APPROVED Minutes of the September 4, 2002 Meeting

James Goodman, Chair
Warren Imada, Vice Chair
Jack Pond, Secretary


SENATORS EXCUSED: N. Buchanan, P. Cravath, C. Ganne, P. Neils.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 3:25 p.m. with a quorum.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the May 8, 2002 meeting were read and approved with two (spelling) corrections.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

There were no committee reports. Chairs and co-chairs of the standing committees were selected/announced.

Budget and Planning
Faculty
Elections
Academic and Institutional Support
Legislative Relations
Program Review
Student
Curriculum

J. Kappenberg
L. Currivan, R. Pfeiffer
C. Hochstein
C. Martin, C. Yokotake, P. Kennedy, K. Khan
G. Levy
K. Hill, S. Palombo
N. Buchanan

The chair of the single ad hoc committee was also selected.

Senate Service Committee
M. Nakano
CHAIR’S REPORT:

Chair Goodman reported that it was an extremely busy summer with frequent meetings of Community College Senate Chairs, and that it promises to be a busy year. He has stated he will keep senators up to date through regular emails and encouraged all to check email frequently.

The Chair reported that HCC and PCATT have partnered with CISCO as the latter begins efforts to get into the education market. They will be piloting these efforts with math courses through distance education. Once the pilot is up and running, other courses will be added until all DE courses within the UHCC system can be offered through HCC and PCATT.

Chair Goodman had previously circulated a report from the UHCC Operational Review Committee. The report centered around the dismantling of the Chancellor’s Office effective January 1, 2003 and the proposed “direct line” that each provost will have to the UH President. No final structure has yet been established, but the final draft is “in the works” and representatives from each CC campus have had input. Members of the committee report that President Dobelle “does listen and... is flexible enough to adopt and try out [new ideas].” In general, there is optimism “that [the committee’s] recommendations will be seriously considered in the reorganization of the University of Hawaii System.”

The Chair also reported on the Faculty Senate Chairs and CC Provost’s Retreat; a visit by Chancellor Tsunoda to LCC on Friday, September 6 from 3:00 to 4:00 in GT-105; Branding of the University of Hawaii (marketing strategy); and a meeting with CAO Deane Neubauer. On the last issue, articulation remains a problem that will undoubtedly be impacted by the UH restructuring efforts.

OLD BUSINESS:

The Interim Report to the Accrediting Commission (due November 1) was circulated by email and reviewed by the Senate. Senator Levy agreed to take the Senate’s comments to Clem Fujimoto who is charged with compiling and editing the report based on input from three AICs (Accreditation Implementation Committees), the Oversight Committee, the Faculty Senate and Campus Council. The Senate discussion centered on the accuracy of some of the words used (“acting,” “interim,” “collegial,” and “broad-based”) as well as the status of certain administrative positions (Dean of Instruction and Assistant Dean of Instruction). The Report now will go to the Campus Council for review.

NEW BUSINESS:

The Senate needs to fill the seat of Senator Paul Cravath who has had to resign his position due to the demands of his production schedule. Several names were mentioned, and some
volunteers have stepped forward. The decision will be made in time for the appointed senator to attend the next meeting. Another possible vacancy may exist and need to be filled.

The Hites Foundation will match funds raised by each community college to fund a scholarship for CC students to attend a four-year institution. LCC’s goal is $30,000.

The LCC Faculty Senate Charter and By-Laws may need a revision. Senator Imada agreed to look into this issue further.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Senator Martin requested a Senate representative to serve on the Travel Grant Committee that will be meeting soon. Senator Hochstein volunteered.

Future meetings are scheduled for September 25, October 9, November 6 and 27, and December 11.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:30.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: Jack Pond, Secretary
Leeward Community College
Senate Agenda
Wednesday, September 4, 2002
3:15 - 5:30 pm
FA 201

I Approval of Minutes

II Reports
A. Standing Committee Chairs:
1. Budget and Planning—Judy Kappenberg, *Mike Reese
2. Faculty—*Warren Imada
3. Elections—Paul Lococo
5. Legislative Relations—*Ralph Toyama
7. Student Committee—*Donnabelle Pascual
8. Curriculum—Nancy Buchanan
*Exiting Chairs

B. Ad Hoc Committees
1. Senate Service Committee—Ray Tanimoto

C Chair’s Report
1. HCC/PCATT DE Initiative.
2. UHCC Operational Review Committee
3. FSC/CC Provost’s Retreat
   a. Chancellor’s Visit to Leeward:
      (1) Friday, September 6, 2002, from 3:00-4:00pm in GT 105
4. Articulation: Meeting with CAO Deane Neubauer 08/09/02
   a. UH Articulation Index: http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/articulation/
   b. HCC Resolution on CC Articulation Acceptance.

III Old Business
A. Interim Report
1. Curriculum, Governance, Administrative Turnover

IV New Business
A. Replacement for Paul Cravath’s Seat
B. Hites Foundation
1. LCC Fundraising goal $30,000 to be matched, for CC student scholarships to transfer to 4 year institutions.
C. Revision of LCC Senate Charter & By-Laws (see below)
1. ARTICLE IV Members of the Faculty and the Faculty Senate Section 1. The Faculty includes all full-time Board of Regents appointees and part-time instructors...appeal to the Faculty Senate. **The Provost shall be the Honorary Chairman of the Faculty.**

V Adjournment
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
2001 – 2002 Faculty Senate

APPROVED Minutes of the May 8, 2002 Meeting

James Goodman, Chair
Jean Hara, Vice Chair
Jack Pond, Secretary


SENATORS EXCUSED: Z. Estrada, R. Flegal,

SPECIAL GUESTS: J. West, B. Hotta, B. Howard (Acting DOI), A. Endo, K. Chambers, S. Uyemura, E. Matsuoka, and newly elected members of the 2002-04 Faculty Senate L. Currivan, C. Hochstein, P. Kennedy, K. Khan, R. Pfeiffer, and C. Yokotake.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. with a quorum.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the April 24, 2002 regular meeting and the May 1, 2002 special meeting were read and approved.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2002-04 SENATE:

The following senators were nominated:

For Chair – James Goodman
For Vice Chair – Warren Imada and Candace Hochstein
For Secretary – Jack Pond

Senators Goodman and Pond were elected by acclaim. Senator Imada was elected to serve as Vice Chair.

SPECIAL REPORTS:

I. Acting Dean of Instruction, Bernadette Howard, addressed the Senate regarding the recent meeting of the Academic Review Board (ARB) and distributed unofficial minutes of that meeting. There were two topics for discussion and vote. The first was the enforcement of the prerequisite policy by administratively disenrolling students who have
been registered in a class for which they do not meet prerequisites. Four motions were made in the ARB.

The first was, “Students who do not meet the prerequisites for English and math courses should be administratively disenrolled if, after they are counseled by their instructor or counselor, they refuse to withdraw voluntarily from the class” (Levy/Uyemura). The motion passed (Y=6; N=1).

The second was, “Students who do not meet prerequisites for English and math courses will be administratively disenrolled if, after they are counseled by their instructor or counselor, they refuse to withdraw voluntarily from the class” (Hochstein/Kelley). The motion passed (Y=4; N=3).

The third was, “Due to the implementation of BANNER, the committee recommends that students will not be administratively disenrolled for lack of prerequisites in the academic year 02-03” (Sherry/Buchanan). The motion passed (Y=4; N=3).

