LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
2001 – 2002 Faculty Senate

UNAPPROVED Minutes of the May 1, 2002 Special Meeting

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


SPECIAL GUESTS: Bob Asato, Lani Uyeno.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m. with a quorum.

NEW BUSINESS:

REVIEW OF AIC REPORTS – The Senate was presented draft reports from three of the seven Accreditation Implementation Committees. These reports will be combined and serve as the basis for the Interim Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) due November 1, 2002.

The first report was from the AIC on Governance. The report explained the progress made by the committee so far, that is, the Committee has written drafts of governance policies explaining the relationships among various campus constituencies. These three governance documents will be presented to the campus constituencies for discussion and approval in the Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 semesters. The committee’s implementation timeline reflected an optimism that consensus can be reached by the time the Midterm Report is due to ACCJC in November 2003.

Motion 02-19 (Imada/Levy): To accept the progress report from the AIC on Governance.

PASSED – Unanimously

The second report was from the AIC on Curriculum Review. The committee has drafted a plan for a systematic review of all LCC’s academic courses and programs, but this plan is not as detailed as the one drafted by the AIC on Governance. The AIC on
Curriculum Review will continue its work over the summer and have a more complete draft and schedule of future campus open forums to discuss its recommendations.

**Motion 02-20 (Kappenberg/Reese):** To accept the report from the AIC on Curricular review and recommend that the timeline be more detailed.

**PASSED – Unanimously**

The final report was from the AIC on Administrative Instability and Turnover. Although the report has been posted on the LCC website (www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006), this AIC is not recommending any further campus wide meetings and feels it has sufficiently answered the issues raised by the Accreditation Team.

**Motion 02-21 (Hara/Levy):** To reject the AIC report on Administrative Instability and Turnover and send it back to the Committee for revision.

**PASSED – Unanimously**

The Senate recommends that the Committee gather data on current salaries, make an analysis of the starting salary offers for advertised positions, analyze the on-the-job-training for faculty who assume administrative positions and for administrators who advance to a different administrative job, report on the shifting responsibilities for administrators, assess the needs of administrators, and describe recent campus and system level evaluation efforts. In addition, the report should address local issues that affect working conditions and propose solutions.

**Motion 02-22 (Reese/Dabrowski):** To commend the three AIC Committees on the work done and the progress made toward addressing the concerns of the Accrediting Commission.

**PASSED – Unanimously**

LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE’S STRATEGIC PLAN – Bob Asato and Lani Uyeno presented an overview of the process that was used to develop the 2002-2007 Strategic Plan. Efforts were begun in August 2001 with the agreement that the process should be open and provide for as much input from the constituent groups as possible. The Plan was developed in three stages: the development of College goals (rooted in the mission statement), development of campus objectives to support the goals, and action plans (based on the notion of increased accountability and the need to address the Commission’s new standards). Numerous open forums and discussions were held, drafts were sent back and forth via email and hard copy. The action plans were prioritized in a manner that allowed the entire campus community to submit their input via their unit/division representatives. A draft of the Plan is due to Joyce early this summer. There is recognition that this Plan will need to be revisited on a regular basis to ensure plans are carried out and priorities remain appropriate.
Motion 01-23 (Reese/Cravath): To strongly endorse the 2002-07 Strategic Plan for Leeward Community College as presented.

PASSED – Unanimously

The Senate unanimously passed Resolution 02-02 (attached).

CHAIR’S REPORT ON UH SYSTEM STRATEGIC PLAN AND UH COMMUNITY COLLEGES’ STRATEGIC PLAN – Chair Goodman reported that input has been received on the UH System Plan (http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/stratplansys.html). A timeline was distributed at the last meeting. The Community Colleges’ Strategic Plan (http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/) calls for workload reduction and salary increases. It remains to be seen how these two plans will work together.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: The next meeting of the Senate will be on Wednesday, May 8. It will be a pot luck, and the Senate will hold elections for officers.

MEETING ADJOURNED: The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: Jack Pond, Secretary
The Senate wishes to commend the Strategic Plan Steering Committee under the leadership of Bob Asato and Lani Uyeno for the open and inclusive process that resulted in the Strategic Plan.

The Senate further recognizes that the Plan does indeed represent the priorities of the entire campus community and that it will thereby provide the basis for budgetary decisions through 2007.

