

### Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 2021-2022

<p><b>Date:</b> Friday, September 24, 2021 <b>Time:</b> 12:00 pm <b>Location:</b> Zoom</p>	<p><b>Members Present:</b> Aimee Maclennan, Ākea Kiyuna, Alma Cremer, Anne Chung, Brenda Watanabe, Camille Hernandez, Caroline Naguwa, Carrie Butler, Carrie Mospens, Cheryl Pavel, Christine Quintana, Claudia Wilcox-Boucher, David Tsugawa, Debbie Weeks, Deseree Salvador, Donala Kawaauhau, Donna De Silva, Donna Madrid, Drew Kapp, Glenn-Dee Kuwaye, Grace Funai, Harold Fujii, Janet Smith, Jeanne Batallones, Jennifer Sims, Jesna Nissam, Kaleopono Quintana, Kanoe Lambert, Kapena Landgraf, Karen Crowell, Kate De Soto, Kenoalani Dela Cruz, Kristine Kotecki, Kuulei Kanahale, Larissa Leslie, Laurel Gregory, Leanne Urasaki, Lisa Fukumitsu, Lissandra Baldan Jenkins, Luria Namba, Luzviminda Miguel, Mari Giel, Meidor Hu, Michelle Phillips, Neva Supe-Roque, Noel Tagab-Cruz, Pamela Scheffler, Pele Kaio, Renee AK Dela Cruz, Reshela DuPuis, Robyn Kalauli, Sam Giordanengo, Sandra Claveria, Sharon Dansereau, Susie Dill, Tamera Loveday, Tanya Dean, Tiffany Naea, Toni Cravens Howell, Wailani Walker</p>
<p><b>Call to Order:</b> 12:03 pm <b>By:</b> David Tsugawa <b>Mins:</b> Aimee Maclennan</p>	<p><b>Guests:</b> None</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
1. Ascertain quorum	Meeting called to order by Chair David Tsugawa at 12:03 pm with 37 senators (including least 3 Executive Committee members) in attendance.		
2. Roll Call and Introductions / Guest	No roll call taken due to sufficient number of members in attendance. Attendance recorded via Zoom enrollment.		
Announcements	Reminder! Documents are due October 1, 2021.		
3. Approval of the Minutes	<p><b>Approval of the August 27, 2021 Minutes (Att. 1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Motion to approve the August 27, 2021 Minutes (Giordanengo/Smith)</b></li> <li>• <b>Discussion: None</b></li> <li>• <b>Vote: 26 Yay, 0 Nay, 6 Abstentions</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion to approve Aug 27, 2021 minutes carried. Minutes Approved.</b></p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p><b>4. Senate Chair Report</b></p>	<p><b>1) VPAS Search Committee: Volunteer Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four (4) people from Hawaii Community College (HawCC) put their names forward to volunteer for the VPAS Search Committee. All names have been sent to System, who may select a candidate from the list of volunteers.</li> </ul> <p><b>2) Student Constitutional Convention (Att. in agenda)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The student constitutional convention is coming up. It was mentioned at CoCo (College Council), but this is a reminder in case you'd like to volunteer for this event.</li> <li>• The college convention represents a convening/gathering of representatives of students with support from faculty and staff mentors. They are charged with establishing chartered documents for the Student Activities Counsel and amending ASUH and Student Charter documents as appropriate and necessary by February of next year.</li> <li>• Barbra Arthurs and Larissa Leslie are helping out, as well as Kei-Lin Cerf from Ko, and Kalei Haleamau-Kam from Palamanui.</li> <li>• Please contact the above if you would like to volunteer.</li> </ul> <p><b>3) Senate Charter Review Committee update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AdHoc charter review committee is arranging to have their first meeting. If you are willing to help with Senate Charter amendments, please consider volunteering for this committee. It would be beneficial to have more members of Senate reviewing the Charter.</li> <li>• The first meeting will be in the beginning of October.</li> </ul> <p><b>4) UH Admin Requests &amp; Memos (Att. in agenda)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System has been good about requesting feedback on policy revisions. They have set up a system to disseminate information regarding policy revisions and directly receive feedback from faculty regarding the revisions using a PDF-fillable policy comment form.</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>David has created a shared folder in the Senate google drive where you can find the feedback forms and current Policies that are requiring feedback.</li> </ul> <p><b>5) STAR opt-in for add/drop notification (Att. in agenda)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a beneficial feature in STAR, which will help us keep track of our students. (Chair Tsugawa gave a live presentation of these features in STAR).</li> <li><b>Comment</b> – In a meeting earlier this week, some faculty were saying that this app and was lagging. Data was not up to date and seems a bit behind real-time, making it unreliable. People felt it was better to double check everything and not rely on this system.