The fourth was “The [Academic Review Board] committee recommend that students enrolled in English and math classes for AY 02-03 for which they do not meet prerequisites will be administratively disenrolled if, after previous counseling by the English and math divisions, the student refuses to voluntarily withdraw. This is with the understanding that the LA and MS divisions will assume full responsibility for accurate identification, advising, and written notification to the students and the Student Services Division” (Hochstein/Levy). The motion failed (Y=2; N=4).

The second topic for discussion was whether or not to charge fees for students who withdraw from a course after learning they are inappropriately placed. After consulting with the Dean of Student Services, the college has determined it will not charge fees to students who must change because of improper placement.

The report from the ARB generated much discussion in the Senate. Many felt that the decision not to administratively disenroll students who refuse to voluntarily withdraw from courses they enroll in without meeting the prerequisites (due to BANNER’s inability to flag them) gives an unfair advantage to the aggressive student who chooses to challenge the instructor/counselor’s recommendation to withdraw. Acting DOI Howard reported that this “problem” with BANNER will only be for one year maximum after which time it will not permit students to enroll in courses for which the prerequisites are not met. Student Services is in the process of preparing a form that instructors may ask students to sign informing them that instructors are not required to make any special considerations for them if they enroll in a class for which they are underprepared. A similar problem may exist with students who try to enroll in writing intensive courses without having completed English 100.
Motion 02-24 (Kappenberg/Imada): To support the recommendation of the Academic Review Board not to administratively disenroll students from classes for which they do not meet the prerequisites.

PASSED – Y=13; N=2; Ab=2

II. Barbara Hotta and Kaz Chambers reported to the Senate that once BANNER is operational, it would not be able to tally results of Student Evaluations of Courses. Part of the problem is that there are 13 different forms currently being used on campus. Both Hotta and Chambers requested the Senate take a look at possibly condensing the number of evaluations to four or so or consider looking at alternatives such as using on-line evaluations or Scantron sheets. The Senate concurred and will take the item up in the Fall 2002 semester.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

STUDENT – Senator Pascual reported that she has begun the planning for the Fall 2002 Opening Day Experience but needs someone to continue her work. Incoming Senator Hochstein’s name was mentioned.

CURRICULUM – Senator Buchanan reported on several actions of the Committee. The first was a proposed AAS Degree in Opticianry. The National Federation of Opticianry Schools (NFOS), through the local chapter of the Dispensing Opticians Association, proposed a partnership with LCC. Their program is an Internet-delivered group of courses that prepares students for positions as Dispensing Opticians or Laboratory Opticians. The curriculum, developed by NFOS, provides training for people in the profession or those who choose to enter it and consists of 45 credits in the major courses. Sixteen additional credits of general education courses are selected from LCC’s course offerings. Of the fifteen courses in the major, nine theory courses will be delivered on the Internet. Students will complete the clinical courses in optometric offices under the supervision of preceptors (practicing opticians) in the field. The courses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Replaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPT 11</td>
<td>Optical Theory I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 12</td>
<td>Optical Theory II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 21</td>
<td>Optical Laboratory Theory I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 22</td>
<td>Optical Laboratory Clinic I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 23</td>
<td>Optical Laboratory Theory II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 24</td>
<td>Optical Laboratory Clinic II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 31</td>
<td>Optical Dispensing Theory I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 32</td>
<td>Ophthalmic Dispensing Clinic I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 33</td>
<td>Ophthalmic Dispensing Theory II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 34</td>
<td>Ophthalmic Dispensing Clinic II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT 35</td>
<td>Ophthalmic Business Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPT 97J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPT 35 Ophthalmic Business Management (3 cr) New Replaces OPT 97J
OPT 36 Ophthalmic Dispensing Clinic III (3 cr) New Replaces OPT 97Q
OPT 41 Anatomy & Physiology of the Eye (3 cr) New Replaces OPT 97G
OPT 42 Contact Lens Theory (3 cr) New Replaces OPT 97O
OPT 43 Contact Lens Clinic (3 cr) New Replaces OPT 97P

In addition, the AAS Degree would require Math 25 or higher, English 22 or 100 and 12 credits of general education courses (OAT 121 or any other introductory Computer Literacy class; PHIL 101 or any other humanities course; PSY 100, 170 or 180; and SP 151 or COMUN 145 are recommended). Most of the OPT courses have other OPT courses as prerequisites or corequisites. OPT 11 has a prerequisite of two years of high school algebra, trigonometry, and geometry and the completion of or concurrent enrollment in Math 25 or equivalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion 02-25: To approve the new OPT courses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASSED – Y=15; N=0; Ab=2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion 02-26: To approve the AAS Degree in Opticianry pending final approval by the Curriculum Committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASSED – Y=12; N=0; Ab=5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Curriculum Committee also submitted the following actions for Senate approval: the change of the number of a current course and the deletion of several courses.

MATH 103 (formerly MATH 27) New number. This course is also being added to the Math/Logical Reasoning Core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion 02-27: To approve the renumbering of MATH 27 to MATH 103 and add to M/LR Core.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASSED – Unanimously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delete ART 145 (Etching), HIST 100 (Approaches to the Study of History), DANCE 182V (Dance Production/Theater), MUS 202B (Introduction to Concert Band), and MUS 202D (Symphonic Wind Ensemble).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion 02-28: To approve the deletion of ART 145, HIST 100, DANCE 182V, MUS 202B and MUS 202D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASSED – Unanimously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAIR'S REPORT:

The Chair reported that the latest version of the LCC Strategic Plan, the UHCC Strategic Plan and the UH Strategic Plan are posted on the respective websites. A great deal will happen during the summer after the Plans are approved by the BOR. Senator Kappenberg asked that a small group of Senators be available during the summer to meet and respond to these new and changing drafts as necessary. The Chair advised all Senators to be up to date and vigilant on these matters and to remain in contact via email.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:45.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: Jack Pond, Secretary
Hello Senators,

I am forwarding a response to a question that the LCC APT group asked me recently regarding the question:

"...We know the submittal of the recommendations report from the ad hoc committee to President Dobelle regarding the restructuring of the the Chancellor's Office is just around the corner. We just wanted to know from your perspective if everything is going well?"

Below is my response followed by the newest Recommendation Draft...

At the meeting yesterday (last week) at HCC, Ramsay Pedersen (HCC) and flo wiger (sic) (MCC) gave a report to the full committee about their two-hour "intense" meeting with Evan Dobelle and Deane Neubauer regarding our initial draft recommendation. The discussion was very open, honest and expressed the major theme that the focus of restructuring is to assist the campuses, and that each Provost should have a direct line to the President without going through another layer of administration (read: CC Chancellor's Office).

Previous to our meeting, they did share their report with the CC provosts and deans (Mark Silliman, Bernadete and Mike Peczok from this campus heard the report). But it was a response to the "initial" recommendations, so there is nothing really to report except that the final draft is in the works.

However, we have to keep reminding ourselves that this committee was formed by the CC Chancellor's Office and not at Dobelle's request. Although he has since recognized the Committee, we all know that at the end of the day--he is charged by the Board of Regents to do whatever he believes is necessary to make the UH system operate better.

However there were encouraging signs from the report of that meeting--Dobelle does listen and if an idea makes sense, he is flexible enough to adopt it and try it out. Which makes all of us think that maybe all the work we have been doing might make some difference in the end.

