I. Call to order

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

II. Campus Report - Part A: LRDP presentation (Helber Hastert & Fee, Planners)

Tina Bushnell and Aaron Mann (representing Helber Hastert & Fee) gave an update on the Long Range Development Plan project. They have been conducting workshops on campus once a month, to collect our visions for the campus; they are targeting community groups and "major players" they need to engage, as well as the administration and student government.

Aaron commented that staff and administration are represented well on the LRDP committee, but the faculty is not represented enough. He explained that the planners would like to establish an ongoing relationship with faculty, who can help "bridging the gaps" of what we do on campus on a daily basis and what needs to be done for the long-range plan. They would especially like to know about new programs that will affect facilities and space planning. To pursue these important needs they are requesting a committee and/or volunteers.
Tina emphasized that the program belongs to us (Leeward CC) and that the more information they receive from us, the more useful the plan will be. They asked the Senate whether there is already an established committee with whom they can work; Chair Lococo suggested starting with the Academic and Institutional Support Committee, but encouraged all senators to contribute.

Sen. Hochstein asked whether the LRDP and Academic Plan processes overlap, and how priorities and funding are being addressed. Tina explained that the LRDP is done every 20 years or so (LRDPs were completed in 1966 and 1995), as a city/county initiative, so zoning documents prevent the need for additional permits. The process just started this spring, with a notice sent out to the campus via administration.

Sen. Neupane asked for whom the private planning firm is working; they are working only with Leeward CC and are due to spend one year creating this document. They are in the first phase (the "front end": collecting information) of the project; the second phase will entail putting this information into the ["back end"] plan.

Sen. Hochstein suggested that the firm meet with each individual division (since the Academic Development Plan is created by the divisions).

Tina said that they do plan to talk to DCs but also wish to speak to us (faculty) and are not sure whether this would be a duplication of effort or whether (more likely) the Senate plays a different role. She requested a focus group with faculty bringing in divisions' feedback (not necessarily DCs' or senior faculty members' views exclusively), and she wanted to make sure this would not be a duplication of the efforts in DC meetings.

Chair Lococo responded that it would probably be worthwhile to have both, in order to address the different perspectives. Sen. Albritton said he could not find the Academic Development Plan online, and Chair Lococo explained that it has been replaced by the Strategic Plan. Sen. Hochstein said that she would like to know whether this is a "wish list" or a list of what we can actually do, so that she can know what information to share with planners; she pointed out several items have been on the docket for a long time (e.g., the Social Sciences building and a second access road).

Tina responded that at this stage it is a “This is where we see the future” project but will ultimately (by the second phase) be both. Aaron added that we are not likely to see many new buildings and that much of the work may be a reallocation of space, which will require a body to help people work together and balance "where we need to drive things." He said the decisions will come down to a look at internal efficiency and space that will be freed up (e.g., who should
Chair Lococo suggested that the firm set up a meeting with Sen. Cain (current Academic and Institutional Support Committee Chair) to discuss further and pass on to the committee chair next year, and to make recommendations to the Senate. He remarked that more formal discussions could be conducted with the committee, and the Senate could be a forum for less formal ones.

III. Approval of the Minutes (January 18 and February 22, 2012)

The January 18, 2012, minutes were approved unanimously; the February 22, 2012, minutes were approved as amended, unanimously.

IV. Campus Report - Parts B through F

B. Appointments to Space Committee (2)

Chair Lococo proposed reappointing Sen. Schmidt to the Leeward CC Space and Facilities Management Standing Committee; the Senate approved the appointment unanimously. He also asked for volunteers to fill Mike Fujita's now-vacant position on the committee; Sen. Loo volunteered, and her appointment was approved by a unanimous vote.

C. Accreditation Draft 3—Review prior to May 1

Faculty can still send changes to the draft though the committees seem fairly settled on it. We will receive a "semifinal" draft (sort of a final draft) to review (and vote on at the May 9 meeting). The May 1 draft will be "pretty much" the final draft, but some additional small changes might be made to it in the summer.

