Members Present: Sally Dunan(Chair), Mike Leidemann, John DeLay, Kahale Saito, Noel Alarcon, Diane Caulfield, Julian Tyrell, Karen Hastings, Ross Egloria, Silvan Chung, Justin Ota, Kaleo Gagne

Not Present: Steve Mandraccia (represented by Sally Dunan), Erika Lacro (represented by Marcia Roberts-Deutsch and Russell Uyeno)

Guests: Marcia Roberts-Deutsch (representing Erika Lacro), Russell Uyeno (representing Erika Lacro), Jennifer Higa-King, Eric Paul Shaffer, Chris Ann Moore, Fumiko Takasugi, Sandy Sanpei, Kara Kam-Kalani, Michael Barros, Keala Chock, Jim Poole, Ron Pine

Recorder: Noel Alarcon/Sally Dunan

1. That chair called the meeting to order at 9:10 AM (estimated)

2. There were no corrections to the March 22, 2013 minutes. The minutes were approved as disseminated and will be posted.

3. Budget Subcommittee – Sally Dunan/Noel Alarcon. Sally reported that the budget subcommittee of the Planning Council met for a preliminary meeting on Wednesday, April 24th. Brian gave an updated report on the Campus financial status and outlook and presented the members of the committee with the spreadsheet showing the final rankings from the governing bodies. Brian requested that the members of the budget subcommittee go back and add another dimension of information by identifying proposals that could be considered as “revenue drivers” that could provide additional revenue for the campus. The addition of revenue drivers will not change the established process for making a budget recommendation based on the rankings of the governance committees – that process will be adhered to. The additional information regarding potential revenue drivers would be provided as supplemental information for further analysis. The budget subcommittee will meet again on May 1st to review the updated information and come up with the recommendation for the Planning Council to review on May 3rd. The Planning Council and the Chancellor will receive the complete list of budget requests with governance committee ranking information and the supplemental information regarding identified revenue drivers, along with the budget subcommittee’s recommendation for funding.

4. Chancellor’s Report. Erika was not present, but was represented by Russell Uyeno and Marcia Roberts-Deutsch. Sally introduced the issue, raised by Ron Pine, that changes were made to the AA program in the catalog last summer without consultation with faculty via the CPC before changes were implemented, nor were faculty notified of the specific changes after the fact, and these changes were not documented in the curriculum files as a means of ensuring a continuous record of curriculum changes for each course and program. A new campus General Education Policy [HCCP #5.213] endorsed by the FSEC in April of last year establishes a minimum computational competency requirement for all degrees at HCC. Ron noted that the minutes of the April 2012 FSEC meeting document that Diane Caulfield expressed concern about the need for CTE input to Appendix C, and FSEC members noted that appendices could be discussed and updated independently of the basic policy document. The FSEC Chair stated that he did not want to hold up approval of the policy when that discussion could be held at the CPC. As a result of the new policy, the general education requirements for the AA degree program
were changed in the catalog in July, but affected faculty and students were not even aware of the changes until March 2013. Catalog changes affecting CTE General Education also occurred, and because the counselors did not have a list of the specific changes that had been made, they were not prepared at the beginning of fall semester to provide timely and accurate advice to students until they were able to identify all of the courses affected by the changes. Russell Uyeno is working on a reconciliation list of these changes, but his focus has been solely on the courses. He can include the program changes on that list. Ron Pine raised the concern that there are likely to be more late changes this summer and suggested creating an ad hoc committee of faculty to provide faculty consultation during the summer, if needed. The possibility of establishing an ad hoc committee during the summer was referred to the CPC chair, Kara Kam-Kalani, for action. Silvan requested that Student Services (Counseling) be included in the ad hoc committee.

Ron also raised the concern that the Chancellor’s new policy requiring college level computation skills, precludes MATH 100 as a qualifying general education course in addition to PHIL 110. Both MATH 100 and PHIL 110 meet the UH Symbolic Reasoning requirement, but neither course is a college-level “computation” course. For information, UHM defines MATH 140 as the first college-level computation course. The discussion of how the policy requiring college-level math skills affects our courses with regard to meeting our general education requirements was also referred to the CPC for further discussion, as a curriculum issue.