Finally, the Senate supports the recommendation of the Committee that the document be periodically reviewed with campus wide input.
I  Review AIC Proposals
   A.  Governance
   B.  Administrative Turnover
   C.  Curriculum Review

(1) We are not being asked to critique the governance documents and
the process for curriculum review that are being suggested by these
committees. All we are being asked to do is to review the progress being
made by the committees on answering the accreditation
recommendations. Is it clear what they have done so far and are
planning to do in the future? The debates on the actual policies are
scheduled for next semester.

II  Leeward’s Strategic Plan (http://alaike.lcc.hawaii.edu/adp)
   A.  Guests: Bob Asato, Lani Uyeno.

III Chair’s Report on the Progress of:
   A.  UH System Strategic Plan
       (http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/stratplansys.html)

   B.  UH Community College’s Strategic Plan
       (http://www.hawaii.edu/ccc/)

IV  Adjournment:
   Our last meeting date of this semester will be May 8.
Progress Report of the AIC on Campus Council
Constituency Roles and Governance

April 12, 2002

1. Summary of the original problem:

In response to a recommendation in the 1994 accreditation report, a representative governance body called the Campus Council was created with its own Charter and By-Laws. All campus constituencies were represented on the Faculty Senate sponsored committee that recommended the establishment of this Campus Council and the Faculty Senate and Administration subsequently gave their approval to the Campus Council.

Per its Charter, the Campus Council “shall function as the recommending and advisory body of the college in matters relating to the priorities of the college.” “Priorities” is defined in the Charter as “establishing preferences, for the direction of the college, especially in regard to budget planning and resource allocation.

The Evaluation Report of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges dated January 19, 2001 commended the college for "organizing the Campus Council" but noted that the college needed to “define the roles of all constituencies in governance.” Also, the report mentions that the role of 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 representational organization of the Campus Council.”

The Evaluation report made the following recommendations:

1) “The team recommends that the college clearly define the role of all constituencies on the Campus Council. (Standards 10B.8, 10B.9, 10B.10)“

2) “The team recommends that the college develop and implement a written policy which articulates a decision making process which includes persons 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.”
Applicable Standards

Standard 10B.8 states: "The institution has a written policy which identifies appropriate institutional support for faculty participation in governance and delineates the participation of faculty on appropriate policy, planning, and special purpose bodies."

Standard 10B.9 states: "The institution clearly states and publicizes the role of staff in institutional governance."

Standard 10B.10 states: "The institution clearly states and publicizes the role of students in institutional governance."

2. Present status of the problem:

The AIC on Campus Council Constituency Roles has completed drafts of the following three proposed documents that address the visiting team's concerns: LCC Shared Governance Policy, Principles of Shared Governance, and a description of the respective roles of the various constituencies on the Campus Council.

As indicated in the sections below, these draft documents will be presented, during Fall 2002, to the various campus constituencies for review and approval. However, these draft documents have already been posted on the LCC accreditation website. The draft should be included in this Interim Report.

3. Proposal of a solution:

Each of the Campus Council constituencies will have the opportunity to discuss and vote on the three draft documents prepared by the Committee. Upon approval by all campus constituencies, the three documents will be sent to the Provost for official approval.

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 which shall remain in effect unless modified or replaced by a successor policy statement that is approved by the Faculty Senate, and Campus Council, and the Provost.
The timeline for establishing the policy:

1) AIC committee collects campus and constituency feedback and publishes its progress report by April 15, 2002.

2) During Fall 2002, each campus constituency reviews and approves the proposed Shared Governance Policy, the Statement of Shared Governance Principles, and the descriptions of the roles of the various Campus Council constituencies by February 28, 2003.

3) In Spring 2003, the Faculty Senate, the Campus Council and the Provost formally approve the Shared Governance Policy, the Statement of Shared Governance Principles, and the descriptions of the Campus Council constituency roles by May 1, 2003.

4) The College shall publish and promote the shared governance policy and shared governance principles on the College's website and in its “For Your Information” handbook for faculty and staff by September 2003.

4. Review of the campus community:

During the Spring Convocation on January 8, 2002, the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Campus Council Constituency Roles held open forums (3 breakout sessions) on the draft documents. The Committee reviewed that input and, as appropriate, adjusted the language of the Shared Governance Policy and the Principles of Shared Governance. The documents are now ready for review and approval by the various campus constituencies.

