

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 2021-2022

<p>Date: Friday, December 10, 2021 Time: 12:00 pm Location: Zoom</p>	<p>Members Present: Aimee Maclennan, Ākea Kiyuna, Alma Cremer, Anne Chung, Brenda Watanabe, Carrie Butler, Carrie Mospens, Claudia Wilcox-Boucher, David Tsugawa, Debbie Weeks, Deseree Salvador, Donala Kawauhau, Donna Madrid, Drew Kapp, Glenn-Dee Kuwaye, Grace Funai, Harold Fujii, Janet Smith, Jennifer Sims, Jesna Nissam, Kapena Landgraf, Kenoalani Dela Cruz, Kuulei Kanahale, Lisa Fukumitsu, Lissandra Baldan Jenkins, Luria Namba, Meidor Hu, Michelle Phillips, Neva Supe-Roque, No’el Tagab-Cruz, Reshela DuPuis, Robyn Kalauli, Sam Giordanengo, Sandra Claveria, Sharon Dansereau, Susie DeSa Dill, Tagi Qolouvaki, Tamera Loveday, Tanya Dean, Toni Cravens Howell, Wailani Walker</p>
<p>Call to Order: 12:05 pm By: David Tsugawa Mins: Aimee Maclennan</p>	<p>Guests: None</p>

