I. Call to Order: time 9:04am  
Recorder: Sterling Foster & Julian Tyrell  
Absent: Justin Ota, Erika Lacro, Charles Miller, Kaleo Gagne  
Guests: Jim Poole, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch

II. Adoption of the Agenda – No changes to the agenda.

Motion – Sterling Foster moved to approve the agenda as it is. Danny Aiu seconded. Motion passed, unanimously.

III. Approval of the Minutes – Feb. 14, 2014 had minor changes; capitalized “gpa” in System Chair report, pluralized “ranking” in Budget Requests, and lower cased “was” in the Approval of the Minutes.

Motion – Noel Alarcon moved to approve minutes with said changes. Mike Leidemann seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. FSEC Member Reports
1. Campus Chair – No Report.
2. System Chair – In the All Campus Council Meeting David Lassner talked about the budget and an upcoming meeting on Apr.2nd for legislators, campus leaders, and system chairs to discuss the 2015-2017 budget. The Board of Regents (BoR) has been very active working with Legislators on the budget, since there are bills trying to take money, in particular a bill that will take tuition money and put it in general funds. In July there will be new BoR members. – There is a possibility a new UH system college president will be found this summer. The original agreement was that the interim, Lassner, would not be a candidate, but he is still running for the position. He seems to be a good candidate and understands shared governance and the faculty interests. There will be campus visits for the presidential search committee. – The UHPD lawsuit had a meeting in which only the representative lawyer spoke and the faculty there from the ACCFSEC felt talked down to and were not happy about the meeting. If the lawsuit is successful it should not hinder administrators discussing with the FSECs everyday workings of the campus, although it could be perceived as bargainable issues. This is may not be true, it is uncertain until the lawsuit is concluded. – The Community College Campus meeting discussed the prior learning assessment that was put though, and allowing faculty to develop equivalency tests for credits, but there is concern over who administers the tests, the length of tests, will the test be assessed, etc. And the understanding is the faculty will control the testing/grading and credit allotment. – There was no specific discussion of reimbursing community colleges for the salary increases/restorations which the legislators/unions approved and the state should have paid for it.
3. Chancellor – Not present, will suspend agenda for their report when/if she arrives.

4. FSEC Representatives – No Reports

   Assessment Committee (AC) – No Report.
   Budget Committee (BC) – FSEC needs to submit the final ranking by Mar. 28th
   Campus Leadership Team (CLT) – No Report.
   Planning Council (PC) – No Report.

V. Non-FSEC Member Reports “Public Forum” – No Reports.

VI. Unfinished Business
   A. Budget Ranking – After reviewing a handout listing the top requests averaged from the first round rankings of governance committees, the FSEC discussed adjusting their rankings for the final round. Most requests were left with the same rank, but three requests changed. TI-53 increased from rank 8 to 9, TI-55 increased from rank 8 to 9, and AS-05 increased from rank 7 to 9. These rank changes were to increase the governance committee average to include them into the final top requests. – A question was asked about AS-05 and the need for a Facilities Management Director. The response was that HonCC was the only campus without this Director, and it would help to have this individual with the continuous construction on campus. – The Campus Chair will make the changes to the rank list and forwarded it to the Budget Committee Chair.

   Motion – Mike Leidemann moved to approve the Final Budget Rankings with said changes. Danny Aiu seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

   B. Committee Reorganization – There was discussion on the restructuring and the new committee CCIE. One concern was regarding the lack of open dialog amongst the faculty, and posting on the faculty-list for comments. Another concern was the positive support from faculty who have not posted their support on the faculty-list, yet emailed the Chair directly. There was concern over who authored the CCIE Charter, but the document has been revised by the Chairs of the committees which the restructuring effects, namely AOC, AC, SSEC, and FSEC. Another concern was the lack of the Kupu Ka Wai council’s (KKW) involvement, which will be remedied by giving them a representative on the CCIE. A concern was made that some of the faculty on campus feel they could not speak their mind, because the CCIE was created and pushed forward by the power-players on campus. Another concern was how does this help/effect the entire campus. – One comment was that a new structure was just created, instead of a retooling of the current committees to address the problems. – There was discussion to support the creation of the CCIE based on the problems of the current committees. One problem is the large size of the current AOC and AC and due to its oversize there has been a lack of completed work and communication. Another problem is the overlap of tasks and duties in the AOC and the AC which creates more work than is necessary. It was mentioned that both the AOC and AC support this change, and since they know best about their own work/committee, we should support them and this change. – To address the main concern of why or what is the purpose, it was proposed that a fact sheet or frequently asked questions (FAQ) sheet be made and distributed to the faculty.
VI. New Business

