Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
Palanakila 117  
11/20  12:40pm-1:20pm  

Present:  Jean Shibuya, Libby Young (Off-Campus Chair), David Ringuette (Presiding Chair), Paul Briggs (Recording Chair), Tara Severns, Letty Colmenares, Mari Nakamura, Emi Troeger, Winston Kong, Ron Loo, Ellen Nagaue, Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Toshi Ikagawa  

Not Present:  Ryan Perreira  

Guest:  Jean Okumura, Patti Chong  

1. Approval of Minutes  
a. Minutes approved with corrections 11-6-07  
   i.  Motion-Ellen, Second by Ron Loo.  

2. CCAAC Report (Handout 1)  
a. CCAAC courses approved for 11-20-07  
   i.  Motion-Emi, Second by Ellen  

3. HAP Articulation Vote  
a. Motion-To accept the HAP Articulation Agreement (Handout 2)  
   i.  Motion-Ellen, Second by Emi  
   ii.  Motion accepted unanimously.  

4. Tracking of Curriculum changes Discussion  
a. A suggestion was made to try to make a tracking mechanism for curriculum changes as a course makes its way to the WCC Catalog.  
   i.  Kim Kiyono has a log of the curriculum changes from CCAAC to the catalog.  A suggestion was made that Kim can make this log available on the WCC website to make the process more transparent.  

5. Class Schedule Resolution Discussion (Handout 3)  
a. Discussion ensued among the Faculty Senate to make the following changes to the Class Schedule Resolution.  
   i.  Stipulation 1: change can to will be accommodated.  
   ii.  There will be an annual evaluation but final determination at end of the 3rd year.  The evaluation could be done by the Institutional Researcher.  
   iii.  Stipulation 2: may be good to have a deadline (1 to 1.5 weeks before start of class to call the students and set aside time with a counselor) with regard to careful consideration.  The term careful consideration is a bit too vague.
iv. Toshi will make a revised resolution for vote at the next FS meeting.

6. DC workload Resolution Discussion
   a. The discussion will be on hold until the next Faculty Senate meeting.

7. Libby Report (Handout 4 and 5)
   a. The off-campus report is included in Handout 4.
   b. Executive Policy-Department/Division Chairpersons (E9.214-Handout 5)
      i. Libby wants comment and feedback from the Faculty Senate on this.
         1. The Faculty Senate generally commented that while the roles and responsibilities of the DCs have expanded their renumeration has not.
         2. Faculty Senators should get comment from their departments on this Executive Policy.

8. Meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm
To: Faculty Senate
From Jean Shibuya, Credit Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee Chair

The CCAAC met on November 13 acted upon the following items.

1. Approved the course modification in prerequisites or co-requisites for BIOL 171 General Biology I (3 credits)
2. Approved the course modification in prerequisites or co-requisites for BIOL 171L General Biology Lab I (1 credit)
3. Approved the new course proposal for Economics 120 Introduction to Economics (3 credits)
4. Approved the course modification in prerequisites or co-requisites for PHRM 203-General Pharmacology (3 credits).

Please bring these items before the Faculty Senate for further action.
Two different procedures govern the articulation of courses to meet the Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues (HAP) General Education requirement at the following campuses of the University of Hawai‘i: Honolulu, Kapi‘olani, Leeward, Mānoa, and West O‘ahu.

A. Procedures for articulation involving UH campuses with a HAP program that has been approved by the systemwide HAP committee. The approval criteria for HAP programs and application procedures are explained in section A.1

B. Procedures for articulation involving UH campuses that do not have an approved HAP program.

A. Articulation Involving Campuses With an Approved Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Program

A1. Overview. Campuses that have an approved Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues (HAP) program will have the authority to review their own courses for the HAP designation. Campus requests to have its HAP program approved will be submitted to a systemwide HAP committee for consideration. Recommendations made by the systemwide committee are subject to approval by the receiving campus(es). Once a campus’s HAP program is fully approved, its students’ HAP courses can be readily transferred to other UH campuses that have approved HAP programs.

A2. Approval criteria for a Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues program. The systemwide HAP committee evaluates campus proposals for a HAP program using the following criteria:

1. appropriate campus HAP support, including
   a. official establishment of a HAP Faculty Board
   b. adequate number of faculty willing to offer HAP courses
   c. support personnel to accurately record HAP sections in the student registration system (Banner)
   d. adequate number of HAP sections to meet student needs
   e. adequate budget

2. designation of classes as HAP using HAP Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes (see Appendix)

3. appropriate HAP designation and review procedures

4. appropriate assessment of HAP student learning outcomes, as required by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges or Senior Colleges and Universities.

5. appropriate faculty development activities in understanding the HAP Hallmarks.