When there is anything definite, I will send it to you--but the short answer to your question for now is: yes, I think everything is going very well and the committee is very optimistic that our recommendations will be seriously considered in the reorganization of the University of Hawaii System.

Also, Next week Joyce Tsunoda and flo wiger will start visiting the campuses to discuss...
restructuring issues, so the final edits will be made in the next few days. If you have any ideas regarding the below Recommendation Draft that you would like communicated, please send them to me ASAP. I will forward this message to the Faculty & Staff tomorrow.

James Goodman
Faculty Senate Chair
UH--Leeward Community College
808-455-0613

RATIONAL FOR SYSTEM CHANGE:

The Committee believes that we are at a critical juncture for the University of Hawaii. The changes being contemplated are perhaps among the greatest since the inception of the institution. Already within the Community Colleges significant development has occurred. Some of the Community Colleges are beginning to develop 4 year degrees and to expand upon the offerings of the University Centers. The CC's are working with other campuses throughout the UH system to develop new models and relationships for the offering of educational programs. Distributed learning has become an increasingly important modality for the offering of the curriculum throughout the entire UH system thereby allowing further collaboration between campuses.

It is important to affirm the central role that Community Colleges have played and will continue to play in the future as the University of Hawaii evolves to meet the changing needs in the upcoming years. Our strategies should acknowledge past progress while at the same time anticipating future challenges and opportunities. It is clear that the Community Colleges of the University of Hawaii have matured into vital and vibrant units. Their rise to prominence and prestige owes much to the tireless efforts and enlightened leadership of UHCC Chancellor and UH Senior Vice-President Joyce Tsunoda. It is because of this strong foundation that the individual campuses will continue to grow and develop as exemplary units within the University of Hawaii system.

With the successful implementation of these changes, it is envisioned that the University of Hawaii will become an institution that is more dynamic, innovative, and responsive to all its constituents. It will be better positioned to provide a greater breadth of opportunities for its students and communities. As an integrated system it will more effectively utilize the many talents and skills of its faculty, staff, and administrators. The University of Hawaii will truly become greater than the sum of its parts.

BACKGROUND AND CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE

An ad hoc committee was appointed in Summer, 2002 by Joyce Tsunoda, Chancellor for Community Colleges, to review the roles and functions of the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges within the context of changes in the organizational and operational structure of the University of Hawaii. The committee membership consists of three Provosts from Honolulu CC, Kauai CC, and Maui CC, four academic Senate Chairs from the remaining campuses of Hawaii CC, Kapiolani CC, Leeward CC, and Windward CC, two students, one APT representative and a Director of OCET.
The task for the Committee was to review the various functions carried out currently by the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges (OCCC) and to determine which functions, if any, are required to support and serve the seven community colleges as the colleges negotiate the transition into a new organizational structure in which the college’s "CEO or Chancellor" (currently titled "Provosts") report directly to the President of the University of Hawaii.

The four broad areas of functions currently carried out by the OCCC are:
(1) Chancellor which includes Executive Leadership, Advocacy, Coordination and Supervision of the Provosts
(2) Academic Affairs, including Student Support Services
(3) Administrative Affairs
(4) Community and Internal Relations (Marketing & Communications) and Business/Workforce Development

COMMITTEE PROCESS:

The committee met early in the summer and developed a meeting schedule, budget and had discussions regarding the role and scope of the committee. One of the issues discussed was the mission and structure of a system comprised of sub-systems. Members of the committee were invited to be part of a team visiting other institutions which had been identified as having a structure comprised of a single system with component parts. In addition, two of the committee members were to attend a leadership institute on a campus where they would spend some additional time meeting with institutional leadership. Upon completion of the above visits, committee members met to debrief each other and begin the process of developing recommendations for consideration by each campus community, the Chancellor of the Community Colleges and other institutional leadership.

COMMITTEE NARRATIVE:

As the committee began its discussions, it became clear that it was not sufficient to examine only the internal composition of the Chancellor's Office but rather the committee needed to explore how changes and adaptations for the CCs would fit into the overall structure of the University of Hawaii. One approach to the committee work could have been to take each function performed by each individual in the Chancellor's office and make a recommendation as to where that function might occur within the larger system. Instead the committee chose to be aware of the functions carried out at the Chancellor Office level but focused on the concept of services and how those services could continue to be offered to assist the individual campuses in carrying out their responsibilities. In doing so there was agreement that some of the tasks would be carried out at multiple levels, hence requiring a high degree of coordination.

From the beginning in committee discussion and in subsequent conversations with President Doble there was no expectation that this would be a cost saving initiative, but rather a mechanism to develop a more effective and efficient organizational structure based on the premise of an integrated University of Hawaii system.

There were numerous questions and concerns raised by committee members including:
- how would an advocacy role for the CC mission be maintained;
- how would integration, collaboration, and cooperation be promoted;
- how to minimize the potential for competition among various units within the UH system;
- the need to utilize resources efficiently to carry out the mission;
- how to maintain a level playing field and to avoid privileging or favoring any unit with the UH system i.e., if the CC’s are led by Chancellors will they be on "equal footing" with the other UH Chancellors;
- what services must campuses continue to have in order to function, what decisions can be made by the campuses and when does there need to be monitoring at a higher level;
- will there be a loss of the community college mission.

Not all the questions were answered and we acknowledge that this is a time of transition. There will need
to be a broader dialogue across the CC campuses as well as with representatives within the UH system to address the concerns raised. The process of the reorganization has the goal of developing a new approach to relationships between and among the campuses where the individual campuses assume a more primary role.

Three themes began to emerge in the discussions: institutional culture; operational functions; and structure of various components within the large UH system. There was general agreement within the Committee that the institutional culture of the CCs is one of concern for students, a culture that places a high value on teaching and learning, and a desire for strong partnerships with the community. This culture is not dependent upon our structure but is rooted within our mission and values.

From operational and structural standpoints, institutions can be constructed in various ways as evidenced by our readings and our visits to other campuses. Members of the Committee were interested in knowing how system level operations work or don’t work within a multi-campus system as well as examining the role of 2 year institutions in relationship to a larger system. How does a system comprised of campuses with differentiated missions work to meet the needs both of individual campuses and the larger overall system?

Members of the Committee visited the following campuses:
- Clairmont College in California
- Penn. State - University Park Campus
- the University of Wisconsin at Madison
- the University of Colorado, Boulder Campus
- the Auraria Higher Education Center at Denver (which provides a single campus infrastructure for three campuses, Colorado Community College, the University of Colorado of Denver, and Metropolitan State University)

In addition, one of the Committee members was familiar with the reorganization of the University of Alaska as it moved from a structure similar to the current UH model to a single system approach.

Among the systems visited there were similarities and differences. One major difference between all of the systems and the current UH system was the absence of Community Colleges in the above systems. They do, however, have 2 year institutions within all except the Clairmont system. In one system, the 2 year institutions were referred to as "de facto community colleges". In all the visits issues of tenure and promotion, transfer and articulation, curriculum, and governance were discussed.

A significant finding from the campuses visited was the importance placed on the quality of leadership from all the constituencies within a system. A common conclusion from representatives among the campuses visited was that strong leadership is critical for the success of the enterprise. In describing leadership, people used works like respect, integrity, and fairness. Institutional leadership at all levels sets the standard and serves as the example.