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
1. Ascertain quorum	Meeting called to order by Chair David Tsugawa at 12:05 pm with 30 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			
3. Approval of the Minutes	<p>Approval of the November 19, 2021 Minutes (Att. 1)</p> <p>Motion to approve the November 19, 2021 Minutes (Fujii/Weeks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>None</i> • Vote: 19 Yay, 1 Nay, 5 Abstentions 	<p>Motion to approve Nov 19, 2021 carried. Minutes approved.</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
<p>4. Senate Chair Report</p>	<p>1) Request for Update from Registrar’s office (Occurring January 2022)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sherise was planning to join the Senate meeting today to report on the participation verification system. David has sent her all the feedback provided by the faculty. Due to conflicting meetings, she can’t make it but will the January Senate meeting. <p>2) Create a task force to help with the CRC proposal (link in agenda)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair Tsugawa presented Att. 11, F2022-3: Proposal to the Academic Senate regarding the creation of a CRC Proposal Ad Hoc committee. Question – In this proposal, would this limit the EPC only to the question of, does the CRC full review, constitute a 20% review? Answer – No, if they are going to review the policy, the whole policy should be reviewed and updated at the same time so everything will be in alignment. Suggestion that Lisa Fukumitsu should be involved in the revision of the language to the proposal as the EPC chair. Comment – As a member of the EPC, I know that the 20% review is on their list as something that needs to be looked at. They are specifically looking at removing the form from the policy itself. There needs to be consideration that we are looking at the 20% policy on its own, to be revised, not this idea that we are aligning it to either to affirm the CRC’s proposal, or not. Comment – To clarify, it’s not to approve the curriculum proposal, but to be able to use, when a proposal is submitted, to fulfill the 20% review requirement, because the committee is already looking at the proposal in its entirety. This way there wouldn’t have to be a separate 20% review on this proposal a year down the road. Reply – I understand, but the thing in question is this the CRC’s purview? We can’t revise the 20% course review to affirm that. Comment – The function of the 20% review is not the same as the function of the CRC course review. CRC review determines if the course being taught the same as the paper that is being reviewed. It looks at the 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>course syllabus and compares it with the Quali metrics. These reviews are two completely separate purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question – Do the 20% reviews go to the DCs for review as well? Answer – Yes this is the process. Reply – Where in the CRC workflow would that happen if we were to combine these processes. Answer – it goes to the DCs before Senate, then the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor. • Comment – When I was reading the 20% policy, I realized it was antiquated needs updating. I didn’t realize that it is something that GEC addresses as well. The way it is worded at Leeward, it makes it seem so simple that the CRC review is a way to address the 20% review. It makes it seem that the process is more streamlined and efficient. You are updating the course or program, that it is able to stand for a review. Maybe it’s not our purview, but it is something that we already do when reviewing the course or program. • Proposal F2022-3 will be withdrawn for the time being in order to revise the wording. It will be brought back to Senate in January. <p>3) ClimbHI Opt-in link (link in agenda)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a networking system for business and education on the Big Island. Everyone should have received an opt-in link in case you want to receive updates from ClimbHI. The opt-in link is attached in the agenda if you need. <p>4) Need for UHPA to come talk?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David was approached to have representation from UHPA to come talk to the Senate. Is there still a need to have UHPA come chat with the Senate? If so, what would you like to discuss? • Comment – I still think UHPA higher ups should come talk to the Senate. I think this is a great time for UHPA to come in and give us more of their time. I’d like to be present with a group of my colleagues to hear what 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>UHPA have to say.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair Tsugawa is requesting that Senators email him questions for UHPA. He will compile the questions, send them to UHPA, and see if they will come to a Senate meeting. <p>6) College Council Report:</p> <p>6a) Chancellor’s Report at College Council (link in agenda)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chancellor is helping to transition in the new VCSA, which should happen in the next 3 months. Ed Ready app is almost ready to launch. HEERF directives to students are available and information has been sent out to students letting them know that they have access to direct-paid funding. <p>6b) VCSA Report – No Update</p> <p>6c) VCAS Report – HEERF update (link in agenda)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lecturers will be sent out vaccination forms because of the new mandates coming into effect in January. <p>6d) VCAA Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PD funding requests have been approved. Comprehensive Reviews, this is a good place to include HEERF fund requests. If you want to make specific funding requests, attach the HEERF acronym to ensure your requests will be accepted. Finals and final projects need to be scheduled during the finals week per the final exam schedule The Director position for Palamanui is open with a deadline Dec 31. 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<p>7) Committee Report from the College Council Committees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSD committee had a report – linked in agenda • CPC – Kalani gave a report, briefly mentioned that they are completing their midterm report that will be submitted early Spring 2022. A draft of the report will be sent to College Council early next year. • Accreditation Steering Committee – Completing Midterm report by early spring and will present to college council for review (link in agenda) <p>8) Open Proposals at College Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal to record meetings has been tabled at College Council by a vote of 12 to 5. • Change HAW 5.202 to 4.202 • Dissolve KAIAC • Creation of CCSSE task force <p>9) ACCFSC Report: Special meeting 12/3/21 on SCR Task force 201</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BOR Chair and our liaison Ernie Wilson were in attendance with President Lassner. Discussion regarding the BOR pig and the report on tenure continued. • BOR Chair Moore wants everyone to understand that there are discussions on how to move forward and improve the tenure system. Any future changes will not impact those currently tenured. <p>10) CCFSC Report: Toni from 11/19/21 CCCFSC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timeline for the employee vaccination mandate was reiterated. January 3rd is the deadline. There is an internal deadline set by the VCAA of Dec 15: please submit documents by Dec 15 if applying for exemption. • There was a discussion regarding an online workgroup, talking about best practices, questions, and problems, that could occur when trying to offer certificates and/or degrees fully online. We should receive info on this in January or February. 		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION / PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TARGET DATE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was discussion regarding the general education reform – they are asking for feedback. Still looking for the reform, as well as the current document, for feedback • Discussion regarding the ACCFSC meetings – these meetings can be Manoa-centric. This was a good opportunity to share our thoughts on the BOR meetings and the PIG report. <p>11) Vice Chair Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ad Hoc Senate Charter Review Committee has been meeting weekly. The revisions for review are linked in the agenda. • They’ve gotten through the document and a rough draft is attached in the agenda. They are hoping to submit a first reading to Senate in the February meeting. 		
<p>5. Old Business</p>	<p>1) CRC – Ku’ulei Kanahele / Grace Funai (Att. 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please disregard the CRC’s bullet point regarding fire science. This can be taken off the report, as CRC was able to move the proposals up and they will go up for Senate vote. • FIRE 250 and FIRE 251 should be “modify” not “retire”. This is an error in the committee report. • Comment – There seems to be something missing on the bottom of the report. The report attached in the agenda may not be the CRC most up to date committee report. • Comment – There was discussion about fire science being in the node because of an MOU that Kapiolani CC had made with the fire science, which said that there should be no modifications or , the program being offered, at HawCC. I don’t know if that affects the students with financial aid with the CO, because we are going to have less credits. There were other issues with the MOU, basically requiring approval from Kapiolani CC saying that we could modify the course. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment – Jessica and Melanie were both in the meeting with Jack, where the four proposals were reviewed. They raised the question about it being offered at Kapiolani, and Melanie said it was taken care of and we are authorized to run the course as being proposed. She didn't have any concerns about it. It should not say "modify" but "new" as it is a new certificate. It wouldn't affect the students in the current fire program. They should still be able to receive financial aid.• Comment – the MOU for fire is for State certification. Our current EMT, that we are authorized to provide, is for National certification. We are not offering the State courses. This proposal today is not impacting any state certification, only national.• There was also discussion about the changes that are being proposed for the course and proposal redesign in Kualii. As an update, there is uncertainty at the system level if we will be able to make changes for the spring because of the large number of Kualii personnel that has changed over. <p>2) DE – Leanne Urasaki</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No Report <p>3) EPC – Lisa Fukumitsu</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No Report <p>4) FPC - Alma Cremer / Neva Supe-Roque (Att. 3-5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shown Att. 4: Student Evaluation of Instructors and Lecturers. Some of the history from eCAFE has been changed from eCAFE to CES. Questions regarding procedures arose: who has access with the CES and where can we change where it's going to be?• Neva was invited to speak with DCs in order to get info about the CES. Each software will have its own way of ensuring appropriate access and sharing options. If the tool changes, then the verbiage will have to be reflected in #7 and #8 of Att. 4. When there are changes as far as access,		
--	---	--	--

