

LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
2010-2011 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

APPROVED Minutes of the September 21, 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, Christian Ganne, Candace Hochstein, Helmut Kae, Roy Kamida, Keith Knuuti, Eiko Kosasa, Michael Lane, Paul Lococo, Erin Loo, Tracie Losch, Susan Lum, David Millen, Kabi Neupane, Blanca Polo, Tara Rojas, Natalia Schmidt, Michael Scully, Melanie Van der Tuin, Greg Walker

Senators Absent: David Millen, Kay Ono

Guests: Vice Chancellor Mike Pecsok, Dean Jim Goodman

I. Call to order

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

II. Campus Report: Visit by Vice Chancellor Pecsok and Dean Goodman

Vice Chancellor Mike Pecsok and Dean Jim Goodman briefed the Senate on several items.

VC Pecsok emphasized the importance of the accreditation visit in one year; he pointed out that it is important for us to be accredited (and that the UH system will not allow us *not* to be) as we must be “good stewards of our academic programs” and serve the large number of our students on financial aid (who would not be able to transfer course credits from a non-accredited institution).

VC Pecsok stated that of the 200 or so faculty members on campus, over 100 are serving on some sort of accreditation subcommittee, and it is not too late to get involved. This fall, our institution self-evaluation report (on how we meet the standards for accreditation) will be circulated, and since it has been drafted by many small groups, it will be important to review it and make sure that nothing important has been left out.

It is important, he added, to maintain a focus on student success. New Student Orientation (NSO) helps students focus on their individual reasons for attending college, and another Student Success Committee initiative is to address students requiring remediation. While high schools are working hard to better prepare students for college, it is a slow process, and we

(Ccs) want to get students out of the remedial/developmental “loop” and into college-level courses as quickly as possible (preferably within one semester or year, rather than three or four semesters). Another goal is to help improve student success in gatekeeper courses, and across the board, to help students through their academic careers.

VC Pecsok emphasized that our students are asking for career paths, and we need to offer them more choices like natural science (for STEM careers, a major target for the University); we are trying to track students interested in the sciences for such programs. Also Na 'Ewa has requested an associate's degree in Hawaiian Studies. As we work with colleagues on other campuses seeking similar programs (to avoid different/competing degrees), discussions need to take place at the faculty (not administration) level since faculty “own” the curriculum.

The administration would like to speed up the process of getting new programs “on the ground” after their proposals leave our campus (i.e., expedite the “Authorization to Plan” process). We have submitted two (while most campuses average three or four per year) for new programs of study, and they must coincide with plans on other campuses. Our business division, for example, would like a health information technology program, as does Kapi'olani CC. This brings up several questions: “How will we resolve our differences?” “Do we need two similar programs on O'ahu?” “If one, which campus should offer it?”

VC Pecsok discussed his visit to the Nanakuli Neighborhood Board meeting, which he attended to address issues associated with the relocation of the Leeward CC-Wai'anae campus (to the Mai'ili building we are set to acquire by the end of the year and begin renovating, which will take about 18 months). While the plan has in general been well received by the neighborhood, there are concerns about traffic patterns and the safety of children walking to school in the area.

In response to Senator Bauer's questions about whether modification of Nanakuli bus routes might be needed, VC Pecsok suggested that an alternative plan might be to schedule Leeward CC-Wai'anae classes so that they do not begin at the same time local schools' start. He stated that if necessary, however, the area's city councilman will help us work with The Bus administration to adjust routes to support student access. Though it may not seem like an important issue to faculty, the community is concerned about this issue, he emphasized.

Since we are also adding faculty to the Wai'anae campus, he pointed out, we will need to start talking about how to treat it “as an organizational entity” whose top priority is serving one of the state's underserved regions (this is a UH priority). There needs to be better planning for distance-education courses (whose creation is currently driven by faculty initiative) for DE support of degrees/certificates. To this end, the administration would like faculty to receive training in the “unique pedagogy and tools” that online teaching requires.