</li> <li><b>Comment</b> – Just reiterating above, the app does lag. Even the add/drop with the students is incorrect. It only says that students are in compliance with either testing results or vaccination. It does not say that the students are safe to come to class. Students still have to complete the LumiSight sign-in when coming to class.</li> </ul> <p><b>6) Memo re: Promotion Documents and Inclusion Years (Att. in agenda)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For those preparing promotion documents: keep in mind that the year you applied for your previous tenure or promotion, you have to include that in your current application document. Example; if you applied for promotion Aug 2018, you submitted your document in Oct 2017. In your current document, you have to include the year 2017-2018.</li> <li>You have to include this year because it is not included in any previous documents.</li> </ul> <p><b>7) ACCFSC REPORT: Meeting Friday 9/17/21</b></p> <p>a) BOR Regent Wilson Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regent Wilson did not really talk about the PIG during the ACCFSC meeting, but he seemed to be feeling uneasy about the report that the</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>BOR put out.</p> <p><b>b) ACCFSC decided to create AdHoc committee to review and suggest changes to the current System definition of “small programs”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small programs are currently a “hot item” because of changes that are happening on all of our campuses with regards to the swept positions from the Legislature (a couple of years ago) and budgets restraints due to Covid-19.</li> <li>• Administrators are looking to make cuts and one of the first things to go are generally small programs. Senate chairs are working hard to keep the small programs because the Administration seems to be working on a vague or overly simplified/generalistic definition of small programs.</li> <li>• The AdHoc committee has been assembled to see if they can come up with a definition of small programs to put forward to System so if it comes to any kind of program removal, it is done in a much smarter way.</li> </ul> <p><b>c) Faculty Input at BOR Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Starting last spring, Senate Chairs were asking Ernie Wilson about having faculty input at BOR meetings.</li> <li>• On the BOR, there is a student representative who serves as a BOR person. What seems to be missing is any kind of faculty representation at these BOR meetings. UH president Lassner and Vice President Lacro do attend these meetings. It is concerning how often Lassner speaks on behalf of faculty, when it may not reflect the true feelings of the faculty.</li> <li>• There needs to be a better way to have faculty represented at the BOR meetings. If anything, it would be beneficial to have faculty participation in many of the BOR committees.</li> </ul> <p><b>d) Public Dissemination of Administration Evaluations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the UH campuses is currently doing an Administration Evaluation. Their senate voted to make the Administration evaluations public. The</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>evaluations occurred this past week and it will have huge ramifications moving forward, especially if other campuses start doing similar evaluations.</p> <p><b>8) CCCFSC Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no report</li> <li>• Chair Tsugawa will be attending the next CCCFSC meeting on 10/22, so Vice Chair Cravens-Howell will lead the 10/22 Academic Senate Meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>9) Vice Chair Report: Call to facilitate review of Senate Charter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vice Chair Cravens-Howell will be facilitating the 5-year review of the Senate charter. To those interested in participating in the charter review, you will receive a doodle-poll for meeting availability shortly. Please expect an email if you volunteered to be on the AdHoc charter review committee.</li> <li>• The committee will arrange to have their first meeting in a week or two. They will discuss the project timeline and begin to review the Senate charter.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5. Old Business</b></p>	<p><b>1) CRC – Ku’ulei Kanahele / Grace Funai (Att. 7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since losing the Curriculum Specialist position in Summer 2020, the CRC Chairs have found that they are picking up a lot of the slack for the vacant position. Because the position was lost so suddenly, there was no opportunity for the CRC Chairs to gain mentorship from the outgoing curriculum specialist. They are still learning about the responsibilities of the curriculum specialist role and are trying to figure out what needs to be done.</li> <li>• Also, with the retirement of Joni Onishi, there has been a gap in the CRC’s understanding of the curriculum process. Joni also filled in some of the duties of the curriculum specialist.