Another finding was the increased involvement of external agencies such as legislative bodies in the operations of educational systems. In Colorado, for example, there is a "State-Wide Guaranteed Core Transfer" agreement among all the institutions which was developed as a result of a state mandate. Each institution/campus has autonomy over curriculum but they have agreed upon equivalent courses. They collaborated to develop common areas of competency and credit hours. Each campus can have a General Education core that is somewhat different and each institution sets its own curriculum. The advantage for students is that if they take Gen. Ed. Courses within the Guaranteed Transfer the courses will transfer to any of the institutions. Each campus had to have the Gen. Ed. Course package reviewed and approved by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, which is a state-wide commission appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate. This Commission has approval authority on all degree programs offered in Colorado colleges.

Even though there were different operational and structural frameworks within the various systems, all of the institutions were able to carry out their educational mission. Depending on the mission and the degree of centralization or decentralization within the institution, responsibilities were located at campus or
In this time of change for the UH system, there is an opportunity and a need for direct individual and group responsibility. The responsibility to set the direction for the UH system rests with the President and the Board of Regents with input from the stakeholders; the responsibility to deliver that direction to students in an effective and efficient manner rests with the campuses.

Certain functions must be carried out for things to work and some of those functions can be at the campus level and others at the system level. Perhaps a more important component is the integration and collaboration between and among the levels. There is always a possibility that service can become gatekeeping and facilitating can become oversight. It is the wish of the committee that we can function as a mature organizational structure in an effective manner to meet the needs of our constituencies both on an internal and external basis. Administrators, faculty and staff of the CCs have the opportunity to take proactive responsibility and model behaviors such as risk-taking, anticipating, connecting, seeking the view of others, and building a broad network of information and working relationships. Campuses within the UH system should be given the authority to carry out their responsibilities, service to assist them in meeting those responsibilities, and then be held accountable.

Through the Committee’s deliberations certain principles began to emerge as critical. These principles were then followed by a set of recommendations for the CCs. There was agreement that whatever the Committee might recommend should not be considered in a vacuum but rather as components of interdependent yet distinct entities comprising the UH system.

**PRINCIPLES:**

- Open door access is critical;
- CCs must remain affordable;
- Partnerships, response to, and collaboration with the community, business, and industry are integral to the CCs;
- Students are the most important person on our campus - they are not an interruption of our work, but the purpose of it;
- An affirmation of differentiated mission and recognition of individual campus identity;
- Maintaining and respecting the authority of campus leadership; the campus CEO should report to the President of UH and other campus administrators should report to the campus CEO;
- All campuses in the UH system should receive levels or services and support necessary for the campuses to carry out their respective missions;
- Faculty representation is needed in system articulation agreements and all curricular issues (BOR policy) to facilitate student transfer while maintaining the locus of control regarding curriculum at the campus level;
- Facilitation, cooperation, and collaboration should exist between and among institutions to formulate system-wide policy and address system-wide issues;
- Orientation at all levels of the system should be one of service and facilitation;
- There must be a climate of mutual respect and trust across and between the various stakeholders within the entire organization;
- The Liberal Arts are central in the educational transformation process;

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- The Chancellor’s staff should be involved in the decisions about their responsibilities and roles and how services can be effectively provided within the new structure.
- There should be discussions among representatives from the CC’s at the campus level, representatives from the Operational Review Committee and representatives from the UH system offices regarding which functions can be appropriately carried out at the campus level and at the system level.
- Personnel from all levels of the University community should be encouraged to apply for system leadership positions as they arise.
- Community College leadership should continue to work collaboratively in terms of both transfer and
career-technical missions and to respond to community education and workforce needs; campus CEO's need a background indicative of the understanding of these concerns.

? Committees, councils, and leadership throughout the system should be reflective of all the stakeholders.

? Areas of workforce development and economic development initiatives should be located in such a way that they can work across the system and not in silos.

? Options should be explored to facilitate the implementation of workforce/economic development initiatives.

? Faculty personnel decisions should be located at the campus level. with appropriate Presidential approval.

? The President and system level administrators should not reside only on one campus.

? Access to system level administrators should be improved.

? The concept of "lead campuses" should be developed as needed.

? The development of a leadership program modeled after the ACE Fellows Leadership Program; it should be flexible to meet the needs of the individual Fellow and also the UH system.

? There should be a support function for governance activities for faculty, staff, and students.

Submitted by:
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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

Background. By letter dated January 19, 2001, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) reaffirmed the accreditation of Leeward Community College, University of Hawaii, with a requirement that the College submit an Interim Report by November 1, 2002. The action to reaffirm accreditation was taken by the Commission after it had reviewed the College's Institutional Self Study and the report of the accreditation evaluation team which had visited the College in October 2000.

The next comprehensive accreditation evaluation of the College is scheduled for academic year 2006-2007. The Midterm Report required of all ACCJC-accredited colleges is due by November 1, 2003.

Although the visiting team's Evaluation Report contained eight recommendations, the Interim Report is to focus on the three recommendations enumerated later in this report.

Preparation of Interim Report. The preparation, review, and approval of the Interim Report has had broad-based campus participation.

During Spring 2001, to ensure broad-based involvement from the outset, Provost Mark Silliman (then Interim Provost) took the following actions to establish a structure and process to implement the eight formal recommendations made by the accreditation
evaluation team, as well as the related concerns and action plans identified by the College in our own Institutional Self Study.

In February 2001, the Provost proposed the establishment of eight Accreditation Implementation Committees (AICs) to respectively address the eight accreditation recommendations and the related College-identified concerns. He sought input on that proposal from his administrative staff, the then Accreditation Liaison Officer, and the Executive Committees of both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council, a governance body comprised of representatives from all major campus constituencies.

One of the proposed AICs was deemed unnecessary. The recommendation relating to the safety and storage of student records has been addressed by the Dean of Student Services and the Registrar without a special committee.

The memberships of the proposed AICs differed according to the nature and substance of the accreditation recommendation each AIC was to review and implement. However, their memberships were intentionally constituted so as to ensure broad-based involvement and representation from all applicable campus units and constituencies.*

In March 2001, the Provost disseminated campus-wide the list of the AICs and their proposed memberships through a mass e-mail and the electronic weekly campus Bulletin. The announcement also solicited volunteers for the membership slots not restricted to particular positions or offices.

After some delay following the faculty strike in April, the membership appointments and the charges to each AIC were finalized by the Provost over the summer. On August 27, 2001, the Provost issued the official “appointment-and-charge memo” to each AIC. A sample memorandum, the one issued to the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Curriculum Revision and Review, is included in the “Supporting Documents” section of this report.

*A number of membership slots were designated for the holders or occupiers of particular positions or offices (such as Curriculum Committee Chair, Division Chair, Discipline or Program Coordinator, or Dean of Instruction). Other slots were intended to ensure expertise in more specific areas helpful or necessary to the AIC’s work (such as Curriculum Central specialist or Information Technology Specialist). A number of slots were assigned to ensure representation from applicable campus constituency groups (such as the Faculty Senate, Campus Council, Clerical Staff Council, Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT Employee) Group, and Student Government), or from particular organizational units (such as the Student Services Division). Appointments to such “representation slots” were made after requesting nominations or recommendations from the affected constituency groups or organizational units.
The seven Accreditation Implementation Committees are as follows: Curriculum Revision and Review, Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, Administrative Instability and Turnover, Degrees and Certificates (Learning Outcomes and General Education Component), Program Reviews/Program Health Indicators, Placement Testing Impacts, and Strategic Planning for Technology and Information/Learning Resources.