D. Leeward CC Administration proposal for new E/M Positions

Senate Chair Lococo mentioned to the Senate that at the last Campus Council meeting, updated budget proposals were discussed, including personnel requests. Among the Administration requests were two new E/M positions: Director of Leeward CC-Waianae, and OCEWD. As the
Leeward-Waianae position would directly supervise faculty, he feels this proposal should have come before the Senate for discussion. Senator Hochstein added that since faculty (DCs) sign off on faculty tenure, LCCW should have an elected coordinator. Senator Ono expressed her concerns over DCs not getting release time while the college is talking about executive positions: why not fund DCs rather than add administration? Senator Kamida remarked that the OCEWD position would also involve direct supervision of faculty. After further discussion—addressing the issue of these positions constituting a reorganization and, therefore, requiring Senate consultation—Chair Lococo agreed to pursue further information from the Leeward Administration and report back to the Senate on May 9.

E. Posting of Final Exam Schedule—Follow-up

The Fall semester final-exam schedule was supposed to be posted beside the Schedule of Courses, but it is still not there. In accordance with the Senate resolution passed at our last meeting, Chair Lococo sent a request to administration for a response on the issue. Although it would have been good to have the exam schedule up (online) before registration, he commented, it would still be nice to get posted while registration is still going on. No response from Administration so far.

F. Senate Resolution on Student/Faculty Success—Follow-up

Chair Lococo also reported on an update to the Senate’s resolution of 9/30/11 concerning the Student Success Memo of 9/15/11. The Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor/CAO had indicated support for the Senate’s list of recommendations. Chair Lococo sent an email requesting an informal update from administration on these recommendations. At this time no response yet from the Administration.

V. Faculty Senate Reports - Part A: Standing Committees

1. Curriculum Committee (Lane)—Report

The committee discussed possibly moving its deadlines up; however, because of resistance, the deadlines will remain the same (i.e., one at the end of September and another one six weeks later [in mid-November]). The committee is considering requesting that it be smaller next year (with two representatives per division, instead of the current three) as things are "smoothing out" now. Since the committee will only be looking at modified fields, not all fields, it will save
time; and dropping one person per division will make things easier on the divisions. The last committee meeting of the semester will be held tomorrow, and this issue will be brought up to the Faculty Senate first thing in fall.

2. Faculty (Ono)—Voting Item (credit hour)

Sen. Ono reported that at Sen. Kae’s request, she had tabled her motion in order to find out Sen. Schmidt’s opinion on the issue of a credit hour definition for students (not a faculty workload "hour" definition). Sen. Schmidt said that in an attempt to create the definition (which is tied to accreditation) in accordance with federal guidelines, she wanted to know whether the ACCJC has a definition—we will be fine as long as we are in compliance with any ACCJC definition. She asked whether ours and the ACCJC’s definitions match; Sen. Ono responded that we have to come up with our own definition, and she asked what guidelines are available. Chair Lococo explained that the UHCC system definition is what we are required to create and follow. The definition should indicate the instruction time the student receives per credit hour (e.g., 50 minutes, but no more than 60); once approved and functional, the definition (see below) must be used for new courses proposed and courses up for five-year reviews.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I COMMUNITY COLLEGES POLICY

UHCCP #5.228
May 2012

SUBJECT: Credit Hour

I. Purpose

This purpose of this policy is to provide a consistent measure of the quality of a student’s academic engagement by defining a credit hour and identifying the process and evidence by which the University of Hawaii Community College System ensures reliability and accuracy of the assignment of credit hours to activities earning academic credit.

II. Related University Policies and Regulations
Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the Chancellor at each UH Community College to ensure that the college is in compliance with this policy and that documentation/evidence is compiled, maintained, and available for review. The Chancellor may delegate compliance procedures.

All colleges will develop institutional policies and processes that comply with UHCCP 5.228 as required.

IV. Policy

A credit hour:

i. Is defined as an amount of work represented in intended student learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement.

Reasonably approximates but is not less than:

ii. Fifty minutes to one hour of class or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks for one semester or the equivalent amount of work over a different period of time.

