, it was suggested also that we ask whether Brian had options to correct any deficiencies.

[Answer to #1 and #2]

Doug wanted to make it clear that this was not a disciplinary process. Doug stated that all administrators serve at the discretion of their supervisors. He also pointed out that should Brian choose to discuss the circumstance of his termination, he is the only one who can do so. Doug is not at liberty to have a discussion on the details of Brian’s termination.

Regarding the 360 evaluations:

Doug wanted to make clear that he has attempted to make his utilization of the 360 evaluations better in two ways:

First, each manager has to have all the people under them in the pot to review them, and they can pick up to ten people outside of their managerial area to conduct a review.

Second, because the 360 review is on a scale of 1-7, a new rule was established that have made it mandatory for reviewers to justify which facet of leadership is in question should they rate a subordinate as 2 or less. According to Doug, this has given new insight into why a subordinate is being given a low score.

Doug did say that, although he doesn’t have to, it’s not his style to let go of a subordinate without a discussion of work performance and an opportunity to improve.

[Answer to #3]

Doug also made it clear that Brian will not be rehired, for he does not have retreat rights to another position. Because there will be an empty space left where Brian worked as a non official web developer, while web developer hasn’t been at the top of PBC, the chancellor is seriously considering moving college web developer further up the PBC pipeline because it will be a great school need.

The following concerns regarding the Division II Dean hiring committee were also brought to the chancellor:

First, we asked how the Division II Dean hiring committee was created specifically because there appeared to be a lack (less than 50%) of members from Division II represented, and of those represented, there seemed to be a lack of teaching faculty.

Secondly, we raised the senate’s concern that the Vice Chancellor’s hiring committee and the Division II Dean hiring committee appeared to have the same chair.

In response to these questions concerning the composition of the dean’s hiring committee questions, Doug responded that a rep from every department was chosen, that finding reps from each department wasn’t easy, especially since teaching staff has so little availability, and he made it clear that Letty had not previously chaired the Vice Chancellor’s hiring committee and that Letty had been chosen because
the new Division II Dean would be her boss and, thus, she could cast a tie breaking vote in case it occurred.

At the time of the meeting, Chancellor Dykstra said he would speak to Letty about possibly adding one more teaching faculty from Division II to the hiring committee.

**On 9/4/14, the chairs of Faculty Senate received this message from Doug:**

> After an extensive discussion with Dr. Letty Colmenares, Chair of the Dean of Division II Screening Committee we have decided to keep the current composition of the committee in place. We gave full consideration to the concerns expressed by the Faculty Senate as we understand them. In our discussion we noted that representation of Division II constitutes a plurality on the committee (Colmenares; Palacat; Craddock; Kong; Sue). We also noted that instructional faculty equally balances with non-instructional faculty, and we consider this an appropriate balance given that Division II includes no non-instructional faculty at all as members of the Division. We also noted that Division II representatives out-number Division I representatives by 5-3. Finally we noted that other members of the committee are taken one apiece from each of the other divisions of the college (Admin.Svces.; Student Affairs; and OCCE). In light of the foregoing and because re-composition of the committee at this late date will delay its deliberations we have made a decision to maintain its current composition.

**Kalawaia opened the floor to all to comment on the notes presented to the faculty. The following are a selection of the comments made by faculty senate as well as guests. The comments cannot be presumed to be the opinion of all faculty senate members.**

- It was noted that the mandatory comment that must be added to scores of 2 or less may lead to negative comments tending to appear negative heavy. It was noted that there is no place on the 360 report to address positive reviews.

- It was also discussed that there appears to be overlap on the two hiring committees and that Doug’s response to this concern is unsatisfactory.

- A question was proposed regarding why there appears to be no arrangements made for the transition after Dean Richardson’s termination. It appears that the original plan was for Brian to be on campus until December to assist with the transition and there is a “sizable hole” left in his absence. It was noted that we should ask Doug about his meeting with the off-campus chairs.

- There was a concern stated that Doug underestimated how much people depended on Brian and that the removal of Brian was a political move to quell peoples’ questions. It was reported that, in contrast, it has done the reverse and effected morale and curriculum by means that without Brian curriculum changes and grants cannot go through.