	<p>the only people who have access are the department and those trained to add or remove questions within their own department or divisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If you have questions, contact please contact your FPC representative in your department. <p>5) GEC – Kenoalani Dela Cruz / Kapena Landgraf (Att. 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Spring 2022 submission deadline will be February 1, 2022. <p>6) HAP – No’el Tagab-Cruz</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No Report. <p>7) WI – Sharon Dansereau (Att. 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The next proposal deadline for WI classes is Jan 31, 2022 for fall 2022 classes.• The committee is holding an interest meeting for questions about teaching writing on December 15. <p>8) Sustainability - Drew Kapp / Kristine Kotecki</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No Report <p>9) UHPA BOD update – Sam Giordanengo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No updates, will be looking at proposals regarding tenure soon. Middle of next semester will be elections for representatives. <p>10) GE Redesign Update – Sam Giordanengo (Att. 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a misinterpretation that we are dissolving disciplines and departments. This is not the case at all.• Implementation of the GE redesign will be planned this summer• There is a proposal to form an Ad. Hoc committee to look at the rough draft of the GE redesign proposal to determine our questions and concerns about this proposal. Having some representation from the GE committee and representation from the counselling faculty would be very beneficial to this Ad. Hoc. Committee.		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Ad. Hoc. Committee will bring back issues or concerns about the GE redesign proposal to the Senate. • Any amendments or changes can also be brought back to the Senate • We have till spring 2026 for this entire thing to be implemented, but a rough draft must be presented to system by the end of Spring 2022. <p>11) Palamanui Updates - Tanya Dean</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Report <p>12) Ko Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Report 		
<p>6. New Business</p>	<p>1) Committee Proposals for Senate Vote (Att. 9)</p> <p><u>CRC</u> Move to vote on the CRC proposals as a block (Dupuis/weeks) Discussion: <i>none</i> Vote: <i>28 yay, 1 nay, 2 abstentions</i></p> <p>Motion to approve the block of CRC proposals (Smith/Weeks) Discussion: <i>none</i> vote: <i>27 yay, 2 nay, 1 abstention</i></p> <p>Motion to approve the operating procedures that were previously in the CRC policy to be separated out into operating procedures for the CRC. (Funai/Fujii) Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment - As we are revising the Senate charter, we keep in mind in our discussions that we wanted to support what the committees feel is best in terms of length of service. If we pass this CRC proposal as is, we can make our charter more flexible in length of service (two versus three years). • Comment – Regarding the new position of the CRC position specialist, I understand that if the position is created it will be to fill Shyann’s spot. There is a general concern about the needs of the Senate and this position 	<p>Motion to vote on the CRC proposals as a block carried.</p> <p>Motion to approve the block of CRC proposals carried.</p> <p>Motion to approve the separation and implementation of CRC operating procedures carried.</p>	

	<p>filling those needs when, in reality, this is an administration position. We understand that the work needs to be done, but are we creating a pattern where faculty is receiving release time to supplement administrative work that admin seems to ignore, in the hopes that we will do it? This continues to take away faculty from their primary responsibilities. If it is a teaching faculty, we'd have to hire teachers to teach the missed courses and non-teaching faculty will be receiving release time and, we know, these individuals will continue to do their own work, not actually receiving release time. While we know this is something that has to be remedied, we are concerned of this continual pattern where faculty fill gaps when admin should be finding APT or their own positions to fill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment – We need someone to fill this position. I hope we will continue to advocate to have this position because the concern is that we can't let this data base go.• Question – Is there a mentoring process so the terms are staggered? Why are the terms 3 years long? Answer – After the Chair has served 3 years, they would transition into the specialist position and mentor the new Chair. Both the Chair and curriculum specialist will get reassigned time.• Comment – There is only one out of seven campuses (Leeward) that have curriculum specialists. As faculty, we are all about teaching. What I wanted to propose to the other CC Chairs, is that we present to Erika that all campuses have curriculum specialists. Not just clerical work, but somebody who really understands curriculum inside and out, who can help faculty when they are making curriculum proposals. This will help them be more informed and make things run smoother. We should have curriculum specialists at every one for our campuses.• Comment– We better be careful that we aren't stretching ourselves too far. We don't want to burn out our Kauhale. I like the previous idea, that you take it back and let the BOR know that this is a needed position at each campus. We don't realize the impact of burnout till it's too late. Without the students we are nothing.• Comment – I'm a curriculum developer on campus. If at any point, any of the faculty want to look at trends that are happening from the non-credit		
--	--	--	--

