

**LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE**  
**2010-2011 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

**APPROVED Minutes of the August 31, 2011 Meeting**

Paul Lococo, Chair  
Susan Lum, Vice Chair  
Melanie Van der Tuin, Secretary

**Senators Present:** Will Albritton, Paula Asamoto, Michael Bauer, Eunice Brekke, Eileen Cain, Candace Hochstein, Helmut Kae, Roy Kamida, Keith Knuuti, Eiko Kosasa, Michael Lane, Paul Lococo, Erin Loo, Tracie Losch, Susan Lum, David Millen, Kabi Neupane, Kay Ono, Blanca Polo, Tara Rojas, Natalia Schmidt, Michael Scully, Melanie Van der Tuin, Greg Walker

**Senators Absent:** Christian Ganne

**Guests:** Donna Matsumoto

**Additional Document Links:** [Meeting Agenda](#)

**I. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m., with a quorum.

**II. Faculty Senate Reports (Appointments)**

**A. Chair's Report (Appointments)**

Senate Chair Lococo put forth the appointment of Keith Knuuti as senator representing the contingent faculty/lecturers group. This is in accordance with the Faculty Senate ByLaws.

Appointment approved unanimously.

Chair Lococo recommended that senators try to avoid bringing up an issue for the first time and voting on it immediately--i.e., during that same meeting--if at all possible. He encouraged senators to present issues and documentation, then to discuss and vote at later meetings. Exceptions are for "emergency" or certain curriculum-related situations. Chair Lococo also stressed his desire to keep meetings informal and flexible; i.e., not to require senators to raise their hands, be formally recognized, formally identify themselves, etc.

**B. Standing Committees (Appointment of Chairs)**

Senate Chair Lococo asked the Faculty Senate to vote on the following appointments of Senate Standing Committee Chairs:

Academic/Institutional Support: Sen. Cain

Budget & Planning: Sen. Kamida

Elections: Sen. Albritton / Sen. Polo

Faculty: Sen. Ono

General Education: Sen. Hochstein / Sen. Millen

Program Review: Sen. Brekke

Student: Sen. Losch

Appointments approved unanimously.

(The Legislative Committee is still in need of a chair)

### ***C. Ad Hoc Committee (Appointment of Chair)***

Chair Lococo announced the following appointment:

#### Ad Hoc committee chair:

Senate Vice Chair Lum to chair an ad-hoc committee to analyze the campus mission statement, as discussed at the April 20, 2011, meeting. The committee is made up of representatives from each of the campus' governing bodies. Jim West, Vice Chair of Campus Council, will serve as representative of the Campus Council. Momi Kamahale will represent the concerns of the Na Ewa Council and LCC Wai'anae. Therese Nakadomari will represent APT and Staff, and Tracy Imper will represent the voice of our students.

### **III. Approval of 05/11/11 Meeting Minutes**

The May 11, 2011, minutes were approved unanimously with the following amendment(s):

- spelling correction to Senator Cain's name (page 1)
- replacement of "and uprising" with "an uprising" (Senator Ono's statement, page 3)
- correction of Senator Hochstein's statement (page 4)--to be discussed with Secretary.

### **IV. Voting Item 1**

Audiotaping of Faculty Senate meetings

**Motion 11-33 (Ono/Polo):** The Faculty Senate Secretary shall be allowed to record meetings,

with the understanding that (1) the recordings are for internal use only, (2) they are for the secretary's use only for the purpose of creating accurate minutes, and (3) they are to be deleted/destroyed as soon as the Official Minutes for the meeting have been approved by the Senate.

Senator Polo remarked on the Faculty Senate's level of professionalism which allows senators the opportunity to discuss/debate issues and keep details from those discussions "in the room."

Motion passed: 22 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

## V. Campus Report

**A. Accreditation Update** (Donna Matsumoto, Institutional Self Evaluation Chair and Accreditation Liaison Officer [ALO])

Accreditation team leader / Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) Donna Matsumoto reported on the campus' progress leading up to the ACCJC site visit to take place in one year (October 2012), once our evaluation report has been reviewed.

This semester, a draft of the report will be sent out to the faculty, for feedback. The Faculty Senate will not be asked to review the entire document; instead, pertinent sections (e.g., on curriculum, general education, last semester's Faculty Senate survey results, and budget and finance) will be presented to the individual committees which can provide particular insight and feedback on them.

Other than the Employee Satisfaction Survey, which was moved up to last spring, the project timeline has remain unchanged. The four standards being assessed are the following:

- I. Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
- II. Student Learning Programs and Services
- III. Resources (Sen. Kae, co-chair)
- IV. Leadership and Governance (Sen. Ono, co-chair).