When asked about this academic plan, he responded that no written framework for academic planning exists for the state or for O'ahu, and there are issues about “dividing up the turf.” Past practice was that neighbor islands had comprehensive (“fly-in, fly-out”) programs due to little DE available (for example, on Kaua'i); little thought has been given to such programming for

O'ahu colleges, which have had differentiated missions to avoid unnecessary duplication of costly programs on O'ahu. Comprehensive programming doesn't seem to be necessary here, but perhaps that is not true—maybe Kapi'olani CC, for example, could use it to serve Makaha students. We need to think about what programs we want and how to generate them; we need to look at our strengths. VC Pecsok asked whether developing an Academic Plan should be a FS initiative, and Senate Chair Lococo commented that when we previously had a strategic plan, it was dictated from above, and our work was of no use, and there is concern that the same situation may occur again.

VC Pecsok said that we are not where we want to be in terms of looking at majors; we are following a general-education model, which may not be the best for our students (whose academic careers “get stagnant” when they are not taking the courses that brought them here. He added that we have been skirting issue with academic subject certificates (which don't rate high for funding) and AAs with concentrations. The question becomes whether this route is preferable to going with majors. VC Pecsok responded to a senator's question about the advantage of having majors by explaining that CC transfer students take 20 credits more than Manoa students because our curricula have not been customize to match Manoa's. An AA degree may articulate but not necessarily with a UH major.

According to VC Pecsok, we also want to track students by assigning them to counselor “experts” in their specific areas of interest, to get them into their major course work earlier (by identifying their interests and recommending appropriate courses).

A senator asked whether students will suffer because of the fact that CC grade point averages are calculated differently from UH-Manoa students' (i.e., only including grades from the home institution), and another Senator confirmed that while a CC course may transfer to UH-Manoa, it may not necessarily be calculated into the student's GPA.

When asked whether students may be caught in the middle of a decision to have two similar programs on the island, VC Pecsok explained that it may ultimately be a question of convenience for the student. Senators also raised the issue of cost and whether the BOR is seeking more money for funding of new programs and whether we will continue extending the application deadline for the many students who come late (which does not seem to support students' success in courses). Has this been getting us additional funds, and are they enough to support the forming of new programs? According to VC Pecsok, this depends on your budget; the five-year plan must specify where the money is coming from.

One senator pointed out that reallocation is hard on some of our programs and that AAT asked for additional funding; VC Pecsok pointed out that Leeward CC-Wai'anae did so as well. When asked whether our administration and the BOR will “fight for that for us too” (something we “need to know for long range planning,” VC Pecsok commented that while the Annual Review drives the budget, currently the system is not providing for new positions. Hence we may have some funding from carry-over funds, but we can cannot hire for new permanent positions without position counts.

Dean Goodman then spoke to the Senate. He emphasized his desire to bring a faculty perspective to administration. He explained that previously he had taught at Leeward since 1995 and had served on Faculty Senate for nine years, serving as Senate Chair for four of those years. He had also worked on the Curriculum Committee for five years; three years as the Curriculum Committee Secretary, one year as Chair, and served as Opening Day Coordinator for three years. He pointed out that such a background is not “normal” for people entering administration but that his time on Faculty Senate was one his most rewarding. He explained that he visits Division Chairs (DCs) to see how they are doing and fix problems on and off campus (e.g., with articulation), working closely with DCs to expand and strengthen Arts & Sciences programs and advocate resources for those divisions, which is instructionally, over three-quarters of the campus. He commented that he is pleased that the campus currently has one of the strongest senses of direction it has experienced in a long time.

VC Pecsok encouraged faculty to come see Dean Goodman and him, explaining that some issues brought up could be solved easily (rather than “boiling up,” which he wants to avoid by keeping channels of communication open). He said he likes “interruptions,” and that “nothing replaces talking face to face” (versus a terse E-mail message).

