

Members present: Jim Poole (Chair), Dave Panisnick, Jerry Saviano, Doug Madden, Guy Shibayama, Cyndi Uyehara, Erika Lacro, Femar Lee, Kaiulani Akamine, Libby Jakubowski, Richard Lightner (Lecturer representative), Joseph Lewis (Student representative), Fumi Takasugi

Guests: Ken Kato, Blair Freitas (student)

No absences

Meeting was called to order at 11:05

Minutes of February 13, 2009 were approved.

< New Business >

Charter Changes

The committee was asked to vote on a charter change submitted by the Health and Safety Committee to add "emergency planning" to its responsibilities. The change was supported unanimously by the committee.

The Recruitment and Retention Committee asked that the FSEC vote on a charter update regarding the elimination of a Recruitment Sub-committee and a separate Retention Sub-committee, due to the diminished need for separate entities. Similarly, changes in the Native Hawaiian Center representative, scope of authority, and meeting schedule were also requested to be voted on. A detailed handout on requested charter updates was distributed. The committee voted unanimously to support all updates.

< Old Business >

Zero-Tolerance Procedures for Dealing with Violent or Threatening Student Behavior

Jim passed out a revised draft of a proposed set of procedures originally submitted by Erika. (The proposal is attached to these minutes). The proposal outlines the procedures that will followed in case a student is violent or threatens violence towards a faculty or staff member.

Ken noted that if such an incident happens in the evening, then it would be difficult to make the required contacts. Security still needs to let Ken know by the next morning. It would be easier to react if the incident occurs during the day. Jim asked whether this was something that Administration can work out. We can change the language to something more detailed or not. Jim and Erika also noted that whenever an administrator is absent, somebody is designated to take their place.

Joe asked about student rights and how they are informed about their rights. According to research at other colleges and universities, students are made aware of their rights. Also at other colleges, a clear time frame (e.g., 24 hours) is also specified for when a report is filed rather than to say "immediately after removing the student from campus."

Femar stated that a timeline should be made clear in the new procedures. Jim suggested making it clear that action should be taken "within 24 hours or the following day." Kaiulani reiterated that having a clear timeline to follow.

David suggested that we inform the student at the time of the incident that they are not allowed to return to campus until an appointment is made with the Dean of Students.

Regarding Joe's concern about rights, Jim stated that the Student Conduct Code outlines the rights of students. It is published in the catalog and during orientation students are told they are to read it. Erika noted that we should also add the proposed zero-tolerance policy language to the catalog.

Dave asked whether we shouldn't also add students to the clause: "If at any time a faculty or staff member has been threatened with violence by a student, they should contact campus security immediately at 284-1270 to have the student removed from campus." Erika agreed but that if it's a student-to-student issue, then Administration has to become involved before the student is told to leave the campus. Dave noted that in the classroom, the violence can be directed to anyone. Jerry stated that if students are yelling at each other, he calls security.

Jerry also inquired about who can convene a student conduct hearing. Erika replied that anyone can request a hearing, but the dean is the only one given the authority to convene a hearing. Jerry knows of an instructor who wanted to convene a student conduct hearing but that it was never convened. She formally requested one on several occasions. Jim noted that in that case, the instructor should have elevated her request to a higher level in the Administrative chain. Jerry stated that in the case of the student that threatened him, a student conduct hearing was never scheduled.

Jerry asked Doug, who is a member of the Conduct Committee, if a chair was elected by the committee. Doug replied that he just heard that there was a chair. When asked by Jerry how many hearings had been held, Doug replied that there was one since he had been on COSA. Jerry calculated this as roughly one hearing a year. Jim suggested that we can formally request the VCAA to have the Dean of Students review the overall procedures for conduct code hearings.

Erika noted that the conduct code we have is our governing document. The zero tolerance procedures document doesn't replace the Code but supplements it.

Libby announced that in April, we will have Allison Tanoue of UH Manoa Counseling here for a workshop organized by Kimberly. The workshop may be useful for developing these procedures also. There is also information in our HCC phonebook regarding what to do.

Jerry reiterated that he just hopes people will call 911. "If someone threatens me, I'll call the cops." Jim noted that Security also has to make a decision whether to call 911. Femar shared her experiences. The first time a student threatened, they called 911. The second time, the student was forbidden to come to the lectures, but was permitted to come to labs. She noted that if she felt threatened, she would call the police.