</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some concerns arose over the summer:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It was suggested that the CRC review of incoming proposals was sufficient for the 20% review of the course. With that said, should the CRC be reviewing the entire proposal instead of only those sections being modified to ensure that the course meets the scope of the content and criteria established by each unit. This puts a heavier load on the CRC if their review counts as the 20% review.</li> <li>○ As CRC are reviewing course proposals, they are noticing that the majority of course objectives are outdated and written in the student point of view. If you press the icon on the CRC proposal form, it specifically states that the objective should be written in the instructor view. Many times, proposals are returned just for this fact. There was a point brought up that, if we as a Kauhale adopted CLO's, does that make the course objectives necessary? (Because we now follow CLO's more than we do the course objectives)</li> <li>○ The CRC chairs don't have admin rights to Kualii, but are requesting that they obtain admin rights just to make minor changes such as fixing grammatical and spelling errors and to unify language such as "C or better". They will notify proposers of any small changes that are made. Currently all minor changes have been returned to proposers and CRC feels a minor sense of frustration that they are returning proposals for these minor things.</li> <li>○ Field 4.5 of the form asks for experiential or professional preparation to teach the course. The TRC feels that they should match the wording to the official MQs. The link to the official MQs is provided in the committee report.</li> <li>○ The TRC has reviewed the majority of proposals that have been submitted. They ask that proposers return them as soon as possible, so that they can be forwarded to the Senate by</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>December.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Last bullet of the committee report has been retracted, as it is inaccurate.</li> <li>○ There is going to be a Quali migration, but the CRC is waiting on direction for this process.</li> <li>○ The CRC is intending to find a way to streamline the template, because it is not the most user friendly. The MQ section needs to be updated. The redesign should happen by the spring semester.</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – Question about the first bullet: The CRC review will be adequate for the 20% review. Who was this suggested by and why was it tasked to the CRC? <b>Answer</b> – We don’t know the answer to this. That is why it is being brought up to the Senate. We want to get a general feel of how the faculty feel. I think it stems from the fact that, if you open up the 20% review, the CRC is listed on it. This may be where this suggestion stems from.</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – I remember Joni Onishi, a year and a half ago, raised this issue if whether or not a CRC review constituted as a full 20% review. This was a suggested way to manage the paperwork for all of the reviews.</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> –The 20% review is fundamentally asking, “is the course, as it is currently taught, essentially the same as the course on paper (the course outline)”? A CRC review assesses the course outline but it does not check if the course description and implementation align. The CRC does not require a syllabus, where the 20% review does. If there is going to be a recommendation from the Senate, I want them to understand the difference between the two reviews.</li> <li>○ <b>Question</b> – Why is the CRC taking on the task to look at anything besides the proposed changes? I have some concerns about the CRC working too hard. It seems like an impossible task that they’ve taken on and I’m not sure it is their job to take on and</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>review every single thing on Kualu, especially when someone puts in a proposal to change one specific thing. <b>Answer</b> – That is the discussion we are having. Do we only look at what is being modified or, because this is the course on record, should we look at the proposal and make it as “clean” as possible?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – This is a great conversation and I’m glad we are having it. The one thing that I want to remind everyone is that the CRC belongs to the Academic Senate. It is not administration or College Council. We can dictate, as a body, what its function is within our charter, which is currently being revised. This can be updated as the Senate charter goes through revisions. Per the BOR policy, anything that has to do with instruction belongs within the Senate</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – Particularly now, without the curriculum specialist position (someone who was specifically designated to know all of the proposals and how they interconnect with the other courses and programs), please keep in mind that CRC can’t press the approval button for just one section. They have to approve the proposal as a whole, even if they see a glaring error outside of the changes to the proposal. CRC feels that it is in the best interest of the proposal, as it goes forward, for the entire document to be accurate.