III. Approval of 8/31/2011 meeting minutes

Approval of minutes of the 8/31/11 meeting was then postponed until the October meeting, pending ALO Donna Matsumoto's review of the presentation of her briefing to the Senate.

IV. Faculty Senate Reports

A. Chair's Report (Lococo)

1. *DE Strategic Plan*

Senate Chair Lococo reported that at the recent (9/160 **Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (CCCFSC)** meeting, it was pointed out that at present there is no UHCC system oversight, and no standard Distance Education training.

UH Vice-President’s office has convened a group to draft a **proposal for a UHCC certification program, and standardized policies**. This policy will eventually be presented to the CC Senates for review and approval. Chair Lococo called for a Senate volunteer to join this group, a faculty member who has taught a number of online courses and would be willing to represent Leeward senate. Senator Mike Bauer volunteered, and was formally appointed.

Appointment unanimously approved.

Chair Lococo pointed out to the Senate that not all Senate Chair appointments need senate approval. In general, those appointees expected to formally or informally report to the Senate need approval.

2. *New Executive Policy E5.228 (Credit Hour policy)*

Chair Lococo passed out a memo from the UH System office, New Executive Policy E5.228. As required by the Federal DOE, the UH System has provided a **definition of Credit Hour**. Similar courses **MUST** have same credits. If not, this must be explained. The UHCC System is mandating that this requires that the **Curriculum Committee** is responsible to ensure consistency of credit hour offering per course. Examples of problems are AMT 24, Econ 130, and Biol 101—different titles or different credits. Another “problem” brought up was science courses with or without labs. The Curriculum Committee must have written rules concerning how credit hours are assigned, especially with labs.

Discussion:

Questions raised during discussion revolved around whether a three-credit (per semester) course refers to three hours or three “academic” (50-minute) hours in class per week? The response was that this refers to an “academic hour.” Also pointed out was the fact that transfer credits and quarter credits are handled differently on different campuses, and that while Manoa may be focused on a course's content, some CCs look more at credit hours.

Chair Lococo asked Curriculum Committee Chair Michael Lane to have his committee discuss this issue and draft rules for review of credit hour assignment for presentation to the Senate.

3. *UHCC Enrollment*

The Senate was informed that the UHCC’s transfer about 1200 students to Hawaii 4-year schools, and 800 to mainland schools. The intra-Hawaii rate has remained roughly the same for several years, but the mainland rate of transfers is growing. A priority for the UHCC’s this year is **easing transfer of students to 4-year schools**.

From the CCCFSC meeting it was also learned that the UHCC system looked at roughly **7000 students who had completed at least 30 credits at a Hawaii CC, but who did not continue or transfer in a five-year period**. An effort has been made to contact these students, and so far about 600 have come back to school.

4. Emergency Reserves

Lastly, Chair Lococo reported that a new rule from the UHCC office is that each campus will now keep a 5% emergency reserve. This reserve is for actual emergencies, such as hurricanes, and not just funding shortfall.

B. Standing Committees

1. Curriculum (Lane)--Voting items

Committee Chair Lane presented several items for discussion and vote before the senate.

NEW COURSES:

HWST 160

Discussion: Since course is equivalent to DANCE 160, FS would like clarification on repeating course for credit (i.e., whether students may repeat EACH of the two courses once or whether there is a one-time repeat rule [i.e. one course considered “the repeat” of the other]).

Motion 11-35: To accept the following new course proposals based on the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee: HWST 160.

Motion passed: 22 Approved, 0 Disapproved, 0 Abstained

COURSE DELETIONS:

Motion 11-36: To accept the following course deletions, based on the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee:

DMED 241
HUM 220
HUM 225.

Motion passed: 21 Approved, 0 Disapproved, 0 Abstained

DIVERSIFICATION DESIGNATION PROPOSALS:

PACS 108 Pacific Worlds (3)--for DS designation

Motion 11-37: To accept the following course diversification designation proposal, *effective Spring 2012*, based on the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee:

PACS 108 Pacific Worlds (3), for DS designation effective Spring 2012.