To help oversee, monitor, and coordinate the timely addressing and implementation of the accreditation recommendations, the Provost established the Accreditation Implementation Oversight Committee in Fall 2001 and called its first meeting on November 26, 2001. Chaired by the Provost, the Oversight Committee is comprised of the Chairs or Co-Chairs and Vice Chairs of the seven Accreditation Implementation Committees, together with the College’s Accreditation Liaison Officer, Institutional Research Analyst, and (as an ex-officio member) the Leeward CC faculty member who is an ACCJC Commissioner.

The Interim Report was compiled and edited by Clement Fujimoto, a part-time assistant to the Provost. A retired faculty member, Mr. Fujimoto is knowledgeable about the College and the accreditation process.

The content of this Interim Report is based largely on the latest “Progress Reports” (included in the “Supporting Documents” section) issued by the following three Accreditation Implementation Committees (AICs) charged with reviewing and implementing the three recommendations required to be reported on in this report: Curriculum Revision and Review, Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, and Administrative Instability and Turnover. As a result, these Committees in effect have played an important and substantial role in the preparation of the Interim Report. The memberships of these three AICs are therefore included in the “Supporting Documents” section and illustrate the broad-based representation on these Committees.

Notwithstanding that the content of the Interim Report necessarily draws heavily from the reports of the three AICs cited above, where applicable, this report also incorporates facts, developments, observations, and analyses gleaned from other sources on campus and within the University of Hawaii system (e.g., actions taken by the UH President and the UH Board of Regents). This is particularly evident in the section below relating to administrative instability and turnover where significant information about changed circumstances and developments since the last accreditation visit is reported.

With respect to the review and approval of the Interim Report, the following campus entities were involved in that review:

1. In late Spring 2002, the members of the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council were sent electronic copies of the then latest Progress Reports of the three above-cited AICs for their respective collective review and comment.
2. In late August 2002, the Accreditation Implementation Oversight Committee reviewed and gave revision input on the first draft of the Interim Report.

3. At the end of August 2002, the members of the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council were sent electronic copies of the second draft of the Interim Report for their respective collective review and comment.

4. In early October, the final draft from the campus of the Interim Report was transmitted to the Chancellor for Community Colleges, University of Hawaii, and then from the Chancellor to the Chairperson of the Board of Regents, University of Hawaii, for their respective approval signatures which appear on the cover sheet of this Report.

Additionally, the members of the administrative staff were also transmitted copies of each Progress Report and each draft of the Interim Report and were also invited to give their input to the Provost.

To keep the entire campus community informed about the progress and developments in addressing and implementing the various accreditation recommendations, the minutes and the periodic progress reports of the seven Accreditation Implementation Committees are being posted on the College's accreditation website. Also posted are key accreditation documents, such as the College's Institutional Self Study and the visiting team's Evaluation Report.

RESPONSE TO THE REQUEST OF THE COMMISSION IN THE ACTION LETTER

In its action letter dated January 19, 2001, which reaffirmed the College's accreditation, the Accrediting Commission indicated that the Interim Report should focus on the following three recommendations made by the October 2000 visiting team in its accreditation Evaluation Report:

1. That curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs.

2. That the College clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council.

3. That the College analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses.

In accordance with the ACCJC guidelines relating to the format and content of Interim Reports, the College will identify and discuss below each of the recommendations or concerns identified by the Commission in its action letter. For each recommendation or area of concern, the College will describe the progress in each area, analyze the results obtained to date, and indicate what additional plans or action the College will take. As
applicable, information about changes since the last accreditation visit will be provided as context for understanding the specific areas about which the report has been requested.

**Curriculum Revision and Review**

In this area, the visiting team expressed the following concerns in its Evaluation Report:

"The process of documenting the development of curriculum appears to have been made more consistent and systematic with the creation of a Curriculum Central [on-line] database, [which enables the creation—in a more uniform way per a standardized, programmed template—of new core outlines for new courses and the modification or deletion of existing courses and core outlines, and] which permits [the] viewing of outlines as well as tracking the course approval process. However, the College’s written response states that while courses are reviewed as they are developed and modified, there is no systematic review of courses once they are taught repeatedly. A comparative review of sample Core Outlines and corresponding [instructor course] syllabi suggests that there are substantive inconsistencies between the outline (as the prescriptive document) and the syllabus (as the descriptive document). The recommendation of the previous [1994] team that curriculum documentation and review be made systematic and consistent is still valid with respect to the regular review of both established Core Outlines and individual course syllabi.”

Related concerns in the area of curriculum review and revision were expressed by the visiting team as follows:

"critical curriculum information was not consistently described in the Core Outlines”; "there continues to be no formal system, policy, or practice to ensure consistency of course content, objectives, and standards from the time it is approved to the present”; “...division chairs should ensure that all syllabi are regularly compared with their relevant [Core] Outline to provide assurance that the objectives and student competencies for all sections of a given course, wherever and by whomever offered, are consistent with the outline of record for that course”; and “Periodic review of established Core Outlines should be formalized and institutionalized to assure the currency and continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies.”

The College’s Accreditation Implementation Committee on Curriculum Revision and Review has made significant progress in addressing the above cited concerns and implementing the visiting team’s recommendation that curriculum review and revision be made a systematic and cyclical process. See the Committee’s attached April 2002 Progress Report. As indicated in that section of its report headed “Proposal of a solution”:

“The college will establish a policy and procedures that institutionalizes a process for the systematic and cyclical review of core outlines and course syllabi and that centers on the role of the faculty in examining and maintaining the courses in their disciplines.
"At the end of the review, all core outlines will be complete, all individual course syllabi will have as their focus measurable student outcomes, the college will have a written Curriculum Review process that will include a system for refining and evaluating the process, and the college will have established timelines for ongoing curriculum review."

Attached to the Committee's Progress Report is a draft of proposed policy and procedures to institutionalize and formalize curriculum revision and review at the College. As of this writing, the Committee is somewhat behind schedule and did not refine and revise the proposed policy and procedures during Summer 2002. However, it is doing so this Fall 2002, and also plans to hold campus forums on the proposed policy and procedures during the Fall semester and to thereafter present the proposed policy to the Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate for review and approval. The College is working towards having the policy fully approved by the end of Spring 2003 or during Fall 2003.

Once approved, the College believes that the good-faith and consist implementation of the policy and procedures will be an important factor in assuring academic rigor and integrity in our courses and programs. The policy and procedures should promote useful and necessary dialogue among discipline and Division faculty on such issues as course content and objectives, student competencies and learning outcomes, course activities, and instructional methods.

**Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance**

In this area, the October 2000 visiting team first cited the recommendation of the 1994 visiting team relating to governance and then made a follow-up recommendation relating to the roles of the various constituencies on the Campus Council.

The 1994 team had recommended "that the college develop and implement a written policy which articulates a decision making process which includes persons in the process who will be affected by the decisions and clearly states the role and participation of faculty, support staff and students on College governing, policy making, planning, staff budgeting, and special purpose bodies."

In this regard, the October 2000 visiting team stated as follows:

"The college set up the Campus Council, a representative governance body in response, and established a Charter and By-laws for the body. This was a major effort, and the college should be commended for its work. However, at the time of the team visit, there was considerable tension on campus regarding the roles of constituent groups in the Campus Council. The Faculty Senate was circulating a policy [shared governance policy draft] that would put all academic matters, as well as budgeting and planning, under their purview. Other segments of the college felt that this change would be tantamount to excluding them from college governance. This issue dominated college meetings at the time of the accreditation review, and it was clear to the team that the problem that led to the 1994 recommendation has not yet been put to rest."
In another part of its report, the 2000 visiting team indicated that "...the role of the faculty in governance has been contentious. Some on the Faculty Senate view their roles as guardian of academic issues to include personnel, budget and planning decisions. This view is in conflict with the representative organization of the Campus Council. This issue, which must be addressed internally, was a major point of discussion during the team visit."