</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – I’d like the evaluation of proposal changes and the evaluation of entire proposals to be done by two different bodies. This is a very specific charge and I believe it would be better kept organized by two different bodies. Also, I still don’t understand when the objectives or outcomes were officially changed. What happens to proposals for courses that are aligned across the system, whose objectives match but may not be written in the way that we require?</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – My understanding is that when we moved the records from curriculum central to Kualu, the person who</li> </ul>		



TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>managed the curriculum central had made a point that the objectives and outcomes were two different things and that the old curriculum central did not handle that well. This person reached out to the Assessment Coordinator for a definition of both objectives and outcomes. The Assessment Coordinator searched through a number of National assessment and evaluation resources to get a clear description for academic objectives versus outcomes. The original definitions that were submitted were either left out or cut off of the bullet. An academic objective is a statement of the instructor’s pedagogy or instructional strategies to achieve the goal of the course. The outcome is the effect of implementing those strategies and pedagogy: what is the intended impact, effect, and outcome on student learning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – it seems that the CRC process is cumbersome, in that we only get to implement changes once a year. I don’t think it is necessary to burden the CRC with more work. Perhaps, at the time the course is assessed, then can we make sure that the proposal is updated. I think it is important to not delay needed changes or adjustments to courses or the introduction of new courses because we have something that is out of date systemically.</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – I think this is worthy of a sub-committee that helps the CRC sort through this and bring something back to the Senate. I had 12 proposals that went through and it took me a year to get them approved because Admin kept kicking them back. I believe we need to streamline this process and support the CRC in any way possible. They don’t need to be the “master reviewers” . We really need the Curriculum specialist position.</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – It is definitely a long process to get through. One of the biggest bottle necks after Senate approval is when the proposal goes to Administration. If we only look at the small</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>changes to the proposals (not the proposal as a whole), it gets kicked back from Admin. Looking at the entire document may help streamline this process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – Part of the bottleneck is prospers not returning proposals back. The bottleneck is at both ends of the process.</li> <li>○ <b>Comment</b> – The CRC is in the process of updating the CRC charter and the duties of the committee. Chair Tsugawa would like to request that the other committees do the same. It is important to make it clear what each committee’s jobs are.</li> </ul> <p><b>2) DE – Leanne Urasaki (Att. 2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First meeting was 09/21/2021</li> <li>• Akea Kiyuna has joined the DE as a representative for Humanities.</li> <li>• There is one vacant seat from ATE.</li> </ul> <p><b>3) EPC – Lisa Fukumitsu (Att. 3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met on 09/7/2021</li> <li>• Jennifer Sims will be replacing Toni Cravens on EPC.</li> <li>• Committee Priorities include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A) HAW 5.254 Curriculum Review Process</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposal received from CRC Chari in Spring 2021</li> <li>○ Committee members were tasked with sharing the policy with their departments and reporting on feedback at the next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>B) Policies that have not been reviewed for five or more years</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assigned to individual members for review</li> <li>○ EPC will meet to discuss recommendations</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>4) FPC - Alma Cremer / Neva Supe-Roque</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Report.</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p><b>5) GEC – Kenoalani Dela Cruz / Kapena Landgraf (Att. 4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEC meets Mondays at 3:15-4:30 twice a month</li> <li>• Fall 2021 Application Deadline is Wednesday, September 30, 2021.