Motion passed: 18 Approved, 1 Disapproved, 2 Abstained

PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS:

AS Natural Science

The Faculty Senate was asked to approve the following changes to the AS in Natural Science proposal so that the Curriculum Committee may approve it at its next meeting (Thursday, September 29):

Motion 11-38 (Lane/Loo)-- Approve the following changes to the previously approved AS Natural Science proposal *contingent on approval votes by the Mathematics and Natural Sciences Division and the Curriculum Committee:*

1. Delete these DA, DS, and DH courses: AMST 297, MUS 281, 282, 283, 284; HIST 297; IS 297; PHIL 297.
2. Add the following requirements to the Engineering pathway: MATH 231, 232; EE 211; CE 270.
3. Specify the engineering majors must complete one of these courses as a DS requirement: ECON 120, 130, or 131.

Motion passed: 19 Approved, 2 Disapproved, 0 Abstained

2. Legislative Committee—Appointment

FS Chair Lococo moved to appoint Senator Kosasa as Legislative Committee chair.

Appointment was approved unanimously.

3. Academic/Institutional Support (Cain)

Committee Chair Cain suggested that the committee should shift its focus to be more of a support system for FS, and she encouraged senators to suggest projects on which the committee should focus. Chair Lococo commented this is a good committee with a broad mission, so it can accomplish quite a bit.

4. Budget & Planning (Kamida)

Senator Kamida announced that the committee, which functions more as an ad-hoc committee, continues to welcome new members.

5. Elections (Albritton/Polo)

The committee reported only three or four candidates (while there are 11 open seats). In the upcoming election, everything will be electronic (as the last Student Government election was

run, with Therese Nakadomari's assistance). Senator Polo is waiting for a list of faculty members eligible to vote, and she is advising faculty to log on and vote (versus leaving the computer and coming back, which could cause technical problems).

Senator Bauer questioned whether Article 5, Section 6 of the Bylaws (p. 11, re: secret ballot, "Marked ballot" rule) will need to be changed to adapt for technology. Group discussion led to the redefinition of "box" to include an "electronic box" as an equally acceptable "container or repository." According to several senators the rule's original wording was added to the Bylaws several years ago because of accusations of ballot "stuffing." Co-Chair Albritton stated that a virtual (electronic) box is more secure, which perhaps should be indicated in a revised set of bylaws. Senator Albritton confirmed that he expects the electronic voting process to go quite smoothly.

6. Faculty (Ono)--Report

Reporting for Committee Chair Ono, FS Chair Lococo presented several items from the UHCC System Academic Policies Task Force.

Three items were introduced for discussion and voting at the next FS Meeting:

- Academic Residency
- Matriculation Fee (covering student transcripts for life, etc.)
- UHCC College Credentials

In addition, the following item was given to the Curriculum Committee for Review:

- UHCC Policy E5.203 (policies for proposing new degrees and certificates)

7. Program Review (Brekke)

Committee Chair Brekke reported the following statistics on course assessment:

Per OPPA, as of Sept 20, 2011 course assessment is occurring for 82.5 percent of all courses.

By division:

VT	93%
AH	92
BUS	88

SS	87
LA	86
MS	60

She also provided the following updates:

Program Review Policy

OPPA will be creating four policies out of the current program review policy: Assessment, Program Review, Institutional Planning, and Effectiveness Review.

Director, OPPA

A hiring committee has been formed. Chair is Michael Moser. Members include: Guy Nishimoto and Alicia Brown (OPPA), Jan Shimabukaro-Lee (current Assessment Coordinator), Therese Nakadomari, Shelly Ota, Jim West, and Eunice Brekke, representing the Senate.

Review of the AA degree program

The Program Review committee has been asked to play a role – more details to come.