OR

iii. At least an equivalent amount of work for other academic activities such as distance education instruction (instruction delivered synchronously or asynchronously using one or more technologies that support regular and substantive interaction between students who are separated from the instructor), laboratory work, internships, practical, studio work and other work that earns academic credit.

Across the UHCC System, a credit is defined as 45 hours of direct and indirect instructional, student work within a standard semester or equivalent term of study (accelerated terms, summer terms, etc.). In general, this reflects the expected work a student, prepared for the class, would need to achieve the intended student learning
V. Procedures

When course and/or activities earning academic credit are added to the curriculum, each college, through their curriculum development and course approval process, and comprehensive program review process, will ensure that:

i. The associated credits are in compliance with this policy

ii. The means by which the policy is met will be spelled out in the institution's officially approved course outline.

iii. The college comprehensive program review process ensures that all activities earning academic credit will be reviewed for compliance with this policy at least once within the review cycle.

The Chancellor (or designee), working with the faculty of the college, will ensure:

ιϖ. That the institutionally approved course outline and every class syllabus includes information on the expected amount of work.

ϖ. A course offered in a time frame different from the standard semester shall contain the same total hours – contact hours, preparation time, content, and requirements – as the same course offered in the standard semester.

ϖι. Regardless of the mode of instruction, courses should be consistent in terms of purpose, scope, quality, assessment, and expected learning outcomes with other courses with the same department code, number, and course title.

Flexibility is granted to each college to design a process that meets the requirements of UHCCP 5.228.

VI. Assessment of the process for assuring reliability and accuracy of assignment of credit hours

The Office of the Vice President for Community Colleges and the Chancellors will convene a joint meeting of the combined UHCC Faculty Senate Chairs and the Vice Chancellors Academic Affairs, at least every two years, to assess the effectiveness of the process and revise as appropriate.

Motion 12-28:
To approve the **UHCCP #5.228** (definition of a credit hour) May 2012 draft (above) as recommended by the Faculty Committee.

**21 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions: motion passed.**

### 3. GenEd Foundations (Hochstein/Millen)—**Voting Item**

Sen. Hochstein said that at the multi-campus GenEd Foundations Board meeting, there was concern about the FS area Hallmark 5, so a subcommittee has been meeting with members from all campuses (math and logic disciplines) and is proposing the following amendment to Hallmark 5: "focus on computational and/or quantitative skills" (along with the following explanatory note: "The course will not focus solely on quantitative skills").

The subcommittee recommends supporting the wording change.

Senator Chair Lococo added that other campuses seem happy with the change except some UH-Mānoa math faculty; Sen. Hochstein commented that it is a compromise.

**Motion 12-29:**

To approve the following amendment to FS area Hallmark 5: "focus on computational and/or quantitative skills" (along with the following explanatory note: "The course will not focus solely on quantitative skills"), as recommended by the GenEd Foundations Board.

**21 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions: motion passed.**

Sen. Hochstein reminded the Senate that while this amendment has passed, this issue will resurrect itself next year. This amendment is a stop-gap solution: the “and/or” does not adequately cover math AND logic skills. The "big question" will come back. Chair Lococo added that Jim West has offered to be Foundations Board chair in the coming year, and if faculty cannot resolve the issue, then CCAOs may need to step in to do so.

### 4. Student (Losch)—**Voting Item**
Due to illness, Chair Lococo spoke for Student Committee Chair Sen. Losch and presented the proposal for revision of the Student Academic Grievance Policy. Chair Lococo explained that the current grievance policy was approved two years ago, but that in approving that policy the Chancellor requested the Senate to tighten up some ambiguous wording in the remedy section. After much discussion, the committee has recommended the Senate approve a solution to clear up the ambiguity in Section 2.2.A.5: changing one word (from “may” to “will”) in two places. Even with this revision, Student Committee needs to review the SAG in the coming year, anyway; however, in case a grievance is filed in the interim, Chair Lococo would like a vote on this revision right now so that the revised language will be in place. Sen. Rojas asked for time to look into other questions concerning the SAG; Chair Lococo encouraged a vote and reminded Senators that if the motion does not get 2/3 approval, we can have a second vote during our next meeting, which would need a majority to pass. He also reminded senators that the incoming Student Committee will look once more at the policy to determine if additional revisions are needed to further clarify the language.