Jim noted that the actions taken by the Administration must be transmitted to all personnel involved in the incident. But the most important part of the procedures is to first get the student off campus so he cannot harm anyone. Once we know he is off campus, we can determine what to do next.

Femar asked whether the document should read that a student conduct hearing would be held in all such cases. Jim noted that the Chancellor may decide that a hearing won't be necessary, but maybe a hearing should be mandatory considering the seriousness of the accusation. Erika stated that she would revise the procedures to include a mandatory conduct hearing.

Libby inquired about who comprises the Conduct Committee. A charter was not available so it was not clear who was on the committee. Ken stated that everybody has to realize that this is top priority all involved must react quickly including the Conduct Committee.

Doug asked whether there is an emergency number you can call. Jim stated that the number for security is posted on the HCC Emergency Action poster which is posted around the campus and should be in every classroom. Ken added that the number is a cell number, which is why it's not an

HCC extension number. Guy asked whether a call is rolled over to Ken. Ken replied that we are not that sophisticated yet. Erika and Ken stated that Security carries the phone on them. Ken also noted that Security has to determine whether to stay on the phone with another call or to take the incoming call. He added that we are working on using call waiting, etc. We have to get better on this and we're working on it.

Erika stated that following the meeting she would review the procedures as revised as well as review issues like the conduct hearing procedures, security officer procedures, and other matters discussed in the meeting. Erika asked Joe to email her things that he hears back from the students. Ken stated that these procedures should apply to all students, credit and non-credit.

Student parking

Joe reported that he presented the student parking proposal (See attached document) to the HCC ASUH and it was unanimously supported. Joe noted that a petition to adopt the proposal was signed by over 100 students. COSA has reviewed the document but they did not formally approve it. Doug, a member of COSA, reported that when submitted, there was a lot of excitement about it and its approval was probable in the next meeting.

Jim stated that he wanted the FSEC to approve the proposal based on the ASUH request, but as a courtesy to COSA (an FSEC subcommittee) we can add a caveat to our motion to reverse our approval if COSA does not approve the proposal in their next meeting.

Because he must oversee the parking changes, Jim asked Ken Kato for comments. Ken's primary concern was that there was not enough space if we opened parking for all students. Others disagreed, but nobody had statistics to backup their viewpoint. Ken also stated that he would need three more booths to implement a daily parking fee.

Femar was concerned about the change in faculty parking. Joe pointed out that there is no change to faculty parking and the assigned lots would be the same. If the change required additional costs, Jerry stated that he was willing to pay more for faculty parking. Most members agreed to an increase, but Kaiulani stated that a cap must be established before she would agree. The proposal to increase faculty fees was not added to the ASUH proposal, but would be considered in the future depending on the increased costs of the change.

Ken stated that any change in student fees, up or down, would require BOR approval. Doug stated that the proposal does not change student fees (\$20) and total revenue would be more than we receive now.

Jim made a motion that the FSEC approve the ASUH proposal and that the FSEC would reverse the approval if COSA did not approve of the proposal. Jim also stated that although many details have to be worked out, the proposal should be forwarded to Admin as soon as possible so it can be implemented for the Fall semester. The motion was unanimously approved.

Addendum: Following the FSEC meeting, COSA did not vote on the parking proposal. Jim asked for an FSEC vote via e-mail to allow the proposal to go forward to the Administration. The motion was unanimously approved.

Instructor Syllabus Posted Online

As a follow-on to previous meeting discussions, Joe presented a ASUH approved syllabus form for instructors to fill in and display online. This would allow students to review the course syllabus online before registering for the class. Joe stated that Todd had reviewed the form and would be willing to add each instructor's syllabus to the HCC site.

Doug stated that the fields proposed don't seem to cover the things that students are interested in. It was pointed out that instructors could insert any description they desired within these fields and that more could be added.

Most members felt that posting instructor syllabuses online would be helpful to students. A motion was made to have the FSEC "recommend" to the faculty to post the form-filled syllabuses for their classes. The motion was approved unanimously.