6. timely and accurate student advising on HAP requirements and/or the transfer of HAP credits

A3. HAP program—approval process. To have a HAP program approved, each proposing campus will submit, through the UH Mānoa Office of Undergraduate Education, evidence that the above criteria

1 A UH campus may apply to have its HAP program approved by the systemwide HAP committee regardless of whether the campus has a Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues (HAP) requirement for a degree program.
have been met. The collection of evidence should contain no more than ten pages of text. The following items are required:

1. **Support.**
   
   a. Statements from the Chief Academic Officer and Faculty Senate President on the adequacy of campus support for the HAP program.
   
   b. Documentation of the official establishment of a campus HAP Faculty Board that will approve HAP designations.
   
   c. Brief description of
      
      i. the extent to which faculty show a willingness to serve on a HAP Faculty Board and to teach HAP classes,
      
      ii. the campus’s ability to meet student demand for HAP classes, and
      
      iii. the staff who will record HAP classes correctly in the student registration system (Banner).

2. **Course designation and approval.**
   
   a. Description of the HAP course proposal review and designation procedures.
   
   b. Recommended: Copies of the campus’s actual HAP proposal form used to designate courses (or a draft of a HAP proposal form).
   
   c. Statements regarding
      
      i. what the HAP designation will be attached to (i.e., section, course, instructor, or some combination thereof);
      
      ii. the duration of the HAP designation;
      
      iii. number of members on the campus’s HAP Faculty Board, length of their service, and board composition;
      
      iv. the voting process to grant HAP approval (i.e., majority rule, consensus).

3. **Assessment.**
   
   a. Statement that the campus will agree to accept the HAP systemwide committee’s set of HAP student learning outcomes and participate in any revisions.
   
   b. Campuses whose WASC guidelines mandate that they assess the HAP requirement should include a statement of intent to create an assessment plan.

**A4. Systemwide committee membership.** A systemwide committee will consist of the chairpersons of the HAP boards on each campus that has an approved HAP program. (Note: The initial systemwide committee will consist of a representative from each campus that is pursuing approval for its HAP program.)

**A5. Annual program review by systemwide committee.** An annual systemwide meeting will take place. Campuses are expected to improve their HAP programs. So that evolving HAP programs remain in compliance with the approval criteria, annual HAP program review will be conducted by each campus and annual re-articulation by the systemwide committee will take place.
B. Articulation for UH Campuses That do not Have an Approved HAP Program

UH campuses that do not have a HAP program approved by the systemwide HAP committee are subject to the articulation requirements of the receiving UH campus. The receiving campus determines the information required for the HAP articulation. Campuses that do not have an approved HAP program should contact the receiving campus for information about its HAP articulation process. Governing procedures are spelled out in UH Executive Policy 5.209.

The following parties agree to the form and content of this memorandum.

Faculty Senate Chair

Campus Administrative Officer
Appendix: Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes

The Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes are used to designate a class as an official Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Issues (HAP) class.

**Hallmarks**
At least two-thirds of a class must satisfy the following Hallmarks:

1. The content should reflect the intersection of Asian and/or Pacific Island cultures with Native Hawaiian culture.
2. A course can use any disciplinary or multi-disciplinary approach provided that a component of the course uses assignments or practica that encourage learning that comes from the cultural perspectives, values, and world views rooted in the experience of peoples indigenous to Hawai‘i, the Pacific, and Asia.
3. A course should include at least one topic that is crucial to an understanding of the histories, or cultures, or beliefs, or the arts, or the societal, or political, or economic, or technological processes of these regions; for example, the relationships of societal structures to the natural environment.
4. A course should involve an in-depth analysis or understanding of the issues being studied in the hope of fostering multi-cultural respect and understanding.

**Explanatory Notes**
The concept of intersection of Native Hawaiian culture with either or both of the other two regions is key. A course exclusively about Hawai‘i, the Pacific Islands, or Asia is not eligible for the HAP designation. A course that does not include relationships with Native Hawaiian Culture is not eligible for the HAP designation.

The course design must include both the Native Hawaiian voice and the native voice from the indigenous people of the area of intersection. These could be represented through publications, videos, guest speakers, or field trips, for example.
A Resolution to Modify the WCC Class Schedule to a MW 75-minute format

HANDOUT THREE

Whereas, a WCC student survey in Spring 2006 demonstrated that a majority of WCC students prefer the 75-minute format for MW classes;

Whereas, a WCC faculty survey that followed in Fall 2006 also strongly supported the MW 75-minute format;

Whereas, there is evident consensus on campus that class scheduling should primarily be for the benefit of students and student learning;

Be it resolved, that WCC will adopt the MW 75-minute format for a trial period of 3 years;

Be it resolved, also, that if the adopted MW 75-minute format is considered to be successful at the end of the trial period (see stipulation 3 below), WCC will then permanently adopt the MW 75-minute format.