5. Results of FSEC Effectiveness Survey. There were 65 responses to the FSEC Effectiveness Survey which ended on Wednesday, April 24th. Ross Egloria noted that there were very few disagree and only one strongly disagree response indicated on the survey report, which he felt was a favorable indicator.

6. System Chair Report

Steve was not present, so Sally provided updated handouts pertaining to the various policies currently being discussed at the System level for which the campus has been asked to provide feedback to the System discussion.

- Common Course Numbering.

This proposal has been in discussion for quite some time. The most recent information is that UH System campuses agreed with common title, course numbers and SLOs, but UHM objected to SLOs because they are using objectives rather than SLOs. Marcia noted that WASC is the accrediting agency for UHM, so it’s not clear why they are not using the same language. Marcia asked how differences would be resolved. Sally referred to the supplemental information from previous discussions regarding the process for resolving problems, regarding establishing committees to discuss and resolve the differences. Diane asked Russell to provide an update with regard to where we are with Curriculum Central, as that apparently will be a key requirement for identifying conflicts with common course numbering. Russell discussed how the campus is proceeding with regard to scanning our curriculum actions and entering those into the Curriculum Central database. He believes this year’s curriculum actions have all been scanned. Curriculum Center is likely to be replaced by another system that is part of Kuali. This would be sponsored by the UH System with more support than Curriculum Central, which is
Kaleo asked about transferrability of courses between campuses with common course numbering. Sally confirmed that this has been one of the stated objectives of the common course numbering effort. The policy, as currently drafted is very generic and establishes that the Chancellor is responsible for ensuring compliance with common course numbering and the conventions, also established in this policy document, for numbering courses. HCC has previously indicated support for common course numbering and reaffirmed our support for common course numbering.

- Pre Requisites for Writing Intensive Courses

Ron noted that the draft policy states that all approvals will be made by the system committee, rather than at the campus level. Historically, the system committee has approved the programs and the programs have periodically reported to the system committee.

- Since HCC already requires ENG 100 with C or better as prerequisite for WI courses, we agreed with that provision and did not recommend changes.

- We feel the sentence in the Statement of Purpose that says "Proposals for Writing Intensive designation undergo review/approval by the university-wide Standing Committee on Written Communications and must meet the Hallmarks of Writing-Intensive courses” needs to be changed to reflect that the WI designation is reviewed and approved at the campus level as meeting the system-wide hallmarks for writing intensive courses. We felt that this one statement, as written, conflicts with the rest of the policy document and with the established practice of reviewing and approving based on established hallmarks at the individual campuses. We also felt that a process requiring submission to a system-wide review process would be cumbersome and create a black hole in regard to the efficiency of reviewing and processing applications.

- Satisfactory Academic Status. Generally, the faculty in attendance disagreed with the 67% criteria regarding W and N grades, with the basic comment being that we should not be penalizing students who are being responsible in determining that they are unable to manage all courses they registered for and opt to withdraw before the end of the semester. Diane noted that this campus has previously adopted a policy including the 2/3 completion criteria and has discontinued that policy. She recommended that this policy be referred to COSA for review and feedback. Sally confirmed that she had sent an email to Emily Kukulies yesterday requesting that COSA review the proposed policy.

The decision was to defer discussion regarding this policy until COSA is able to review and provide input. Katy Ho was sick and not at work today, so no comments from her regarding N grades.

- N and W grades. We discussed N and W grades in conjunction with both the Satisfactory Academic Status policy and the Academic Forgiveness policy. The general opinion regarding N grades is that this campus wants to retain N grades as there are many times when they are appropriate. That means we need to ensure that faculty know what the pros and cons of N grades
(and W grades) are with respect to Financial Aid and Veteran's Benefits and we also need to ensure students receive appropriate information about the disadvantages of N (and W) grades in those circumstances. There are too many reasons that N grades are beneficial to discard them, or to evaluate them as failing grades in determining satisfactory academic performance.

- Academic Forgiveness/Academic Renewal policy. A copy of the policy in effect at Hawaii Community College was provided as an example. The general reaction was that we do not like this policy. It opens up a multitude of administrative tracking issues. Student Services input was that this is contradictory and does not make sense. Kaleo's response was that this would be very confusing for students and he opposes this policy (at this campus). The overall reaction was that we would rather use N grades and let faculty determine when to use them. Marcia noted that using incompletes (I) would also be an option, in addition to or as an alternative to N grades.