- We request that the admin appreciates the importance of trust and transparency

- There appears lots of room for change in the 360 and a question was proposed as to whether it is time for a system-wide examination of the effectiveness of the 360. Additionally, a question
was posed as to why there appeared no room for negotiation regarding Brian’s future and the Division Dean II hiring committee.

- It was reported that there is rumor that at the academic affairs level, decisions appear to have been made arbitrarily or precipitously in concern to Brian Richardson’s removal. It was also brought the senate’s attention that there were possible violations of policy that led to unfair or unbalanced evaluations of Brian; his sudden and somewhat hidden firing; and his sudden removal from campus.

- It was also proposed that the faculty needs to give Doug and other members of admin (including Ardis and Ellen) the opportunity to rebuild faith with the faculty and staff who have been disturbed by the process of Brian’s firing and the suddenness of his removal.

- It has been proposed that we create an anonymous discussion board to allow faculty and staff to voice their opinions on the issue of Brian and his removal. However, upon reflection it was noted that that this was a concern because it could open up the discussion to some really unpleasant things and that individuals outside of campus could see the discussion.

- It was proposed to the senate that perhaps Faculty Senate could work to gather questions and comments from the faculty, distill them into some organized forum and then bring them to Doug. It was then agreed that all senators bring the issue back to their departments and solicit concerns and questions so that the chairs can bring these to Doug. It was suggested that senators could accept anonymous written questions.

- It was also discussed that if Brian were to share consecutive years of 360s, then perhaps they would be willing to push for more answers.

- The following question was posed: Why don’t the opinions of people outside of his division matter when his assignment went outside of division II.

- It was, likewise, noted that the Division II Dean position was moving faster than a transition has been made. Also that Division Dean II position has leapt in front of other positions that have been empty for longer and have had no move made on them.

- Finally, it was agreed that senators will go back to their departments, accept written responses (positive or negative) on the following items:

  - The dismissal of Brian
  - The sudden removal from campus without explanation or plan
  - If this has been planned since June, was there a plan? If not, why not?
  - How might we improve the process of evaluating and firing administrators?

- It has also been noted that Doug’s leadership has been much welcomed and appreciated and that many want to believe in the rightness of this decision and that administrators have been fair and just and wise. Nevertheless, one guest reported that she was told directly not to get involved with this and not to say anything because it is politically dangerous. She further suggested that it’s likely that many people on campus feel the same way.

- There was a question posed as to whether student input should be solicited regarding the issues surrounding Dean Richardson’s dismissal; however, as a group, we decided to begin with faculty
and staff concerns and not to open it up to students.

Motion made to adjourn the meeting by Floyd; seconded by Ka‘ala and Motion passed via voce.

The following agenda items were tabled until the next meeting:

- WCC evening curriculum
- The lack of drinking fountains in the Hale Manaleo and Hale Na‘auao
- College representation in social media
- The cancellation of under-enrolled classes

H. The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, 10.7.14

Attachment: Faculty Senate report on the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs Retreat 9.5.14.

Minutes submitted by: Jenny Webster
Recording Chair

Attachment: Dave Krupp’s Faculty Senate report on the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) Retreat September 5, 2014

- Attended by outgoing and incoming FS chairs from across the UH System
- UH President David Lassner made a presentation regarding the UH System Strategic Directions 2015-2021 (see Lassner’s PowerPoint for details, strategies and metrics)
  - Hawai‘i Graduation Initiative
    - Increase the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and completion of students, particularly Native Hawaiians, low-income students, and those from underserved regions and populations in preparation for the success of graduates in the workforce and their communities.
  - Hawai‘i Innovation Initiative
    - Create more high-quality jobs and diversify Hawai‘i’s economy by leading the development of a $1-billion innovation, research, education, and training enterprise that addresses the challenges and opportunities faced by Hawai‘i and the world.
  - 21st Century Facilities
    - Eliminate the University’s deferred maintenance backlog and modernize facilities and campus environments to be safe, sustainable and supportive of modern practices in teaching, learning and research.
  - High Performance System of Higher Education
    - Through cost-effective, transparent and accountable practices, provide our diverse student body throughout Hawai‘i with affordable access to the superb higher education experience in support of the full institutional mission of the University.
- Senator Jill Tokuda engaged the group about what faculty can do to improve the public (and legislative) perception of the University
- Main take-home advise: Faculty need to be vigorously engaged with the community. Useful if they are known and observed engaged by their respective legislators.