In the context of the foregoing, the 2000 visiting team indicated that it was therefore recommending "that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council."

To address this recommendation, the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance has completed proposed drafts of the following shared governance documents: Leeward CC Shared Governance Policy, Leeward CC Principles of Shared Governance, and a description of the respective roles of the various constituencies on the Leeward CC Campus Council and how the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate relate to each other. See the Committee's attached April 12, 2002 Progress Report to which are attached the three proposed draft documents.

As indicated in its Progress Report, the Committee, during Fall 2002, will present the three proposed documents to the various campus constituencies for their review and approval. During Spring 2003, the Committee is hopeful that the three documents will be approved by the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council, and Provost by May 2003.

As stated by the Committee in its report, "Shared governance becomes a reality when individuals both understand the decision-making processes and engage themselves in those processes in a creative, meaningful, and collegial manner. Once approved, the College will publicize and promote the shared governance policy and shared governance principles...."

As of this writing, it remains to be seen whether the three shared governance documents will be approved as proposed or in amended form and by May 2003 as projected above. The nature and intensity of campus discussion and debate on the proposals and the relevant issues are also difficult to predict. However, the College is making a good-faith effort to address the subject recommendation and is hopeful that the dialogue on the issues will be collegial, mutually informative, and beneficial to the various constituencies and the College as a whole.

It should be noted that the attached, proposed Shared Governance Policy is different from the policy draft mentioned in the report of the October 2000 visiting team (as being circulated by the Faculty Senate) and is differently authored. The attached draft is not being proposed by just one constituency or governance group. Rather, it is the product of a broad-based committee—the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance—which is comprised of representatives from all of the major campus constituencies.
Administrative Instability and Turnover

The October 2000 visiting team recommended “that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses.”

In making this recommendation, the visiting team first made reference to the following related recommendation made by the 1994 visiting team: “The team recommends that the College and System stabilize the administrative staff of the College to insure the continuity and effectiveness of leadership, as well as limiting the disruption to the operating and planning procedures caused by the frequent changes in the administrative staff.”

In the College’s own response to the 1994 recommendation in our Institutional Self Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, September 2000, at page 39, we stated in pertinent part as follows:

“... The current vacancy in this position [of Provost after Sharon Narimatsu had vacated the position on June 16, 2000] is as disturbing to the campus community as it no doubt is to the University System administrators. Exogenous factors, including budget constraints, declining enrollments, and the uncertain prospects for the health of Hawaii’s economy and the State government’s return to fiscal well being all have contributed to the pressures that impinge upon administrators. Internal factors that deplete the energy and will power of the administration may be most closely related to the small number of administrative positions at the LCC campus. Whatever the case, the College’s response to this recommendation at this time is that the problems that prompted it have apparently not been adequately addressed.” [Emphasis added.]

In its report, the 2000 visiting team noted in part as follows:

“The past few years have seen continued instability and consistent administrative turnover at Leeward Community College. Presently [Fall 2000] there is an Interim Provost [Dr. Mark Silliman], Acting Dean of Instruction, and Acting Assistant Dean of Instruction. In the last few years, the College has had three provosts. ....”

In another part of its report, as preface to its recommendation quoted above, the October 2000 visiting team indicated as follows:

“...While the college was asked to take steps to stabilize the administrative staff, the college still suffers from the effects of frequent turnover. While the team recognizes that colleges are human organizations, and no one can guarantee that people will remain in administrative positions for extended periods of time, the self study indicated awareness that the small number of administrators led to a depletion of ‘energy and will power.’ The team also noted that the administrative evaluation system is unclear, and administrators typically do not receive any information or documentation regarding their evaluation once it is completed which suggests a lack of constructive feedback that would assist in their professional growth. External factors, which are often beyond the college’s control (including systemwide budget constraints, declining enrollments, and
the uncertain state economy) may also play a role in administrative instability. However, the college cannot ignore this disturbing trend. It has had three provosts in three years, and many top administrative positions are held by interim appointments. The team felt that it would be in the college’s interests to analyze the local factors that lead to high administrative turnover, and develop constructive strategies in response.

In a later part of its report, the visiting team reiterated, “...the self study identified that there may be factors within the control of the college that contribute to ‘a loss of willpower’ and burnout. It is clear that the college should address those local issues.”

In its Progress Report of June 10, 2002 (copy included in the “Supporting Documents” section), the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Administrative Instability and Turnover has made a number of recommendations or proposed a number of solutions intended to alleviate the problem of administrative turnover and to address the concerns of the visiting team as described above. Not all of the recommendations are within the control or the sole control of the College.

The proposed solutions or recommendations relate to providing administrators with the following: pay increases; insurance coverage for professional liability; appropriate on-the-job training or administrative internships for would-be administrators from the faculty or staff; more meaningful and helpful evaluations and feedback for professional growth and improvement; opportunities and funding to attend conferences which will benefit the College as well as the administrator; and relief from heavy workloads and stressful working conditions through additional staffing, permanent or temporary, such as the ones mentioned in the Committee’s report.

Although outside the College’s control, two of the recommendations above are being implemented at the University of Hawaii system level. At its meeting on October 19, 2001, the UH Board of Regents approved UH President Evan Dobelle’s proposal for an amended executive compensation plan and policy which would index the salaries of executive employees in the UH System to a national benchmark, the annual College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) Administration Compensation Survey, or other appropriate equivalent salary survey.

Over a five-year period, effective July 1, 2002, the salaries of executive employees who are underpaid in relation to the national salary benchmark will have their pay increased incrementally (as applicable) to the 20th percentile salary amount and thereafter to the 40th percentile level and thereafter to the median salary level, “provided they have been evaluated above the fully satisfactory level.”

Executive personnel includes community college provosts, but does not include the managerial classification of community college deans, assistant deans, and directors. However, on February 22, 2002, the UH Board of Regents also approved a new compensation plan and policy for managerial employees. Under the plan, the salaries of managerial personnel would also be indexed to the same national benchmark and would also be incrementally increased or adjusted (as applicable), effective July 1, 2002.
Recently, it has also been announced that UH executive and managerial employees will be provided with insurance coverage for professional liability, but details have yet to be provided.

Relevant to the issue of providing relief from heavy administrative workloads through additional staffing or positions, the College's Strategic Plan, 2002-2007, includes goals and objectives the implementation of which requires the establishment of new administrative positions. For example, under the goal of "Improve educational effectiveness," and the objective thereunder to "Improve, broaden scope of assessment," an Office of Assessment and Strategic Planning would be established. It would be headed by a Director who would be responsible for institutional research, program assessment, student outcomes assessment, and strategic planning. However, it remains to be seen whether the College will be successful in having such positions established and funded through the budget process and where such positions would be assigned or accommodated in any potential reorganization or restructuring of the College.

Regarding opportunities and funding for administrators to attend conferences which will benefit both the College and the administrator, current administrators have been allotted travel funds to attend one conference each year related to their professional development goals.