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Electronic pdf or paper copy version of documents must be submitted to Kenoa Dela Cruz.</li> <li>○ Please refer to the Course Designation Checklist for a list of all required documents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposals GEC will review – GEC anticipates reviewing an estimated 12 course renewal designation proposals in Fall 2021 and 12 course renewal designation proposals in Spring 2022.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Five courses have already submitted proposals, which GEC will be reviewing in their October meeting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>6) HAP – No’el Tagab-Cruz (Att. 6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accepting HAP application. Reminder, deadline is September 30, 2021.</li> </ul> <p><b>7) WI – Sharon Dansereau</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Report.</li> </ul> <p><b>8) Sustainability - Drew Kapp / Kristine Kotecki (Att. 5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking committee representation from the trades.</li> <li>• Sustainability had an info session on the SF designation. If you’re interested in any more information about the certificate, there is a flier linked to the committee report.</li> <li>• SF Designation proposals; apply by October 10, 2021. You can apply at the instructor level or course level.</li> <li>• The responsibilities of the Sustainability committee have been divvied up between faculty for the different sustainability initiatives on the HawCC campus. If you have any sustainability-related questions you can contact the following individuals:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Drew Kapp and Kristine Kotecki as the leads for the academic</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>sustainability committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ka’ea Lyons and Debbie Weeks as the leads of the Kauhale sustainability committee.</li> <li>● La Honua Earth Day debriefing/planning Oct 12, 3:30. Contact Drew if you are interested in participating</li> </ul> <p><b>9) UHPA BOD update – Sam Giordanengo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The rate my administrator poll was put out this week. Sam would encourage everyone to look at this, as we look at our course evaluation system. It includes things that need to be improved or things that need improving. A similar activity was carried out a few years ago, in-house. What UHPA has done this time, is handing out the data to an independent polling firm. They will present the information back to UHPA which will then disseminate the information to all union members. The results should come to your personal email NOT your edu email.</li> <li>● If you are not a full dues-paying union member, you will not receive the results.</li> <li>● The tenure battle is heating up. It is not going away. There is one Senator who has made it their “life mission” for removing tenure for non-teaching faculty.</li> <li>● If you have tenure, currently as we speak and you are teaching faculty, the proposal is suggesting that you have to apply for tenure every 5 years and the criteria of renewal will be decided by the Chancellor.</li> <li>● Tenure guarantees academic freedom on the teaching side, and guarantees non-teaching faculty the ability to do their job by the best way that they deem important to perform their duties. This is not an optimal way to run a university. The Manoa faculty are about ready to “light their torches and get their pitchforks”. They feel that the BOR is micromanaged from the top down, which is against the state constitution.</li> <li>● UHPA has federal case laws on their side. This came up in the 80’s and UHPA took it to the federal courts and won. This has already been done,</li> </ul>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>this just a new set of Senators and a new BOR. We want to get this done with the BOR and we don't want to go to court. Now is a great time to submit written testimony or put your name down for the zoom testimony at the BOR meetings, as you can tell the BOR how you feel about this verbally or in writing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please be aware of this, it is not going away. The Senator pushing for this is very adamant that we should move forward with this.</li> <li>• If you are interested in the links for the BOR testimony, just send David an email . In addition to sending individual testimonies, you can send in a group testimony. At the last BOR meeting, there was a group-signed letter that was sent to the BOR.</li> </ul> <p><b>10) GE Redesign Update – Sam Giordanengo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They were hoping to submit something to Senate this month, but they don't have a completed document yet. This is a very large document and it is going to be going to consultants for proofreading and editing within the next week. Then there is an integration subcommittee that is looking at all of the academic integration models and, once the models are chosen, how they will be integrated into the University.