Student no-shows

Jim distributed a Student No-Show Policy draft and asked the committee to take it with them and review it before the next meeting. (See attached proposal) The draft lists the drop procedures to follow if a student doesn't show up for the first 2 classes and their students waiting to enter a closed class. The procedures focus on courses that are "hard" capped because of equipment limitations (e. g. computer courses). The emphasis is on keeping the class full and accommodating as many waiting students as possible by dropping no-show students. A discussion followed regarding no-show students. Instructors cannot drop students unless the class is full and students are waiting register for class. Students that are not dropped may be assigned an F grade at the end of the semester. Doug stated that Fs given no-shows skew the statistics and unfairly show a high rate of failures for the course.

It was agreed that the discussion will continue at the next meeting.

HCC email

Jim stated that he recently queried the faculty regarding the retention of the HCC e-mail system. Jim reported that he got over 40 emails responses and everybody wanted to keep the HCC email. Doug asked where this issue originated. Jim answered that a discussion has been rolling along for the past couple of years to eliminate HCC email and have everyone use the UH system email in its place. However, the change was never officially initiated and the faculty was never allowed to comment on such a proposal. Jim queried the faculty in order to bring the issue out in open and officially decide which options to pursue.

Doug noted that this issue was discussed during the last COSA meeting. Everybody seemed to be in favor of hawaii.edu. Rob and Emily seemed to be especially in favor of this.

Erika noted that there was no initiative directed at e-mail. She stated that there was direction given by the Chancellor to eliminate "redundant systems". Some would view our email as a redundant system.

Jim noted that most in the committee favored retention of the HCC e-mail system, but realized that the cost of the system must be considered. Therefore, we should ask the Administration to give us a cost estimate before we decide the direction to pursue. Erika state that she has already asked PCATT to determine the cost of retaining HCC e-mail. Jim requested that the estimate be completed before the end of the semester. It was generally agreed that the issue would be continued following the receipt of the cost estimate.

The next meeting will be April 17th. Room to be determined.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:43

Minutes respectfully submitted by Fumi Takasugi

Zero-Tolerance Procedures for Dealing with Violent or Threatening Student Behavior Honolulu Community College

Honolulu Community College is committed to a violence-free, harassment-free workplace and learning environment for all faculty, staff, students and other patrons. In accordance with the Honolulu Community College student conduct code, the following procedures will apply when dealing with violent or potentially violent student conduct.

- If at any time a faculty or staff member has been threatened with violence by a student, they should contact campus security immediately at 284-1270 to have the student removed from campus. They may also contact the local police to file a police report if they feel the situation warrants.
- Security will inform the removed student that they are not to return to campus until permitted by the Dean of Students.
- Immediately after removing the student from campus, the security officer will file a report with the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services who will in turn inform the Dean of Students.
- If the student disappears after the incident, Security will be directed to check each class the student is to attend. The Dean of Students will attempt phone contact and inform the student that they are temporarily suspended from campus and will be contacted again for an interview.
- The faculty or staff member must complete an incident report immediately following the incident and be available to confer with those who have official interest in the incident.
- Following receipt of the incident report, the Dean of Students will make contact with the student as soon as possible to review the filed complaint with the student, get the student's side of the alleged threat, and make a recommendation to the Chancellor as to the appropriate next step.
- The Chancellor, after meeting with the faculty member filing the complaint and other campus administrators, will immediately review the circumstances and actions of the student to determine:
 1. If the student should be temporarily suspended or allowed to return to campus pending a student conduct code hearing.

2. If the student should be allowed to return to campus and under what conditions.
 3. If the police should notified by a campus administrator
- Security and all instructors of the student or others involved will be informed of the actions taken.
 - Should there be a conduct code hearing, the Chancellor will make a determination of the final action based on the recommendations of the conduct code committee. All affected faculty and staff will be informed of the action taken.