Motion 12-30 (Brekke/Scully):
To approve the revisions to the 10/27/10 SAG Policy, Section 2.2.A.5 as recommended by the Student Committee.

21 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions: motion passed.

5. Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations (Rojas/Walker)—Report

Sen. Rojas said the committee will be meeting in fall to follow up on student evaluation issues but needs a recommendation as to whether it should remain an ad-hoc committee or become a sub-committee of a Senate Standing committee.

Chair Lococo explained that an ad-hoc committee reports to senate as a whole, while a sub-committee would report through a standing committee. An advantage to being a sub-subcommittee is that it could be ongoing; whereas an ad-hoc committee is limited to two years or upon accomplishment of its mission unless renewed. Guest Gail Levy has suggested that other instruments for evaluation of faculty (e.g., for student/peer evaluations) have not been looked at for a long time, and that our current evaluation language is not up to date with SLO language. In this sense, she said, a sub-committee might be better because it will take a long time to gather all the relevant information and review all the forms being used. She emphasized
the importance of this information given the evaluations' connection to tenure and promotion; Sen. Hochstein commented that it is wrong for it to be so closely tied in with tenure and promotion.

Chair Lococo suggested a broader look at evaluation, maybe even of administrators, and certainly to include DE. He recommended discussing the issue more at May's meeting.

Sen. Rojas pointed out that this is a big task for which they have not been able to secure volunteers. The Senate agreed to continue this discussion at the May 9 meeting.

VI. New Business

A. Leeward CC DE Strategic Plan (Walker)

Sen. Walker gave instructions for commenting on the DE Strategic Plan document (linked on our Laulima home page). He asked that in addition to sharing comments, faculty also offer solutions. He explained that some UH system material was removed from the document, and our own (Leeward CC) information added in. The plan was approved unanimously by the DE Committee, which would like a Faculty Senate vote at the May 9 meeting. Chair Lococo reminded senators that the UHCC system will eventually be asked to vote on the plan in order to use it as a base for a UH system plan.

Sen. Hochstein commented that the document is well written but asked whether DE is intending to be a support to classes or a satellite program—a separate "arm"—(which would be much more involved and require more funding to extend into other areas). She added that she would like to know the intent of the document (and approval); is it just a matter of keeping up with technology and helping faculty develop online courses, or does it also involve recruitment of certain faculty and staff? She expressed concerns over funding and other implications of the plan.

Sen. Kosasa concurred that the document has a feeling of DE being its own program and asked whether that was intended. Sen. Walker responded that ideally DE would be a program, but that it is highly unlikely that will ever happen. He added that everything in the document came from the Strategic Plan, which he will double check.

Sen. Ono asked whether DE issues will still be addressed within our divisions (treating the online course format as just a mode of delivery); Walker said yes. When Sen. Ono asked whether a faculty member who should not be teaching online could be removed from online courses, Sen. Walker explained that the plan's focus is on getting faculty up to speed, not getting rid of
anyone. Sen. Ono asked about data comparing face-to-face classes and their online counterparts.

Sen. Walker remarked that in terms of growth (in enrollment), online courses rank far higher than face-to-face sections. He added that success rates in most online courses have also been much better than those of their face-to-face counterparts over the last five years. He commented that he had just received recent data from Guy Nishimoto and will put out a report at end of spring. Student feedback surveys, he added, suggest consistently that students want more online courses. In response to a question about the demographics of our online students, he reported that over 70 percent of our online students are women (mainly working mothers).

Chair Lococo informed the Senate that this body will decide what to do with the plan at its May 9 meeting.