A. Faculty Development Charter – The Faculty Development Committee Chair has asked the FSEC to approve a membership change in their charter. They would like to include “One (1) lecturer member from any Division” into their charter. Their committee has agreed to this change and then their Chair submitted the request to the FSEC. There was discussion regarding how this increase of membership will affect their committee and if they will have problems filling the position. Since they are asking for the change, they will need to ensure a lecturer will fill the position. If they don’t, the increased membership list could adversely affect the maintaining of quorum at their meetings. – The Campus Chair will notify them of the approval and ask them to update their Charter and FSEC authorization date.

Motion – Jessica Kaniho moved to approve the Charter change. Noel Alarcon seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Agenda suspended to address the New Business items C and D before discussing item B.

C. FSEC Assessment Cycle – The FSEC has been asked to maintain an assessment cycle, which could be each semester, each year, or once every few years. It is recommended that the cycle be established in the Charter. The Assessment should address the duties of the FSEC, allow faculty feedback, review the feedback, and respond with or without action. The following was submitted for approval:

FSEC Assessment:
The FSEC shall conduct an annual survey to assess the performance of the Campus Chair, the System Chair, and the Representatives. The questions are subject to change, but must assess the duties of each position. The survey shall be conducted around March’s meeting, with a minimum of two weeks for responses. The data shall be collected and discussed that semester. The survey, the results, and the FSEC responses shall be posted to the intranet. If the FSEC responses include action items and those items are not addressed that semester, the items may be carried over and implemented in the following year.

There was discussion regarding who was asking for the FSEC to do this. It was the Chair of the Accreditation Oversight Committee. Also there was discussion if FSEC has the authority to make this change to their Charter. The Chair answered that the FSEC can make changes to their Charter regarding operating rules and procedures, and the Chair believes this falls within procedures. Also it will ensure the FSEC is assessing itself, asking for faculty feedback, and addressing those comments. – There was discussion around some word choices, and changes were made based off of consensus. – The Chair was tasked to make the change upon approval.

Motion – Danny Aiu moved to approve this paragraph into the FSEC Charter. Erica Balbag-Gerard seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

D. FSEC Assessment Questions – The FSEC was asked to submit an assessment survey to the faculty. The questions from the previous years were lacking detail regarding roles and duties of the FSEC. It was proposed these questions be changed. The Chair submitted a handout with new questions. – There was discussion over word choice regarding gender, he/she or she/he or s/he or the fact that today many people do not subscribe to only two gender choices. A solution was found and agreed upon. – There was discussion on the two questions regarding the System Chair, and that the questions
were the partly the same question. It was suggested that the two be reworded as one. – There was a suggestion to include a comments box on the survey for faculty to write the FSEC comments. This was accepted. – The Chair will submit the survey to the Faculty, and return to discuss the results at the next meeting.

**Motion – Sterling Foster moved to approve the Assessment Questions. Danny Aiu seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

B. The CCIE Charter – Considering many comments were discussed and made above regarding the CCIE approval as an unfinished business item, the CCIE Charter is tied to that approval. Therefore these items of business will be combined, the approval of the CCIE Charter and approval the structure. – Since the above discussion presented clarification of the CCIE’s role and statements from within its charter, it was suggested that the faculty need more time to read/discuss/comment on the charter.

**Motion – Danny Aiu moved to table the CCIE Charter until the next meeting. Sterling Foster seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

IX. Adjournment: time 10:54am