The decision was defer discussion on this until fall to get more input from faculty regarding how they use the various options such as N and I grades and their perspectives regarding an academic forgiveness policy. A suggestion was made that there should be a faculty/student services survey in the fall to get a wider response from faculty regarding this proposal.

7. Proposal for CTE Program/Course E-focus Designation

Chris Ann summarized the history of E-focus designation at the community colleges, including the fact that other campuses dropped the E-focus designation after UHM made a decision requiring that E-focus courses would only be counted for graduation at the 3/400-level. She noted that the fact other campuses dropped an E-focus designation did not mean they stopped including ethics in the curriculum, which she believes has not been clearly understood by all members of the HCC faculty. The ethics committee would like to see ethics included in the campus Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) as they had been previously. To provide a concrete framework for identifying and assessing ethics outcomes for CTE programs, the ethics committee put together a list of options regarding how CTE programs can do, or are already doing, ethics education, document and assess the inclusion of ethics in the program. There are several options available for including ethics education – (1) take a UC E-focus course, (2) have an existing course within the program designated as an E-focus course (such as PSYCH 180, SPCH 50), or (3) a program can be designated as E-focus (based on 12.5 hours of ethics education over the entire program). The hallmarks the ethics committee developed for CTE programs to use for identifying/establishing E-focus are 12.5 hours of ethics education including at least 8 hours of discussion, and then periodic assessment of ethics outcomes. These hallmarks were derived from the system-wide hallmarks for course E-focus designations and adapted for programs to use in assessing their ethics outcomes. As added clarifying information, the hallmarks refer to "tools for ethical deliberation" such as professional codes of ethics, knowledge of laws pertaining to ethics, knowledge of employment practices. She broke this down using CTE specific examples.

Chris Ann also put together a rubric that can be used at course level or at program level for assessment. CTE program coordinators have agreed they can use this information. Improvements – include program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes related to ethics.
In response to a question, Chris Ann stated that she believes that as long as CTE programs are assessing their ethics outcomes at the course and program level, it is not necessary for CTE programs to be formally designated as E-focus programs.

Silvan asked about the designation of our UC courses as E-focus at the 100-level that are not transferrable to UHM in relation to students thinking it’s not worth their time to take an E-focus course at HCC only to have to repeat the E-focus requirement at UHM. Chris Ann responded that students throughout the system must take ethics courses but the campuses are documenting and assessing that differently. This campus has chosen to use the E-focus designation for documenting and assessing the inclusion of ethics education. Marcia noted that E-focus is a designation that can be attached to courses that students take for another reason, so it is not necessary to take E-focus separately from other requirements. Chris Ann also noted that the 300-level E-focus requirements at UHM are program-specific courses and are not general courses with E-focus designation. So the upper division E-focus requirements are being used in an applied context, which is different from the way ethics is used at the community college level for the AA degree.

Chris Ann also confirmed that the ethics committee proposal for documenting and assessing ethics focus content in CTE programs will be presented at the CPC.

8. FSEC Chairs Annual Report

Sally reported that she had started the draft for the FSEC Chairs annual report during spring break. The draft, which will need more work before it is complete, is posted on the FSEC Intranet site. Steve Mandraccia will also need to complete the System Chair’s annual report, which will also be posted in the Intranet site.

So far, she has received one annual report from the Honors Committee and expects to receive additional reports from other committees as they are able to complete them.

9. Guidance for FSEC Committees

Sally has posted a draft version of some other guidance for committees and added that to the folder on the Intranet site she mentioned last month.

10. Current Status of General Education Board/CTE General Education Charters

Sally reported that the General Education Board charters, including the CTE General Education Board charter are on the agenda for today’s CPC meeting. Anyone who is interested in that discussion is encouraged to attend the CPC meeting at 11:30.

11. The meeting time for May 10th was changed from 8 AM to 9 AM, as a result of the Planning Council changing its meeting from May 10th to May 3rd, at 1 PM.

The meeting adjourned at about 10:45 AM.