**B. Computer Literacy among AA students (Polo/Bauer/Albritton)**

Sen. Polo explained that while computer literacy is an outcome for the AA degree, students are no longer required to take ICS 100. A major problem with this, she said, is that while instructors use technology, and students believe they know how to do so, they are not really computer literate. Etiquette also an issue (i.e., for professional emails: netiquette for the workplace), as well as avoiding phishing problems and viruses, and learning how to clear out a virus. There are more basic issues, too, like students not knowing what to put (and what not to put) up on Facebook.

Kaua'i, Maui, and Big-Island faculty have been meeting with O'ahu CC faculty about the issue of students needing to learn professional use of computers, for which they are now recommending ICS 100 or 101, or BUS 101. When the CCs were asked what they are doing about computer literacy, Windward CC reported that it previously had an exam students had to pass in order to graduate (or else they had to take a literacy course), but that the campus had to get rid of the exam due to a lack of funding. Sen. Knuuti added that faculty also didn’t agree on literacy standards and areas; the discussion board showed no consensus among faculty.

Sen. Polo asked how we will know what computer literacy instruction is needed (and how to provide it). She is putting together a survey to assess what students know and what they want to know. She will also ask faculty what we want our students to know, what computer literacy problems we have with students, and what they need for our classes. She will also survey advisory committees about what computer skills employers want and need. (Our name as Leeward CC is affected, for example, if our college-educated students get viruses on their employers' computers, she added.)
For the gathering of necessary data (and to generate a discussion about how to solve the problem), students, faculty, and advisory committees on all 10 campuses will be surveyed, Sen. Polo said. Gail Levy asked whether this is a system-wide initiative, and Sen. Polo responded that the survey is, and that the initiative may go further if data supports the need for it.

Sen. Knuuti pointed out that because such a course would be an extra requirement for a degree—and since many think they know everything about computers—students will not want it.

Sen. Polo responded that if discrepancy exists between the student and faculty responses on the computer-literacy survey, this will indicate a problem.

Sen. Brekke asked whether there is a national standard for computer literacy, and Sen. Polo said if there were, it would have to be updated every six months. Sen. Walker added that it is difficult to measure computer literacy, particularly one's ability to use technology at critical times (versus barely learning and memorizing the concepts).

Sen. Polo said many issues are involved, including students' ability to assess the reliability of online sources. Gail Levy explained that some of this is covered in the information literacy tutorial/exam but only in ENG 100 (and only certain topics are covered). Sen. Brekke suggested perhaps pairing computer literacy initiatives with ENG 100.

Chair Lococo recommended staying in contact with the Curriculum Committee if changes will involve the AA degree at some point, since any changes will need to be approved by the committee. Sen. Walker added that because of the role of the Internet, "digital literacy" is now a focus.

C. CCSSE Communications with faculty

Chair Lococo informed that Senate that he has received faculty complaints over the CCSSE survey taking a whole class period for students to complete, especially with so many surveys being administered already. Chair Lococo wanted to know whether the issue needs to be looked at. Sen. Kae said he heard from a faculty member who was told the survey would only take 15 minutes, when it actually took the whole period.

Sen. Brekke asked whether students take the survey online instead of during class. Chair Lococo said he has been informed that the online format yields a low response rate and therefore not enough data. Sen. Lane commented that the survey was so long that in one class students refused to take it.
One suggestion offered was to have a committee talk to OPPA. Chair Lococo explained that the administration of the survey has to be random; Sen. Ono asked whether decisions (about class sections in which the survey will be administered) can be made earlier in the semester, to offer the instructors more lead time. Sen. Hochstein recommended making this suggestion to OPPA, and also requesting clearer communication about the survey requiring an entire class period.

VII. Faculty Senate Reports - Part B: *Chair’s Report (Lococo)*


Chair Lococo informed the senate the UH System provided updated statistics on transfers within the system and transfers from the Community Colleges to UH-Manoa increased from 38% in Fall 2005 to 46% in Fall 2011 in a continuous trend. He added that while the CCs have been concerned about articulation, UH-Manoa does not seem to have regarded it as important until now.

