Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes - May 10, 2013

Members Present: Sally Dunan (Chair), Steve Mandraccia (System Chair), John DeLay, Mike Liedemann, Kahale Saito, Noel Alarcon, Diane Caulfield, Julian Tyrell, Karen Hastings, Ross Egloria, Silvan Ching, Justin Ota, Erika Lacro, Kaleo Gagne.

Not Present: Charles Miller

New Members Present: Sterling Foster, Jessica Kaniho, Ina Miller-Cabasug, Erica Balbag-Gerard

Not Present: Danny Aiu

Guests: Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Sandy Sanpei, Doug Madden, Jennifer Higa-King, Michael Barros, Scott Rhode, Evelyn Greene, Dean Crowell, Brian Quinto, Mike Willett, Jenny Wong, Doug Raphael, Kara Kam-Kalani, Jerry Saviano, Alapaki Luke

Recorder: Steve Mandraccia and Sally Dunan; prepared by Steve Mandraccia.

1. The chair called the meeting to order at approximately 9:05 am and began by introducing the new members (see list above).

2. Approval of minutes from April 26, 2013. Sally stated she also made a change on item 7 after clarification from Chris Ann on the proposal for E-Focus designation for CTE. The clarification she provided is 12.5 hours of ethics education including at least 8 hours of discussion and then periodic assessment of the ethics outcomes. So the CTE programs would be documenting 12.5 hours of ethics education, which could include assignments, related to in-class discussion with 8 hours of in-class discussion on ethics. No other clarifications were noted. Sally said she would circulate changes in the minutes to provide the opportunity for feedback by people. Ron stated he would like to be able to read what people are saying he said. Sally replied she would circulate before a final posting.

3. Chancellor’s report. Sally stated that Erika responded by email regarding the reconciliation list for the catalog changes from last summer and that the list is being worked on; it’s being developed. Currently the priority is getting the changes for this year identified so the counselors can be notified in a timely manner.

4. Chancellor’s update. We got our $38 million for science building, a major accomplishment for our campus. Governor to release the money in July and chancellor has spoken with the
governor and sees no issues. Kokea street sidewalks will need to be upgraded and
depending where the bid for the building comes in, there may be money to pave the
incinerator parking lot (where the portables are now) once portables are gone. Expect
construction to start in spring, between January and March. Most likely will not start until
building 7 is completed. Erika was asked if the plans for the building were complete and
she responded, “yes they are ready to go”. Model call design build; 80 or 90% designed
and the remainder can be tweaked during the build with architectural firm.

5. Budget subcommittee update. Sally stated the budget committee met on May 1 and
finalized the recommendations for this years’ budget and the planning council met on May
3 and approved the recommendations forwarded by the committee. Erika noted that for the
first time in history the legislature did not fund the UHPA increases meaning they are
essentially treating faculty as though they are not state employees. We are looking at the
budget for 2015 containing UHPA member pay increases that the college cannot withstand
with our current budget. Erika said she is hesitant to fund any recurring items like positions
because in two years we will have a major problem, if we don’t get funding. The budget is
on a two year cycle and we just got our biennium budget so next year we can ask for a
supplemental and she is certain the university will go back to the legislature and tell them
they made an error and we cannot take these increases with our current service budget.
Erika stated that for us, if we have to take that cut, then we will probably have to make
personnel cuts to be quite honest; it’s several million dollars. Given that our budget is 90%
funding people, salary, and only 10% goes to other things and we will have to look at how
we are going to manage that; it’s not a good situation. Erika responded that she wasn’t sure
how we would do it, but first she would work on getting it from the legislature and if it
looks like in 2015 we won’t have it, we will have to start looking at temporary positions
and really cutting items, but the other thing tied to that we should think about how to
increase student enrollment and the number of credits the students are taking because every
additional credit increases our tuition and fee account $100 and we can use that for salaries.
Erika just wanted to put out that we could be $2 million short.

presented the current proposal for the structure of the General Education Board. Jennifer
distributed a copy of the charter and mentioned it was approved by CPC and stated she was
asking for FSEC also to approve.

- Had to work within the structure of the Gen Ed Board approved by CPC and FSEC.
  Looked at membership and how applications would be processed. Mentioned that the
  main purpose of the board is for certifying courses for certain CTE categories or some
  of the articulation categories. All the board does is review courses and/or instructors.
- Created one unified Gen Ed board.
- Structured function should involve consultation, cooperation, collaboration between UC and CTE faculty.
- Should be equal voting and representation including campus wide discussion and collaboration.
- Review of application should include expertise of faculty from both CTE and UC.
- CTE sub-board should be at the same level of the articulation sub-boards.
- Treat Tech I and Tech II as separate independent units.
- Treat UC as one unit, even though it consists of 4 big divisions.
- Increase representation of CTE faculty on CPC. Want that CTE person to be the one serving on the sub-board.
- Operate with two sets of criteria to determine whether a course of instructor is certified. Articulation side and CTE side.
- Minimize the number of CTE faculty needed to serve on the GenEd board. Has been reduced to 4.