Stipulations:

1. Instructors who prefer MWF, MTWRF, or another format can be accommodated.

2. At the beginning of the trial period, classes moved to later time slots that are not typical at the WCC campus (e.g., later in the afternoon) should be given assurance that those sections will not be cancelled without careful consideration, because it may take time to build enrollment in the new time slots.

3. The WCC Faculty Senate will conduct surveys toward the end of the trial period (probably during the third year) to evaluate students, faculty, and staff satisfaction with the implemented MW 75-minute format.

Submitted by WCC Social Science Department
October 26, 2007
From President David McClain:

**Faculty housing** - The University of Hawaii is looking at ways to help faculty with the rising cost of housing — especially as a factor in recruitment and retention. Among the suggestions: have the UH Foundation be the guarantor of a loan up to a certain amount (requires a change in current law); build more faculty housing; have UH be a landlord for condominiums designated for faculty. Issues include who should have priority (new hires or retention of current faculty), tenure or non-tenure track people, other criteria for selection, etc.

**Consultation/discussion with Faculty Senates** – The ACCFSC’s governance committee will look at developing a formal procedure that will allow the UH president to consult with the faculty senates on matters that require input. The committee will examine various governance models, including those in California, and report back at the January meeting.

The catalyst for this was a September resolution from UH system faculty senate presidents to President McClain and the regents objecting to the passage of the University Affiliated Research Laboratory (UARL) attached to the UH system rather than just to UH-Manoa. The ACCFSC objected to what they felt was a lack of consultation with faculty on this revised proposal. President McClain responded that he felt there had been adequate consultation as the original proposal had been referred to individual campus senates for reaction and input.

**Update on increased funding for the UH-Manoa libraries** - According to the president, this funding is in the top tier of the UH-Manoa campus supplementary budget request.

ACCFSC AGENDA

I. Standing Committee Reports
   a. Distance Learning – No report
   b. Articulation – At an Oct. 31 meeting, it was reported the renumbering of some voc-tech courses to 100-level was affecting the financial aid of some students, who were limited in the number of courses they could take above or below the 100-level and still receive financial aid.

       Also, differing GenEd designations among UH campuses is causing some confusion for students. It was emphasized that when discipline groups meet, they need to include Manoa representatives.

   c. Budget – No report
   d. Business Process – Meeting set for Nov. 29
   e. CCCFSC report – The faculty classification plan for community colleges was approved at the November 15 UH Board of Regents meeting. Campus faculty senate chairs also met with representatives from the ACCJC accrediting team. There seemed to be a consensus among the chairs that the current system with
a vice president for community colleges is an improvement as well as the dual reporting system (to both President McClain and VP Morton) for the chancellors.

The chairs asked whether a Regents sub-committee for the community colleges is still active, and the ACCJC representatives said they would follow up.

f. Governance – Barbara Leonard from UH-Hilo circulated copies of “Traits of Effective (Faculty) Senates” from the American Association of University Professors and asked that we gather input from campuses.

II. Continuing Business
a. Division/ Department Chairs Executive Policy – A revised version will be sent to faculty senates for input by **December 5**. (Libby will forward when it is received).

III. New Business
a. HAP Articulation agreement – UH-Hilo sent a suggestion for revision to replace all references to “systemwide HAP committee” with “UH-Manoa HAP committee” since UH-Hilo has its own requirements in these areas. WCC and other campuses can sign at a future date.

**CCFSC AGENDA**

I. **HAP articulation** - See above under “New Business.”

II. **11-month CC faculty workload** – Apparently only an issue at Kapiolani CC where 11-month faculty (including department chairs) are being asked to convert to 9-month.

III. **Role of CC Council of Faculty Senate Chairs** – CCCFSC chair Harry Davis requested copies of campus senate charters be forwarded to him to clarify the roles and authority of individual senates and the CCCFSC as a whole. He shared a document on administrative consultation he drafted for the Kapiolani Faculty Senate to clarify lines of communication when senate input is needed on issues. (Libby will share with WCC Faculty Senate for feedback to Harry by Jan. 11 meeting).

IV. **ACCJC/WASC visit** – VP John Morton said the report for the CC system should come in the next three weeks. Overall, he said the exit interview with his office was positive and that the team saw progress on the previous recommendations.

VP Morton expressed some concern that the terms of five current UH regents will end in June and new appointments will be made between March and July. He anticipates much educating will need to be done on community college issues.

V. **What’s on your Mind?**
   Campus reorganization – VP Morton reiterated that campus reorganizations do not have to have Board of Regents approval, unless they involve adding major new units or if the reorg undoes a previous BOR action or if it incurs a major additional administrative cost.
Libby asked a question based on an inquiry from a WCC faculty member on standard practice and confidentiality of faculty course evaluations filled out by students at the end of the semester. The question was whether it was the prerogative of the dean of instruction to review the student evaluations before the instructor sees them.