5. Shift from plan to implementation:

During Fall 2002, representatives from the Committee will present the proposed Shared Governance Policy, the Principles of Shared Governance, and the descriptions of Campus Council constituency roles to the various campus constituencies.

During the Spring 2003, representatives from the Committee will seek the approvals of the Faculty Senate, Campus Council and Provost to the proposed Shared Governance Policy, The Principles of Shared Governance and the description of Campus Council constituency roles.
REPORT OF THE AIC ON CURRICULUM REVISION AND REVIEW

1. Summary of the original problem:
   The team was concerned that there continues to be no formal system, policy, or practice to ensure consistency of course content, objectives, and standards from the time curriculum is approved until the present. Their recommendations: 1) 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. 2) Division chairs should ensure that all syllabi are regularly compared to the core outlines to provide assurance that objectives and competencies for all sections of a given course, wherever and by whomever offered, are consistent with the outline of record for that course.

2. Present status of the problem:
   The college has established a curriculum review process, developed core outlines, and set up an online Curriculum Central database, but the review of curriculum is not systematic and cyclical as recommended by the visiting team. There is still no policy or procedure set up to make it so. Also, critical curriculum is not consistently described in the core outlines, though progress has been made in “filling-in-the-blanks” in Curriculum Central.

3. 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.

4. Review by the campus community:
   See the steps for review listed below, (5)
5. **Shift from plan to implementation:**

   a. The report will be presented to the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council in April 2002.
   b. Summer 2002, AIC members will refine and revise the draft.
   c. The draft will be on the website in September 2002.
   d. Campus forums will be held in the fall on the policy and procedures.
   e. The refined draft policy and procedures will be sent to the Faculty Senate/Curriculum Committee for discussion and debate.
   f. If approved by the Faculty Senate, the DOI and Provost review and approve it.
   g. At this point, the policy is adopted by the college and will be implemented under the direction of the Dean of Instruction.
Policy and Procedures Proposal

Subject: Curriculum Revision and Review

Purpose: To establish policy and procedures institutionalizing curriculum revision and review, and for the periodic review of core outlines and course syllabi with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs and of assuring the continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies.

Implementation:

1. The Division Chair (DC) will be responsible for determining which courses will be reviewed each year, so long as they review 20% of the courses per year over a five-year cycle.

2. Each discipline will review its own courses, ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines and the continued articulation of the course with system colleges, should that be the case.

3. If the courses that are reviewed need no modification, the DC will input approval into Curriculum Central.

4. If the courses that are reviewed need modification, normal curriculum procedures for course modification will be followed within the current semester. The discipline representative will be present at the curriculum committee meeting to present the rationale, etc., for the changes.

5. Curriculum Central will be modified so that the essential elements needed for course syllabi are standardized with the same initial information. This standard information will become the first page(s) of each course syllabus to ensure that 1) course alpha and number, 2) title, 3) credits, 4) prerequisites, 5) description, 6) goals, and 7) learning outcomes of courses are presented uniformly regardless of the instructor. Also appearing on the first pages will be field boxes so each instructor may fill in the variable and personalized information: 1) name, 2) office, 3) office hours, 4) telephone number, 5) email address, 6) course section number, 7) classroom, 8) course meeting dates and times, and 9) textbooks and supplies. The additional pages of the syllabus will reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor.

6. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the reviewed courses with the individual course syllabi of the faculty. If there are any discrepancies, the disciplines, with the division chair, will work with the faculty to make corrections.
AIC on Administrative Instability & Turnover
Progress Report

1. **Summary of the original problem:**

The committee on administrative instability has determined the following based on the findings of the committee reports in 1994 and 2000. The 1994 report states

8.2 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 frequent changes in the administrative staff. (8C)

The committee honestly feels that the 1994 report overstated the problem and that had it not been included in the report, the 2000 report may not have mentioned it as a problem.

The 2000 report recommended:

8. The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses. (Standard 10B.4)

The 2000 report, however, has some validity because several administrative positions had temporary occupants due to unusual conditions. The provost left suddenly for reasons not internal to Leeward Community College after holding her position for one year. The Dean of Instruction became Interim Provost and the Assistant Dean became an Acting Dean of Instruction. To add to the impression of administrative instability our Dean of Students accepted a position on the Manoa campus which meant that a counselor was serving as an Acting Dean. The assistant dean positions by their very nature are likely to be occupied for a shorter period of time than other administrative positions due to the ambitions of those occupants to advance as well as their desires to go back to the classrooms.