With respect to improving the evaluation process for administrators, the Provost in the last two years has improved the usefulness of the annual evaluations of his administrative staff by providing them with written assessments of their strengths and weaknesses and by sharing with each administrator more specifics from the evaluations submitted on that administrator. Likewise, it would be helpful to the Provost in the future if he receives similarly useful annual evaluations with sufficient, constructive feedback for professional growth and improvement.

On a related matter, the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Administrative Instability and Turnover believes that the evaluation of all campus administrators, whether of the Provost by the executive to whom he reports or of the deans, assistant deans, and directors by the Provost to whom they report, could be made more meaningful and helpful if the administrators being evaluated are informed as to the general composition of the evaluator group and the rationale for that composition.

It should be noted that, since the time of the accreditation team's visit in October 2000, UH President Evan Dobelle has taken some actions which may have significant impact, as yet not fully known or realized, on the issue of administrative turnover at the various UH campuses and in administrative offices such as the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges. On December 10, 2001, President Dobelle mailed a notice of termination letter to all 205 UH employees in executive and managerial positions. The key sentence read as follows: "...unless you receive notice to the contrary from now until the close of business December 16, 2002, your Executive/Managerial (E/M) appointment will end effective the close of business December 16, 2002." In a separate statement, the President indicated that he "needs the flexibility to restructure and realign
personnel to best meet the needs of the institution." The letter indicated that "There may be reorganizations within or across the academic and administrative units,... early retirement incentives, or direct elimination of certain positions..." or a combination of alternatives. He has given indications that community college Provosts may be redesignated as Chancellors and may report directly to him.

As of this writing, out of seven total administrators at Leeward CC, the following four serve in acting capacities: Dean of Instruction, Assistant Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Services*, and the Director of the Office of Continuing Education and Training. (*The regular Dean of Student Services is on temporary, special assignment to help implement the new SCT Banner Student Information System for the UH System.) The three administrators holding "permanent" appointments are the Provost, the Assistant Dean for Academic Services, and the Director of Administrative Services. However, because of the uncertainty over executive-managerial appointments beyond December 16, 2002, and the fact that recent executive-managerial appointments—with an exception or two for executives at the highest level (e.g., the new UH Manoa Chancellor)—have been approved but with an ending or termination date of December 16, 2002, the Provost has been reluctant to advertise and fill the acting positions on a "permanent" basis until the UH President has taken the personnel and related actions which resolve the uncertainty.

In some respects, the local factors that may be contributing to, or which may have contributed to administrative instability and turnover in the past, are being overshadowed at least temporarily by the initiatives, changes, and potential changes emanating from the University President.

During Fall 2002, the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Administrative Instability and Turnover will be reconvened by the committee chair to determine any additional issues that the Committee may wish to address and to assess the UH System situation with respect to personnel actions taken or to be taken by the UH President regarding executive-managerial staff and any organizational or administrative restructurings that may be undertaken by the UH President.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

1. Sample appointment-and-charge memorandum, dated August 27, 2001, to the AIC on Curriculum Revision and Review, one of the seven Accreditation Implementation Committees established to address and implement the formal recommendations made by the ACCJC accreditation evaluation team which visited Leeward Community College in October 2000.

2. Membership listing of the three Accreditation Implementation Committees on Curriculum Revision and Review; Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance; and Administrative Instability and Turnover.

3. April 2002 Progress Report of the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Curriculum Revision and Review, including the attachment to that Report:
Policy and Procedures Proposal for Curriculum Revision and Review (DRAFT)

4. April 12, 2002 Progress Report of the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance, including the three attachments to that Report:
   a. Leeward CC Shared Governance Policy (DRAFT)
   b. Leeward CC Principles of Shared Governance (DRAFT)
   c. Description of the respective roles of the various constituencies on the Leeward CC Campus Council (DRAFT)

MEMBERSHIP LISTING
(as of academic year 2001-2002)

Accreditation Implementation Committee on Curriculum Revision and Review

Acting Assistant Dean of Instruction: Bernadette Howard, Co-Chair
Curriculum Committee Chair: Nancy Buchanan
2nd Curriculum Committee representative: Paul Lococo
Curriculum Central specialist: Barbara Hotta
Division Chairs of all 6 instructional Divisions (or their designees):
   - Arts & Humanities: James West
   - Business Technology: Shelley Ota
   - Language Arts: Kay Caldwell
   - Mathematics & Natural Sciences: Manny Cabral
   - Social Sciences: Donald Thomson
   - Vocational-Technical: Robert Hochstein
Student Services Division Chair (or designee): Stuart Uesato
Selected Discipline or Program Representatives or Coordinators
   (one from each of the 6 instructional Divisions):
   - Arts & Humanities: Patricia Kennedy, Co-Chair
   - Business Technology: Jean Hara, Recorder
   - Mathematics & Natural Sciences: Michael Bauer
   - Language Arts: Gail Levy
   - Social Sciences: Grace Miller, Second Recorder
   - Vocational Technology: Fern Tomisato
Language Arts: Leslie Munro

Accreditation Implementation Committee on Campus Council Constituency
Roles and Governance

Administration Representative: Clifford Togo
Faculty Senate Chair: James Goodman
Clerical Staff Council representative: Terry Richter; Vice Chair
APT Group representative: Dale Hood; Chair
Auxiliary Services Officer: Derrick Uyeda
ASLCC President (or designee): David Donaldson
Division Chair representative: James West; Co-Recorder
Academic Support/Services faculty representative: Ralph Toyama
Lecturer designate on Campus Council: Dorothy Sunio; Co-Recorder
Accreditation Implementation Committee on Administrative Instability and Turnover

Institutional Research Analyst: Andrew Rossi
Senior Personnel Officer: Takako Desaki
Acting Dean of Instruction: Douglas Dykstra
Acting Dean of Student Services: Stuart Uesato
Provost: Mark Silliman
Director of Administrative Services: Clifford Togo
OCET Director: Lucy Gay
Campus Council Chair: Manny Cabral
Two Faculty Senate representatives: Ronald Flegal; Jack Pond
APT Representative: Kathleen Cabral
Secretary to the Dean of Instruction: Cheryl Mokuau, Vice Chair
Secretary to the Provost: Terry Richter, Vice Chair
Chair of the Phase 1 Reorganization Planning Committee: Donald Thomson, Chair
Head Librarian (representing Academic Support): Diane Sakai, Recorder
Two Division Chairs: Kay Caldwell; Robert Hochstein
Hello Senators,

I was going to send you a report of the meeting of the CC Chairs at Manoa with the Chief Academic Officer Neubauer regarding our long-standing gripe about articulation problems and the Gen Ed Core. However, the Chair from Kapiolani CC beat me to the written report, which I am forwarding to you.

I will add, that the essence to this report is that the problems mentioned above will be solved in the future (very near future—say in January) by a "Council of Chief Academic Officers," which will be composed of reps from all ten campuses (most likely Deans of Instruction).

The duties of this council will include—Decision Making, Implementation, Planning New Initiatives and Coordination and Communication. This Committee will replace the CC Chancellor’s Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the System Academic Council (the step right before BOR approval). The only wild-card in here is whether this Council will include any faculty voting or non-voting members. Deane is open to faculty involvement, however the pros and cons and type of representation—are still being discussed.

I’ll see you on Wed 3:15, in FA 201.