VP Morton said the standard practice is that the instructor sees them first, then summarizes them for contract renewal and tenure and promotion purposes.
I. Introduction

This executive policy implements Board of Regents Policy 9-1a (3) and (4) by (a) describing the duties and responsibilities, criteria, selection process, reporting line, and compensation approval levels of department/division chairpersons, and (b) describing the appointment of program directors and chairs of academic subdivisions.

II. Objectives

The purposes of this policy are to: (a) delineate the duties and responsibilities of department/division chairpersons, (b) establish the criteria for department/division chairpersons, (c) provide guidelines for approving compensation for department/division chairpersons, and (d) provide for the appointment of program directors and chairs of academic subdivisions.

III. Policy Guidelines

A. Department/Division Chairpersons

1. Duties and responsibilities: The department/division chairpersons shall be responsible for the following functions and other related duties and responsibilities as may be assigned as they apply to department/divisions:

   a. Engage the department/division in developing a strategic vision for future program planning;

   b. Represent the program to the public and prospective students;
c. Provide a quality academic program with demonstrated support for student success based on available resources;
d. Schedule courses and appropriate support for courses required by the curricula;
e. Assign courses and ensure proper balance and distribution of workload;
f. Assist students, faculty, and staff with course registration, tracking of course enrollment, and determination of appropriate number of sections offered;
g. Facilitate internal and external communication;
h. Prepare the department/division budget;
i. Monitor expenditure of funds allocated to the department/division and ensure the proper management of department budget within annual planning guidelines;
j. Recommend reappointments and appointments to vacant positions;
k. Provide for new faculty orientation;
l. Complete an independent assessment on tenure and promotion applications, contract renewal decisions, and evaluations of lecturers;
m. Ensure continuing evaluation of all faculty is conducted effectively;
n. Ensure that program reviews are completed in a timely manner;
o. Maintain accreditation standards with particular attention to educational effectiveness and program learning outcomes;
p. Ensure proper advising for students in their program(s);
q. Ensure proper processes are followed to resolve disputes between faculty and students;
r. Prepare annual reports;
s. Implement University rules on overloads, additional, and outside compensation;
t. Provide effective supervision of support staff, as appropriate;
u. Oversee the direction of graduate programs, where applicable;
v. Foster improvement of instruction and encouragement of scholarly activities;
w. Advise faculty regarding professional development; and
x. Mentor faculty regarding their roles and responsibilities in teaching, scholarship, and service.

A letter of appointment from the Dean/Director or Vice Chancellor/Dean of Instruction to the department/division chairpersons will outline the specific duties and responsibilities and form the basis of evaluation.

2. Reporting

The department/division chairpersons report to a Dean/Director, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Dean of Instruction, as appropriate.

B. Program Directors and Chairs of Academic Subdivisions

1. Faculty personnel may be assigned extra administrative duties and responsibilities by a Dean, Director, or Vice Chancellor/Dean of Instruction, wherein the administrative function is not primary or not permanent. The assignment is renewed annually.

2. The program directors and chairs of academic subdivisions report to a Dean/Director, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Dean of Instruction, as appropriate.

C. Criteria for Department/Division Chairpersons or Program Chairs and Selection Process

See UHPA contract 2003-2009, Article XXIII, sections A, B, C.

D. Compensation (adopted from A9.235 Administrative stipends for department chairs, special program directors and chairs of academic subdivisions)

1. Faculty personnel appointed to serve as department/division chairpersons may receive additional compensation in the form of released time from regular faculty responsibilities and/or change from 9- to 11-month appointments, and a monthly stipend which shall not be less than $100 per month. The specific amount of the stipend is determined by the size and complexity of the
department/division and nature of the administrative duties as determined by the Dean/Director or Vice Chancellor/Dean of Instruction.

2. The Dean/Director or Vice Chancellor/Dean of Instruction may approve specific stipends as follows:
   
a. Administrative stipends up to $300 per month may be paid to chairs, directors, or other administrators of departments or programs of moderate size, scope, and complexity.

b. Administrative stipends up to $400 per month may be paid to chairs, directors, or other administrators of departments or programs of considerable size, scope, and complexity.

c. Administrative stipends up to $500 per month may be paid to chairs, directors, or other administrators of departments or programs of extensive size, scope, and complexity.

3. Administrative stipends exceeding $500 but less than $1000 per month may be paid to chairs, directors, or other administrators of departments or programs upon approval of the appropriate Chancellor. Stipends exceeding $1000 may be granted under unusual circumstances with the approval of the Chancellor.

4. Released time may be granted by the Chancellor or designee for workload related to administrative responsibilities.

11/19/07