Each section of the report includes a description of the standard, self analysis, plans for improvement. A three-part rubric for each standard (for program review, planning, and SLOs) will also be provided.

ALO Matsumoto addressed the following comments and questions:

*Comments:* Interdisciplinary approach on standards assessment has been appreciated, as has the availability of resources on Laulima.

Q: Is there one central online site where updated assessment information is being posted?

A: Kathleen Cabral is posting resources on the LCC intranet, but in the meantime, these materials are accessible on the "Accreditation" page (on the Faculty and Staff Resources area of the LCC Web site).

Q: Is it inevitable that we will go on warning due to SLO and assessment issues?

A: It is not inevitable. According to the rubric, we need to be at proficiency (meeting SLOs) by Fall 2012, but since it is unlikely that most campuses will reach that goal, it is possible that the visiting team may not be too strict. We may get recommendations only, but we do expect "dings" on SLO issues. However, most of the institutions that have gone on warning (which prevents them from proposing new programs) have done so because of planning at the district level (not because of SLOs). SLOs will be addressed during campus visit interviews (to include interviews of FS senators, especially the Executive Committee); Donna will return in spring to talk about interviews. Following the campus interviews, the visiting team will make its recommendation, but the commission itself will make the reaccreditation decision.

Q: Does the visiting team use a consistent (rubric )methodology?

A: Team members do their "homework" (random interviews) before entering a class. By the time they start their observations, they already will have interviewed about 150 people total, read the campus' self evaluation, written a report (each member's is about 30 pages long), checked for evidence, and looked at the midterm report and 2006 report. Although "unclear evidence" is sometimes a problem, the team must, in its own report, provide evidence that we are NOT at proficiency if that is their recommendation.

Q: Sometimes it is difficult to find concrete "evidence" of proficiency. What do we do in those cases?

A: It is important to provide what you can (E-mails, etc.), and let Donna and the administration know that you need more; they will do their best to provide it.

Q: Should faculty talk about SLOs in class?

A: Yes. Visiting team members will ask students if they know what their course SLOs are.

Q: Can we get more cooperation from staff and administration? With certain standards, it seems some procedures were not followed for approval of programs, and we don't know why. Untenured faculty may feel uncomfortable probing/reporting these issues; administrators need to step up to plate and get staff to provide adequate evidence.

A: Faculty should have no such fear because the names of assessment committees' members won't appear on the report drafts; the report content will be rewritten in one

voice.

Q: Is there separate policy for Distance Education?

A: Yes, and DE also answers different questions. Senator Walker (DE Coordinator) will be interviewed "by everybody," but Donna will not repeat the same DE information in multiple sections; she will put [each piece] where it fits best.

Q: What is happening with the mission statement charge?

A: Leanne Chun and Bobbie Martel are heading a committee that has created a report draft for that section. Donna will write an update and ask the FS ad-hoc committee [see Minutes section II.C] to work with her on it.

Q: Is it true that there are professionals out there who could help write this report draft?

A: ALO Matsumoto stated that she had never heard of that (though it would be interesting to know whether a consultant could give help with feedback).

Chair Lococo reminded senators that in May the Faculty Senate will vote on the report's final draft, so it is important to make sure it is in "good shape" (as a "no" vote could have a potentially severe negative impact on the College).

### ***B. Student Evaluation Review (Action Item)***

Chair Lococo pointed out that the review of the student evaluation process has not been assigned to any specific committee yet. He asked the Senate whether it should be assigned to a standing committee, or an ad-hoc committee be formed to address this task.

**Motion 11-34 (Hochstein/Ono):** An Ad Hoc committee should be formed to review the student evaluation process.

#### Discussion:

Sen. Rojas says one main concern is that while student evaluations are not technically included (as "required") in the tenure and promotion guidelines, it is possible that decisions are being made based on student evaluation results. To whom can we go to determine whether performance on student evaluations is being used to evaluate tenure and promotion applicants?

Sen. Hochstein pointed out that the latter is a union issue. Another separate issue is whether we should have a standardized evaluation for internal use only (which may require a new

recommendation for how it should be used). A decision needs to be made as to whether this review should be conducted by the Faculty Committee or an ad-hoc committee.

Chair Lococo added that the Senate has been asked to look at evaluation policy, process, forms, and the use of eCafe; and to take a broad look at these areas, not just at the survey questions. He mentioned that it is difficult to track down the history on the forms currently in use, but that they may be from the '80s (at which time they may have gone through Faculty Senate approval though he cannot find evidence that they did).

Sen. Ono suggested that the union has to be involved.

Sen. Hochstein pointed out that while the union claims student evaluation reporting is not required, faculty may be assuming it IS required because DPC members are identifying student evaluations as a required section in their documents.

Sen. Ono added that faculty use student evaluation data as an easy way to provide evidence of their qualities as instructors, though they could potentially be using letters, videos, etc. instead.