</li> <li>• Sam is hopeful that the first draft will be available to share with the Academic Senates in October.</li> <li>• Sam would like to put together an AdHoc committee to determine how we fit this into our curriculum. The model is a skeleton and each individual campus has to “put the meat on the bones”. It will be a good four-year process for this to be fully implemented.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>6. New Business</b></p>	<p><b>1) Committee Proposals for Senate Vote</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Proposals</li> </ul> <p>2) UH BOR PIG – BOR Resolution in PIG Report</p>		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The entire pig report is included, but if you don't have time to go through the entire report, please (at the very least) read the one-page resolution itself. It details what the BOR would like to propose moving forward. The second thing item that you are strongly suggested to read is Christian Fern's letter of dissenting opinion (Att. in agenda)</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – Please do read the PIG report and the letter of dissenting opinion. Christian Fern has been around for a long time. When you read it, you'll be glad that we pay union dues. For his letter of dissenting opinion, he was there at the table. No one else was representing the faculty. It gives you a good feeling that someone is fighting for us (and doing a great job of it).</li> <li>• At the ACCFSC meeting, there was concern that there was no faculty representation at the PIG meetings. Chair Tsugawa is really happy that Christian is there on behalf of the faculty. Christian is representing us very well. He wrote a very clean and coherent response to the BOR resolution.</li> <li>• All of this being said, Chair Tsugawa would like to draft a letter to HawCC Administration, asking them to submit BOR testimony against the BOR resolution and the PIG report. He is seeking the Senate's approval to send this letter to administration</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion to adopt the letter from the Senate (DuPuis/Smith)</b>  <b>Discussion:</b> None  <b>Vote to adopt the letter to be sent to the administrators of the HawCC campus:</b>  <i>39 Yay, 0 nay, 5 abstain</i></p> <p>4) Faculty concerns – Staffing Plan proposal and reallocation of positions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the last CoCo meeting, Ken discussed reallocation of staffing.</li> <li>• Chair Tsugawa is asking the Senate for feedback on Ken's proposal and to provide feedback. Please include your concerns on the document, all of which will be anonymous. The list of concerns and feedback regarding</li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion carried.</b>  <b>Letter will be forwarded to HawCC administrators.</b></p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>the staffing plan proposal will be forwarded to Administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reminder: Wala’au session on Friday October 1, 2021 from 12:00 – 2:00 pm with VCAA Kaleiwahea (see 9/10/21 email from VCAA). He will likely ask for feedback or discussion regarding the staffing plan.</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – The wala’au has been scheduled at the same time as many department meetings. It has been requested that the wala’au be rescheduled for another time. The new time has not yet been announced, but we will be informed of any change.</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> - At the last DC meeting, Melanie said that the staffing plan has been tabled for now. They want to give Admin more time to talk about it in detail.</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – These spreadsheets make it very apparent that everyone’s department is suffering no matter how we look at it. It was hard, because I think we need to unify and look into some kind of fair process.</li> <li>• <b>Comment</b> – The spreadsheets have the information that we need so we understand what the proposals are. We want to make sure that this information doesn’t divide us across divisions. I’m glad to hear that this is open for more robust conversation.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>7. For the good of the Order</b></p>	<p><b>1)</b> Reminder – Please check your personal emails for the UHPA “Rate Your Administrator” survey!</p> <p><b>2)</b> Food drive next week Tuesday, 2:00 in Hilo and a Palamanui distribution will be coordinated later in the week.</p>		
<p><b>8. Adjourn</b></p>	<p><b>Motion to adjourn (Cravens/ Wilcox-Boucher)</b>  <b>Vote to adjourn: No formal vote taken.</b>            -Meeting adjourned at 1:42 pm by Chair Tsugawa   <b>-Next meeting: Friday October 22, 2021 12:00pm via Zoom.</b></p>	<p><b>Motion to adjourn carried. Meeting adjourned at 1:42 pm.</b></p>	