HCC ASUH PARKING PROPOSAL

	ELEMENT OF PROPOSAL	EXPLANATION, NOTES, ETC.
1	Discontinue the parking lottery	With Lot 1C half empty even at the start of a semester and with all parking lottery applicants now being permitted, there appears to be no important reason to continue it. The lottery sign-up online is easily overlooked by students, and a second try is not allowed. Students often use their passes only occasionally, only alternate days, or not at all if they withdraw. Parking is more available at HCC than at LCC or KCC, but lottery alone creates a perception that it is just the opposite. No other community college has a lottery.
2	Students purchase a \$20 permit when paying tuition	Saves staff time, students do not need to stand in another line after paying tuition, and no adjustments are needed to the routine as they are now when permits are not picked up after lottery notification.
3	Permits only to students who present a driver's license, proof of insurance, etc.	Changing this requirement might result in too many students wanting to park on campus. The documentation requirement could be discontinued later if desired after the lottery is discontinued and it is seen that there is likely enough additional parking available.
4	\$20 permit valid for any student parking lot on main campus or Lot 8	No lot restrictions. Includes Lot 1 (end of Bldg 7), Lot 1C (old incinerator site), Lot 3 (King St. end of campus), and Lot 8 (lower end of Kokea St.).
5	\$10 permit for afternoon-only parking and/or parking any time in Lot 8	Lot 8 permit is currently \$15, and students can use main campus lots after 1:30 pm. Lot 8 closes at 5:00 pm.
6	All parking on space-available basis	Parking currently guaranteed with lottery permit. But many students park on campus only infrequently or not at all. With new system, students who do not find parking in one lot (although unlikely) could go to another because of no lot restrictions.
7	\$1 or \$2 charge-parking for students without permits if and where parking is available. Student ID required.	\$1 or \$2 (\$2 = 160 min. nearby street parking). Principally for students who drive only on rainy days, miss the bus, need to drive a certain day to do something else in town, etc. Day passes issued (on the spot only) if regular permits are substantially fewer than spaces available, or if spaces obviously available mid-morning or later. Passes could be issued at Lot 1 for parking in Lot 3 or 8 as well. Income generated could possibly be used to support shuttle service between campus and Lot 8, additional lighting in Lot 1C, etc.
8	Parking attendant booth at Kokea St. entrance	To ensure that an attendant is always present and not somewhere else out of the rain or out of the sun.
9	Student-operated parking office for parking information, complaints, etc.	Concern now is that students want parking changes, but administrators get the complaints. With new system, administrators would get only unresolved complaints.
10	Student assistance in Lot 1C if needed	So that cars are not parked too loosely, for flashlight help in unlit back of lot after dark, etc.

ONLINE SYLLABUS FORM

Course Alpha		Typical or Specific Term	
		Select Term	
Instructor's Name		Phone	Office
Instructor's E-mail Address		Instructor's Web Page Address	
Brief Course Description			
Student Learning Outcomes			
Course Topics		Exams, Quizzes, etc.	
Required Textbooks		Supplies	
Attendance Policies		Grading Plan	
Other Information			
Other Items Explained at First Class			

**Honolulu Community College
Student No-Shows (Draft)**

March 13, 2009

Intent

The intent of this policy is to help ensure that each class remains full and the maximum number of students will be able to take their desired courses. The policy primarily applies to courses where maximum the number of students must be “hard” capped because of special equipment requirements. An example is a course where a computer is required for each student.

Situation:

During the first week of the semester the number of students registered for a hard capped class has reached maximum capacity, but one or more students are absent, and a student requests to register as an override.

Instructor Procedure

1. Have the division secretary stop further online registrations. (This prevents another student from registering online if someone drops).
2. Have the override student attend each class in a “standby” status until the end of the second class period.
3. If at the end of the second class period the absent student is still a “no-show”, allow the override student to register and submit a drop card for the no-show student. (Note the previous policy allowed an instructor to drop a student if they were absent any one of the first two periods. This change ensures that we are fair to a student who was absent the first day due to circumstances beyond their control. Secondly it allows time for the instructor to check their e-mail or voice mail to see if the no-show student attempted to make contact)
4. If there are no more students waiting to enter class, have the division secretary remove the online registration restriction.

Other Courses

The above procedures primarily apply to hard capped courses that have special equipment requirements. Assuming there is space available, the FSEC recommends that instructors in other courses not drop no-show students and allow overrides as often as possible consistent with the history of student drops and no-show behavior. For example, most instructors have found that the drop or disappear rate is much higher for freshman 100 courses. Therefore, even though overrides may cause enrollment to rise above the cap in the early weeks, the numbers will soon drop down to the capped level. Remember, the goal is to accommodate as many students as possible.

Records Office

When the Records office receives the drop card they must assume the instructor has followed the procedures above and drop the student. Regardless of when the drop card is submitted, the student will be refunded 100% of the course tuition.

Limits of Authority

The instructor may not drop a now-show student unless the class is full and another student is ready to enter the course. The intent is to keep class enrollment at its maximum capacity.