At the lowest level of the structure is where all the proposals come in; notes that the GenEd board only certifies courses; it does not approve or disprove courses or instructors. All committees on the same level have the same representation. The CTE sub-board has two UC faculty, two Tech I faculty and two Tech II faculty. In the case of a Tech I proposal, the two Tech I and two UC faculty review and vote. In the case of a Tech II proposal, two Tech II faculty and two UC faculty review and vote, and in the case of a proposal affecting both Tech I and Tech II, we have one Tech I faculty, one Tech II faculty, and two UC faculty review and vote. This change was suggested by Bert. It was mentioned that equal voting and representation between CTE and UC representatives does not happen at the General Education Board Level. And that more than course certification decisions have occurred at the GE Board.

The board will do decision making by consensus; meaning the process requires all members involved in the decision making will have input in the discussion, understand the decision, and will publicly support it. So once consensus is reached, the action will be passed and recorded. Note that if one member has an issue or thinks more work is needed, the action is not passed; all members must agree. The decision making is done at the sub-boards and it really has not happened that the Gen Ed board has had to make a decision in lieu of a decision at the sub-board. So there is equity at the decision making level and at the CPC level. In addition, at the Gen Ed board the decision making requires consensus so that one person has as much influence as anyone else so no one can get “out voted.” The GenEd board is not going to overturn a decision of a sub-board.

GenEd board had about 7 meetings and there were many disagreements, but the final product was as a result of a consensus of all members; everyone agreed to it. This is a data driven breakdown. CTE is going to have more representation per course than UC. Erika noted that our accreditors told us to finish this discussion, but they also hold us accountable for assessing the processes we do have. As we put something in place, we do have the
responsibility to come back and assess if working and amend if need be. Steve again made a motion that we approve the charter as written. Sally seconded. The voting members for this vote were the current FSEC members. Diane requested an amendment but the motion was already on the floor. Sally asked for any further discussion. Karen Hastings asked about amending the motion to accept an increase in CTE members. Sally stated only the person who made the motion could amend. Sally then called for a vote; those in favor of ratification were 9 members; no opposed and 2 abstentions.

Having concern over this policy is one thing, but those concerns should be documented as to what they exactly are and what proposed solutions should be. As we move forward, saying we have concerns is not good enough. It ought to be what are the specific concerns and what do you propose as a remedy? A concern regarding equal number of CTE and UC faculty on the GE Board was again brought up, with proposed solutions. Karen asked how the accreditors will respond to us passing a GenEd charter but still have concerns. Erika replied they will want to talk to everyone and if we appear to not have our act together it will still be an on-going issue. Karen stated we have our act together but we may just have to modify. Erika said it is fine if we approach as we will let it run and assess for the concerns stated later, the committee will find that acceptable.

7. Status of annual reports. Sally reported that she has received an honors committee report but has not received others including her own. She said she assumed all the committee chairs will submit the reports when they are complete.

8. Continuation items for the next FSEC; turnover items. Need to finish discussion related to system policies regarding satisfactory academic standing, academic forgiveness, and N grades were all items that were discussed and decided more discussion was needed in the fall; a FSEC system chair issue. FSEC charter will need an update with the membership changes approved this year. The CPC charter needs to be updated with the new membership changes approved. The new FSEC needs to expect the new CPC charter update. Kara asked about coordinating with the DCC’s in creating a charter and Sally said the DCC’s are not subcommittee of CPC; they are independent committees. Guidelines for committees and housekeeping. FSEC charter does need update and revision. The listing of campus committees is outdated. Suggested adding responsibility of the outgoing campus and system chairs to complete an annual report for the previous year. Other FSEC responsibilities include to maintain and manage an updated list of faculty assignments and lecturers and manage related mailing lists including hcc-faculty-L listserve.

9. Election of new chairs for 2013/2014. Steve nominated John Delay for the position. John accepted the nomination. Sally asked for any other nominations and there were none. The FSEC members (both incoming and outgoing) voted unanimously for John. Sally thought Danny would be the best and a vote was taken in absentia, and then ask if he would accept.
Only Sterling opposed the vote as he felt it was not appropriate to vote for someone not present. Danny was approved with the knowledge he may decline. In that case, the FSEC would have to take up voting for campus chair at the first meeting in the fall.

Meeting adjourned: Time not recorded.