Senator Brekke commented that the course assessment statistics refer to courses that have at least begun the process, and that while *completion* statistics may not be as impressive, this is probably due in part to the fact that assessment procedures have been confusing and there has been no formal assessment policy in existence; therefore, those involved in assessment should be congratulated—we are doing quite well compared to a couple of years ago.

8. Student (Losch)

There are no grievances at this time.

VI. New Business

A. Student Success “Gatekeeper” Notices

Senator Losch, who is on the Student Success Committee, clarified that the committee's goal is to raise success in “gateway” courses (courses which fewer than 70% of students pass with C or better, as defined nationally and referred to in the context of federal funding, ATD, and various other programs).

Instructors were to have received individual “student success” letters for our own information; nobody else was to receive this information. Rates were listed by CRN, alongside a “course average “ (of all instructors teaching that course), for instructors to compare.

Another committee initiative for gatekeeper courses involves starting to look at Professional Learning Teams (versus one-day workshops) employing a small-group paradigm over the course of a year on gatekeeper courses, for a small stipend. Course redesign is also being considered for the improvement of student success. An opening institute is due to begin in spring, to initiate work over the summer and implement changes in fall. (Methodology, approach, and technology will be up to each instructor.)

Significant content changes to a course will have to go through Curriculum committee.

Several senators raised concerns over the memo distributed to faculty. Concerns mentioned include the following:

- no analysis appears to have been done about why failing students are not passing (assumptions are being made)
- statistics are flawed, impacted by too many variables—withdrawal rates are an important variable (especially since Baltimore research indicates that a majority of withdrawals are the result of financial problems, not instruction)
- nontenured faculty members afraid of not being rehired may be inclined to inflate grades (and pass students on to the next level, for which they may not be ready)
- the term “instructor success rate” is a union issue
- there is the possibility of this [flawed] data becoming standard in tenure/promotion documents

Many faculty members are openly alarmed about the memo.

Motion 11-39 (Hochstein/Albritton): For the Faculty Senate to go into Executive Session.

Motion passed: 19 Approved, 0 Opposed, 2 Abstained

Faculty Senate came out of executive session, and Senator Cain proposed the following motion.

Motion 11-40 (Cain/Polo): The Faculty Senate will sponsor an anonymous survey to ascertain faculty concerns regarding reports from the Student Success Committee in its memo about “instructor success rates” and “student success rates.”

Motion passed: 21 Approved, 0 Disapproved, 0 Abstained

B. Ad Hoc Committees

1. Review of Mission Statement (Lum)

Committee Chair Lum distributed a written report and explained that the committee met on 9/13/11 and voted to revise the campus mission statement, identifying three broad purposes/goals for the following: native Hawaiians, open-door access, student learning.

The committee will meet every two weeks, and members will meet with their constituencies (about ideas to consider in revising). The goal is a revision of the statement by December, to be introduced at convocation in January and presented for an open forum in late January or early February. The committee is requesting one more Senate representative contact Senator Lum; committee will meet again Tuesday, September 27, at 1:30.

2. Review of Student Evaluation Process—Appointment

FS Chair Lococo moved to appoint Senators Rojas and Walker as co-chairs of the Student Evaluation Process Review Committee; the appointments were approved unanimously.

VII. Announcements

Senator Losch: The “H” focus committee is welcoming course proposals. There are currently only three approved on our campus, and the committee would like more. Proposals may be for courses in any discipline (e.g., Geography, Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, etc.) Proposals are accepted every semester; this semester's deadline is October 10.

FS Chair Lococo: At our next meeting, the Senate will discuss whether changes need to be made formally to the bylaws. Several issues may be part of this discussion, such as whether a standing committee for DE is necessary, whether Leeward CC-Wai'anae should be considered a division in terms of FS representation, whether election procedures should be formally revised, etc. If the Senate wishes to engage in a review, this could be given to a standing committee or a new Ad Hoc committee created for this purpose.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

Next meeting: October 26, 2011.