Sen. Rojas mentioned that she became aware of these student evaluation issues when she became coordinator for her discipline and realized that different people seem to have different views on the implementation and use of student evaluations and their inclusion in contract renewals/tenure and promotion documents. She also became aware of faculty members being given notice that they were to be receiving statistics regarding their students' success rates, which led to the question, "How is all this information being used by administration and TPRCs?"

Sen. Lum pointed out that faculty members have complained that Ecafe is public, and there seems to be much misinformation about it (e.g., about whether individual faculty can turn the "make public" feature on and off). The bottom line is that eCafe information doesn't belong to the faculty member [alone].

Chair Lococo commented that this--not just the form itself but also its use--sounds like an issue FS should definitely address: form itself but also use.

Sen. Rojas and Sen. Walker agreed to co-chair an ad-hoc committee to review the student evaluation forms/process.

Sen. Hochstein recommended breaking the committee's broad charge into pieces, and not trying to review everything at once just for the sake of rushing for accreditation. She recommended that the committee be given enough time and latitude for thoughtful review.

Sen. Kamida recommended including a lecturer on the committee.

**Motion passed: 22 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

## VII. Standing Committee Reports

### *Elections*

Former Elections Chair Sen. Loo suggested automating the system. She worked over summer with Therese Nakadomari (IT Server & Network Infrastructure Manager), who is building a program (Web-site based, with login) which displays photographs and bios of candidates. The program can run reports and would be ideal for LCC-Wai'anae (bypassing problems involved in delivering and counting paper ballots, and providing a more secure, efficient means of voting). Sen. Loo proposes this change for the Nov. 14 election.

Chair Lococo said the Elections Committee should also help FS keep track of terms and notify/inform senators whose terms are coming to an end about term limits and the re-election process.

### *Faculty (Sen. Ono)*

Sen. Ono to attend system-wide meeting September 1--she will bring any important issues back to Senate.

### *Program Review*

Chair Lococo will send the "Statement on Assessment," which was voted on and approved last year, out to the general faculty. The Statement reinforces the Faculty Senate's interest in encouraging faculty to engage in ongoing and meaningful assessment.

## VIII. Ad Hoc Committee Reports

### *Mission Statement Review (Sen. Lum)*

Vice Chair Lum explained that the chancellor's charge gave a timeline of next spring for review and revision of the mission statement. Sen. Lum created a committee representing all stake holders [see section II.C] and plans to serve as a non-voting Chair (voting only in the case of a tie). The focus of the committee will be determining whether the mission statement is in line with BOR policy, the UH System Strategic Plan, and ACCJC standards. By the end of next semester, all campus governing bodies will be approached for final review and approval of the committee's recommendations.

## IX. New business

### *Procedure reminders*

Chair Lococo reminded the Senate that all faculty members are automatically invited to FS

meetings. Non-faculty guests need to be invited by him informally, and administrators need to request his permission to attend an FS meeting. He emphasized that while he has never turned an administrator away, this procedure is important as it recognizes the Faculty Senate as faculty body representative (and helps it to be taken seriously). Senators are therefore encouraged to invite faculty members to attend, but also to let Chair Lococo know of any non-faculty members who wish to attend a senate meeting.

### ***Faculty Senate Web sites (reminders)***

The *Laulima* Faculty Senate site is for internal (senator) use only; it has posted unofficial and official minutes. The site on the E-media server has links to all old approved minutes (but Sen. Hochstein reported she was unable to access them). Kathleen Cabral is in the process of creating a new system that will embed attachments in pdf files.

Currently, the only way for a faculty member to access official FS minutes is via the intranet (which, Sen. Hochstein reminded senators, requires a login).

Chair Lococo said we will at the very least provide approved minutes accessible to all faculty. Sen. Ono added that this will be necessary for the accreditation report (as broken links are limiting access to important evidence).

Sen. Hochstein proposed the possibility of having approved minutes posted/accessible on the E-media site.

## **X. Announcements**

***Be aware of academic calendar changes*** (to spring break), which caught people by surprise and are requiring changes in plans, child care, etc. The new dates were not sent to Chair Lococo until this past June.

### ***Curriculum Committee (Sen. Lane)***

Curriculum Committee is meeting next week (Wed., Sep. 7<sup>th</sup>) for an Outline Proposal Workshop. Deadlines were moved up "dramatically," to September 30 (September 19 for math and science), for Spring proposals. (FS must approve proposals by the end of February, so they need to be submitted early.) These deadlines are still much more flexible than other campus' deadlines (i.e., one year in advance.) Senators Albritton and Bauer are also Curriculum Committee members.

***Next meeting: September 21, 2011.***

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 4:55 P.M.**