- I made a presentation summarizing the results of the Faculty Worklife Survey conducted in 2014.
  - Survey report is still in draft form – still awaiting final draft
  - Previous surveys may be accessed at [www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/opp/faculty/](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/opp/faculty/)
  - Information presented was used to provide a background for discussion ACCFSC priorities for the upcoming year

- ACCFSC Priorities
  - Faculty-UHPA-Admin relationships defined
  - Addressing morale and building collaborative relationships
  - Faculty governance
  - Need to understand each other’s mission and not go against each other – how we serve each other
  - Tenured faculty members less represented – decreasing portion of the faculty
  - Make clear our connections to the community and how our work contributes to the community
  - Need philosophical discussion about why we need a research institution
  - How improve legislative/public appreciation of the Manoa research profile?
  - Evaluate tenure/promotion process

- Election of ACCFSC Officers
  - UH 4-yr Co-Chair: Ron Bontekoe
  - UHCC Co-Chair: Dave Krupp
  - Secretary: Christine Beaule

- Post retreat sustainability tour of campus
  - Bioprocessing garden (Inge White)
  - Hale ‘Imiloa raingarden (Todd Cullinson, Hui O Koʻolaupoko)
  - Lower campus aquaculture (Leonard Young)

**UHCC Strategic Planning Council Meeting September 12, 2014**

- **UHCC Vice President John Morton discussed UHCC Strategic Directions for 2015-2021**
  - Aligned with UH System Strategic Directions
  - Presented data on enrollment, achievement (degrees, certificates, transfers)
  - Data and outcome metrics broken out by variety of factors
  - Defined outcomes, draft target metrics, and strategies for these outcomes by campus
    - Participation (enrollment)
      - Recent high school graduates
      - 25-49 year old working adults
      - GED recipients
      - Pacific Islanders (those already residing in Hawai’i)
      - Fall-to-fall persistence
    - “Performance Funded Outcomes”
      - Performance funding = $6 million of UHCC base budget
      - Our share of the pie depends upon meeting targets
      - Identified target metrics to be used
        - Degrees and Certificates Achievement (CA)
        - Awarded
        - Degrees and CA Awarded to Native Hawaiians
- Degrees and CA awarded in STEM
- Degrees and CA awarded to Pell Recipients
- Annual Transfers to UH 4-yr programs

- Performance weights still being discussed
- What happens to dollars when campuses don’t meet targets?
  - $ used for special projects as determined by VP John Morton
- Where does money go on our campus?
  - It is part of our base funding

- Other Outcomes (Non-Performance Funding)
  - Close the success gaps
    - Target populations: Native Hawaiian, Filipino, Pacific Islander and Pell Recipients
    - Outcomes focus: Graduation, UH 4-yr transfer and STEM graduation
  - Improve time to degree
  - Improve student readiness for college programs
  - Build a better workforce development system
  - Implement Papa o Ke Ao (Hawai‘i Foundations of Enlightenment/Knowledge)
  - Sustainability
  - Achieve 21st Century facilities
  - Develop effective distance learning and other modern pedagogies like flipped classrooms
  - Increase revenue from non-state and non-tuition sources
  - Improve efficiency and cost effectiveness

- Organizational Support Structures
  - Need to have inter-college involvement in moving the system to success on the plan
  - Need involvement from academic leadership, both management and faculty
  - See Morton’s PowerPoint on Organizational Structures
    - Student Success Committee: monitors strategic data, rec policy and monitor innovations
    - Outcome working groups addressing different topics form Student Success Committee: graduation, transfer, developmental education, distance education, Papa o Ke Ao, Achieving the Dream & Hawai‘i Strategy Institute and workforce
    - IR provides data to working groups and Student Success Committee

- Innovation Funding
  - Funds to support innovation projects geared towards achieving strategic plan objectives
  - $1.5 Million/year
  - Will support innovation group activities (see last slide)