2. **Present status of the problem:**

The committee believes that administrators are under paid and less prepared than they should be for the position and they do not receive appropriate feedback on their performances.

Further, administrators are over worked and are too confined to their offices, which interferes with keeping in touch with the campus.

Various disparate duties side track them in accomplishing needed tasks.
3. Proposal of a solution:

We proposed the following solutions.

That all administrators should be paid a salary equal to or higher than the highest paid faculty member. There has been promise of some pay raises for community college administrators.

As previously indicated in the report, the committee believes the job may be more attractive if the college offers administrators professional liability insurance.

Problems of inexperience should be addressed. First, internships to faculty and staff interested in becoming administrators should be provided; and secondly, on-the-job training for administrators once they have accepted their positions should be an integral part of the position.

Ongoing evaluations by other administrators and relevant faculty members with feedback to those being evaluated might add to administrative stability. There is now an evaluation process, however, administrators don’t appear to receive enough feedback from the process.

Previously the policy was for the Provost to discuss in some small degree with each administrator his or her evaluations without showing those evaluations to the administrators.

The Provost is still treated in a similar manner by the Chancellor and he is not aware of who his evaluatee group is.

Some pressures relating to working conditions have been minimized for administrators by the hiring of a grant writer and creating temporary positions for publications specialist and a person to make catalog changes and help with related subject matter. Further, a person has been hired as Fund Development Officer. The President of the University has instituted a policy that all administrators are expected to follow, which requires that they spend at least one day a week out of their offices. They may attend meetings, visit various parts of the campus or catch up on needed work at home among other things.

We further recommend that the college make every effort to send administrators to conferences which 1) may be a benefit to the college, 2) may benefit them individually, and 3) may be simply pleasurable and rewarding.

4. Review by the campus community:

The committee plans to share its recommendations with the campus community by individual email or by hardcopy if requested. The nature of the subject, in the opinion of the committee, does not warrant a campus wide meeting.
5. **Shift from planning to implementation:**

The University is in a state of change and cannot make promises at this time. We are faced with budget crisis, administrator uncertainty and a new president which make implementation of these recommendations difficult or uncertain.

It is essential that the evaluation process continue and be expanded to include the provost. He has the same rights as other administrators to received proper feedback.

It is recommend that the college provide professional liability insurance for administrators. The expense of such insurance could be eaten even in times of austerity, as is the case at this time.
AIC on Administrative Instability and Turnover

2000 VISITING TEAM RECOMMENDATION:

The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses. (10B.4)

SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM:

PROVOST: Current provost (Silliman) has only been in the position permanently for one year; however, he held the position on an interim basis for nearly one year prior to his appointment. The most recent past provost (Narimatsu) left the position suddenly after only one year for reasons not internal to LCC. Prior to that, the provost (Polk) served for 9 years.

DEAN OF INSTRUCTION: Currently, LCC has an Acting DOI (Howard) while the Dean (Dykstra) is on extended college business in Hong Kong. The Dean (Dykstra) has been in his job for about 2 years or since the previous dean (Silliman) took the position of Interim Provost. At the time of the visit, the DOI (Silliman) had served in his position for six years (the longest employed DOI in LCC history).

DEAN OF STUDENT SERVICES: Currently, LCC has an Acting DOSS (Uesato) who took the position in February when the DOSS (McGinnis) accepted a position at the system office after one year at the college. Previously, Interim DOSS (Uesato) held the position for about one year after DOSS (Tokuno), who served in the position for 6 years, accepted a position at UH Manoa.

DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: The current DAS (Togo) has been in the position for over ten years.

DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION AND TRAINING: The current DOCET (Gay) has been in the position for over 15 years.

Assistant Dean positions, by their nature, are likely to be occupied for a shorter period of time than other administrative positions due to the ambitions of those occupants to advance as well as their desire to return to campus jobs they held previously. Nevertheless, certain Assistant Deans are long-lived (Pecsok—5 years acting and regular appointee, Dykstra—5 years).
ANALYSIS OF THE CAUSES OF ADMINISTRATIVE INSTABILITY:

The committee believes the factors that may lead to the turnover of administrators fall into four areas. It believes that they are under paid, are less prepared than they should be for the positions, are overwhelmed by an enormous workload, and do not receive appropriate feedback on their performance.