2. General Education in AAS Degrees

During the last Community College Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (CCCFSC) meeting, UHCC VP John Morton informed us that the US State Dept. uses ACCJS list of approved AAS programs for determining international student applications. Only Kauai CC has approvals listed. The rest must demonstrate that their AAS Degrees are indeed approved by ACCJC. Key issue—GenED. Our Curriculum Committee will be examining our AAS degrees to ensure they include appropriate GenEd. This will be an issue during the Accreditation visit in October, so not much time to review. Hope is to get programs grandfathered in while making changes. Chair Lococo’s brief review of Leeward CC’s AAS programs leads him to feel that we may not have much if anything to change. He charged Curriculum Committee Chair Michael Lane to bring this up before his committee.

3. Votes in the ACCFSC

Senators were also informed that there had been several votes taken at the last All-Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) meeting.

   A. During a discussion of UH administration salaries and overall budget priorities, we were informed that the “Faculty Dependent Scholarship” fund of $250,000 has run out, and no more planned for the budget. ACCFSC voted unanimously: “The ACCFSC objects to the University of Hawaii’s failure to find subsequent funding for the faculty
dependents’ scholarship, especially in light of the potential excessively high salary for the incoming UH Manoa Chancellor.”

B. The ACCFSC voted approval of a reconstituted “Faculty DL Committee.” Essentially the same committee as before but with new designation and reporting directly to the ACCFSC. One key difference is that now it is authorized to more proactively identify and make recommendations on UH system DL curriculum issues.

C. Voted to approve the “Common Course Numbering” proposal that our senate had authorized at our 3/21/12 meeting.

4. DE materials (ADA compliance) - ACCFSC discussion
Since by law all DE materials are required to be ADA compliant, there was some discussion at the ACCFSC meeting concerning some sort of common policies across the system, along with funding from the system for such purpose.

5. ACCFSC Academic Affairs Committee
Finally, Chair Lococo also notified the Senate that he is now a member of the ACCFSC Academic Affairs Committee. Duties, tasks, and functions to be determined.

VIII. Announcements

Academic and Institutional Support Committee (Cain)
The AIS needs a new chair since Sen. Cain will be FS Secretary in the next academic year. The chair must be a senator. Please contact Chair Lococo to volunteer.

Legislative Committee (Kosasa)
This session closes May 3.

Jean Hara’s retirement
Sen. Ono announced Jean Hara’s retirement party: May 19, at 11:30 a.m., at the Mandalay Restaurant ($25 for lunch, $5 gift contribution).

Mike Fujita memorial
Sen. Ono announced Mike Fujita's memorial service: May 20, at 6:30 p.m., at Mililani Memorial Park, Mauka Chapel.

Sen. Loo suggested that since was Mike was once a senator, we (FS) should consider writing a letter of thanks to his family. Other senators added that Mike was also on the Curriculum Committee and served as the AS Accounting coordinator and helped with transcript evaluations. Guest Gail Levy suggested perhaps planting a tree in his honor.

**Motion 12-31 (Loo/Hochstein):**

To issue a letter of appreciation to the family of Michael Fujita.

**21 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions: motion passed.**

Sen. Loo will draft the letter, and Chair Lococo will sign it.

**Commencement**

Sen. Scully reminded senators about commencement. Volunteers are needed for crowd control, etc.; please email Lexer (Chou) to volunteer.

**Faculty Engagement Committee**

Sen. Ono announced that senators Scully, Asamoto, and Brekke will meet May 17 to make plans for August events.

**TB tests for faculty taking courses**

Sen. Lane requested investigation of the rule requiring faculty to take a TB test in order to enroll as a student in a course. Sen. Ono pointed out that OCEWD does not require the test for its classes. Chair Lococo will bring this issue up at the August CCCFSC meeting.

**Committee reports**

Chair Lococo requested that, per bylaw requirements, committee chairs each create an annual report summary by the end of the semester.

**IX. Adjournment—5:20 p.m.**

Next meeting (last meeting of the semester) is on May 9, 2012.