	<p>side that can be implemented into their curriculum I (Senator Supe-Roque) am available. Vote: 19 yay, 10 nays, 2 abstentions</p> <p>Move to approve the proposed curriculum changes – proposal redesign for Kualii courses and programs (Funai/Dupuis) Discussion: none Vote: 21 yay, 8 nay, 2 abstentions</p> <p>2) Third reading and discussion of proposal 5.202 There is still the proposal to change proposal 5.202 to 4.202 College Council. We are voting on how Chair Tsugawa should vote on this matter at College Council.</p> <p>Motion to request that Chair Tsugawa vote in favor of the change of policy 5.202 to policy 4.202 at College Council Discussion: none Vote: 20 yay, 4 nay, 4 abstentions</p> <p>3) F2022-2 Proposal to the Academic Senate (Att. 8)</p> <p>Motion to create a GE redesign Ad Hoc committee (Giordanengo/Claveria) Discussion: none vote: 14 yay, 0 nay, 1 abstention</p> <p>4) Next year’s Senate Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because Vice Chair Cravens-Howell has become the co-Chair of the MNS department, she no longer intends on becoming Senate Chair next year. • There are three options that we can entertain: 	<p>Motion to approve the proposed curriculum changes, proposal redesign for Kualii courses and programs carried.</p> <p>Motion for Chair Tsugawa to vote in favor of the change of proposal 5.202 to 4.202 at College Council Carried.</p> <p>Motion to create the GE redesign Ad Hoc Committee Carried.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vice Chair Cravens-Howell can step down as Vice Chair in Spring 2022, and we can have a new vice step in for spring. ○ Vice Chair Cravens-Howell can remain as Vice Chair for Spring and 2022 and we could vote Chair Tsugawa on as the Senate chair for a 3rd year so the new Vice Chair can train for one year ○ Take on a new Vice Chair in Spring 2022 and then they become chair for AY 22-23 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Question – Can we combine two of the above suggestions? Give Vice Chair Cravens-Howell a break, train a new Vice Chair for year for 1.5 years, and then the new Vice Chair become Chair for AY 22-23? <p>Motion that we accept the original second option: Vice Chair Cravens-Howell remains Vice Chair for Spring 2022 and Chair Tsugawa remains as Senate Chair for AY 22-23. We will designate a new Vice Chair for AY 22-23, who trains to become Senate chair in AY 23-24. (Giordanengo/Fujii)</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Question – What happens to Vice Chair Cravens-Howell’s involvement in the charter review if they do not continue as Vice Chair? Answer – The new person would have to pick up this work as it is the purview of the Vice Chair. ● Comment – If the decision to choose a new Vice Chair for S22 is made, an election process for a new Vice Chair would have to be carried out. Vice Chair Cravens-Howell would continue on until the decision is made. Candidate(s) for the new Vice Chair would have to be brought to the EC, discussed, then voted on. <p>Vote: 19 yay, 0 abstention, 0 nay.</p> <p>5) Request for assistance with the Development of a potential select committee or group on data analysis – first reading and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Senator Kawaauhau spoke about her letter to the Senate Chair. The letter is in reply to dissolve KAIAC and form CCSSE. This letter is in regard to fill this need in whatever manner the Senate deems necessary. These members are offering their services in order to collect and interpret data. 	<p>Motion to accept Vice Chair Cravens-Howell for S22, Chair Tsugawa for AY 22-23, and a new Vice Chair for AY 22-23 carried.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Academic Senate Meeting
12-10-2021

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair Tsugawa suggests that a new proposal is generated and sent to the Senate in order to create a new committee. 		
7. For the good of the Order	1) 12/21 mini food distribution – 30-40 packets to go out.		
8. Adjourn	<p>Motion to adjourn (Smith/Fujii) Vote to adjourn: No formal vote taken. -Meeting adjourned at 2:33 pm by Chair Tsugawa</p> <p>-Next meeting: Friday January 28, 2022 12:00 pm via Zoom.</p>	<p>Motion to adjourn carried. Meeting adjourned at 2:33 pm.</p>	