1. Salaries. Ask Takako what the current policy on paying faculty who move to administrative positions. Make an analysis of the starting salary offers for positions for which we have advertised. Are they above/below/at the national average?

2. Preparedness. Analyze the on the job training (or lack thereof) for faculty who assume administrative positions and for administrators who advance to a different administrative job. Presumably, when administrators are hired from off island (out of state) they are suitably trained by experience.

3. Workload/Working Conditions. Analyze the shifting responsibilities for administrators as new college endeavors are undertaken (i.e. D.E., numerous grants, catalog/schedule, move to year-round scheduling, etc.) Also, the new UH President sent termination notices to 250 system-wide administrators effectively guaranteeing no one’s employment beyond December 2002 pending University-wide reorganization; however, no discussion of the intended reorganization plan has been forthcoming. This places additional stress and uncertainty on college administrative staff, and any impending turnover may be entirely out of the control of the college. In November 2000, an LCC Administrator’s Staff Development Needs Assessment was conducted that shed some light on the issues as seen by the administrators. (Attach Results of the LCC Administrator’s Staff Development Needs Assessment of November 2000). In that report, administrators shared some of their struggles and concerns. These included:

- Amount of time required in the job
- Difficulty in prioritizing
- Volumes of emails and other reading material
- Need to accommodate numbers of people without resources to do so
- Need to please everyone
- Problems with intra campus relationships
- Personnel problems
- Learning the past practices on campus
- The large number of meetings that must be attended.

Administrators also shared their opinions on how they might be better supported. These included:

- Better pay
- Better attitude (give administrators a chance)
- More forgiveness when they make mistakes
- More praises
- More patience
- Group activities which allow administrators to get out of their roles
- More feedback on their evaluations.
4. Evaluation. Previous attempts to evaluate the college’s administrative team have been meager, inconsistently applied and lacking in sufficient and meaningful feedback.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE PROBLEM:

1. Salaries. All administrators should be paid a salary at least equal to the highest paid faculty member. There has been promise of pay raises for community college administrators by the University President, but as yet, it is uncertain. The State’s current economic condition may prevent this from becoming a reality. The College or the University could offer administrators professional liability insurance as part of a pay package.

2. Preparedness. Problems of inexperience need to be addressed. Budget permitting, administrators should continue to be allocated funds for travel to attend conferences as they were in 2001. Internships to faculty and staff interested in becoming administrators should be provided. On the job training for administrators once they have accepted their positions should be an integral part of the position. The Staff Development Center is currently looking at ways to provide training and development of future administrators

3. Workload and Working Conditions. In response to the heavy workload in the Dean of Instruction’s Office, the full-time Grants Writer position was filled in 2000. This relieved some of the workload from the Interim DOI who was doing the work of the grants writer. In 2001, a Publications Specialist was hired to work on marketing the college and be responsible for the publication of the catalog and schedule of courses (work that had been previously done by the Assistant DOI). In addition, a Fund Development Officer has been hired at the College.

4. Evaluation. The current provost has implemented a new online evaluation of campus administrators. Feedback from the first round has been returned to each. The exact number of evaluations sent out and returned should be described here. A sample of the form should be provided. Is the Chancellor’s Office attentive to its need to evaluate campus CEOs on a regular basis and provide meaningful feedback in a timely fashion?

PLANNING TO IMPLEMENTATION:

The University is currently in a state of change under the new leadership of its new president, and promises are difficult to make at this time. The economic condition of the State of Hawaii has only now begun to show some signs of improvement after nearly 10 years of deterioration exacerbated by national events. It is too soon to expect large amounts of money will be allocated to the University as the State struggles to balance its budget. Nevertheless, some ideas can be implemented that bear low costs. These include:
- Allowing administrators to attend conferences to improve their effectiveness and provide in service training.
- The college is blessed with considerable assigned/release time. Some of this could be used to provide internships for faculty desirous of moving into administrative positions. It must be realized, however, that current monies for released/assigned time may soon dry up.
- A mentoring program with more experienced administrators in the system could be implemented to aid administrators in the transition to administrative work.
- It is essential that the evaluation processes continue and be expanded to include all administrators and all constituent groups. The efforts must be regular, thorough and results should be made available to the administrator being reviewed for his/her analysis.