James Goodman
Faculty Senate Chair
UH–Leeward Community College
808-455-0613

---

Update Gen Ed Meeting 8/30/02
Bachman Hall

Attending: Deane Neubauer (UH VP for Academic Affairs), Karl Kim (Manoa’s Chief Academic Officer), Denise Konan (Assistant to Karl Kim), Faculty Senate Chairs: Neghin Modavi (Kap CC), Jerry Saviano (Honolulu CC), Nancy Bushnell (Kauai CC), Floyd McCoy (WCC), and James Goodman (LCC). Also, we had faculty members David Cleveland (from Honolulu CC) and Carmela Tamme (form Kauai CC). Administrators included Louise Pagotto (Kap CC), and John Muth (Chancellor’s Office).

This was a follow up to our meeting on July 15th to continue the discussions of Community Colleges (CC) concerns over Manoa’s Gen Ed decisions.

Background A quick overview for newcomers

There have two previous meetings May 28th (with Karl Kim, and Manoa’s Gen Ed Committee reps and Faculty Senate Chair and July 15th with Deane Neubauer.

CC reps in May meeting were Myself, Jerry Saviano and David Cleveland and Mike Rota. The July meeting had a larger attendance including, Louise Pagotto (Dean of Curriculum from Kap CC), and Kauai FS chairs. The
August 30th meeting, as you can see, had reps form all CC except Maui and Hawaii.

CC concerns — expressed in May and July — are twofold:

1) Manoa's Gen Ed Committee's decision in May 02 to limit the Ethic (E) and Oral Communication (O) Focus requirements to 300 and 400 levels effectively cutting off CCs from offering course that would fulfill these requirements.
2) The second is a broader concern having to do with a lack of genuine CC participation in Gen Ed decision-making that affect the entire UH system, particularly feeder campuses such as CCs. Manoa's Gen Ed decisions have thus far been unilateral. This frustration is further augmented by Manoa's decision not to adopt a mechanism patterned after the current Writing Intensive (WI) model as promised earlier (to the BOR) as a management strategy for the new Gen Ed requirements. A WI model would have allowed for the establishment of UH system-wide committees to oversee the implementation and functioning of the new hallmarks, thereby allowing CC participation.

What the CC reps asked for in the July meeting with Deane Neubauer and Karl Kim were:
- Allowing for Focus E and O requirements to be fulfilled at 100 and 200 levels. This could be done by increasing credits from 3 in each O and E category to 6 (e.g., 6 credits of E 3 at lower and 3 at upper divisions) or having lower-division pre-requisite to E and O courses at the upper division level. Note that Manoa reasoning for 300 and 400 level restriction were based on (a) WASC's requirement that its Gen Ed Core be spread through upper and lower divisions and (b) pedagogical reasoning Focus requirement are best fulfilled within the major. At the conclusion of the July meeting Deane Neubauer said his office would clear the issue with WASC. Furthermore, we stressed that pedagogical arguments could be made that it is equally critical that E and O requirements also be taught at the lower division level. Indeed, our new WASC standards require that we do.
- Enhancing the role of CCs in Gen Ed decision-making. We expressed our desire that, as a system, CCs should have a greater role than the mere perfunctory one that only requires Manoa to "consult" with other campuses. David Cleveland brought a draft agreement patterned after the Minnesota Transfer Model in which various MN higher education institutions had jointly arrived at competency goals. The model allows each institution to its own Gen Ed curriculum yet maintain a guaranteed transfer among them.
- Our homework for next meeting August 30th - was to work on an ideal Gen Ed transfer/articulation model that balances institutional autonomy and allows for system agreements and participation.

August 30th Meeting

The CCs presented a revised draft of David Cleveland's proposal for a transfer/articulation agreement model including a comprehensive rationale. The Minnesota model inspires this draft. It also contains language from the BOR policy and the new UH System Strategic Plan together they underscore the importance of UH to behave as a system, to collaborate with respect and, above all, ease and facilitate transfer.

In a nutshell the proposal seeks the following:
- All UH campuses adopt the new Manoa Gen Ed hallmarks
- All UH campuses adopt the originating campus' core area designation of courses
- Establish a WI type system-wide standing committee in each area corresponding Gen Ed core areas (Diversification fields, Foundation and Focus, etc.). The function of these committees will be to engage in periodic discussions, review, and revision of hallmarks and handle appeals.

This model allows for genuine system-wide participation. Also, there is no need for system-level review of individual courses for articulation and transfer since each campus has agreed to accept the originating campus' designation. Thus review and approval occurs at campus level (as is with WI).

The meeting however, did not engage in any substantive discussion of the above proposal. Instead, Deane Neubauer presented his idea for establishing a new system-wide Academic Affair committee to then handle such policies.

Deane's position is that in face of impending changes in the CC Chancellors' Office, there is a need for a new structure to deal with broad system-level academic affairs issues and policies. His ideas are at a draft stage. He will send a written draft out shortly to Provosts to be disseminated and seek campus-level feedback to further
solidify plans. He wants to move fast and implement the new structure by early November. The articulation and transfer issues, according to Deane, will be the number one priority of this Committee.

Deane Neubauer's Proposition (as I understand it)

Creation of the UH Council of Chief Academic Officers (CCAO). Members of the CCAO will include Deane Neubauer, the UH VP for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic officers (CAOs) of the 10 UH campuses. Manoa, Hilo, and West Oahu already have such a position. Most CCs do not have a specific CAO position which needs to be established. CCAO will replace the existing System Academic Affairs Committee (SAAC).

The CCAO will not be a super curriculum or articulation committee rather it is an administrative body that acts as a direct agency of policy-making and communication. It functions are:
1) Policy/Decision-Making e.g., articulation/transfer; new program proposals, etc.
2) Implementation of policy/decisions
3) Planning and initiatives
4) Coordination
5) Communication

According to Neubauer this model would ensure a more transparent and participatory process and better coordination, support, and facilitation of program development across campuses. This model fits President Dobelle's emphasis on seamless functionality and regular and consistent participation by all campuses via the creation of leadership teams.

One significant question had to do with the faculty's role in this committee/process. Neubauer indicated he is open to suggestions. Allowing Faculty participation would create further openness to the process and prevent CCAO to be perceived as an administrative black hole. On the other hand there are inherent tensions in joining an administrative decision-making body with that of faculty governance.

Would there be a need to modification and or creation of a parallel Faculty Governance system regarding curricular affairs?

If we allow for faculty representation on the CCAO who will they be? Should they be the current Faculty Senate Chairs? How many? Would/should these faculty reps maintain an advisory role in this committee? Another option mentioned was to have the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate (ACCFSC) be the one that is linked as advisory capacity to the CCAO.

I asked Deane Neubauer for a sample walk-through of how a new program proposal would be processed. Please note, this does not apply to a single course only programs. This how it goes:

So, in conclusion, our questions/concerns regarding Gen Ed and related articulation and transfer issues were not answered or discussed. Instead, we were presented with a draft model of an administrative structure that would, soon after its creation, receive our proposals and recommendations for change in policy.

One advantage of this proposal is that once the CCAO makes a decision, it will be a system policy. All including Manoa, must comply.

An important gray area has to do with the role of the faculty.

Implications for CC campuses, as I see them, includes the need for the CC Faculty Senates to coordinate among ourselves to speak with a single strong voice and press/encourage our CAOs (whomever they may be!) to push for a Gen Ed articulation/transfer model in the new CCAO. Also, we need to engage in serious discussion among ourselves at the CCs and, indeed, at the UH system level of faculty governance, over the issue of participation in CCAO and matters of curriculum.
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