

**Hawaiian, Asian, & Pacific Issues Focus (HAP)
Multicampus Group**

May 3, 2012, 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Meeting Notes

Present

Dawne Bost, UHM GenEd Office – guest	Mikahala (Miki) Helm, UHMC (guest)	Tracie Ku‘uipo Losch, LeeCC Nawa‘a (Kawika) Napoleon, KapCC
Keala Chock, HonCC	Joanne Itano, UH System	Kiope Raymond, UHMC
Dennis Chun, KauCC	Kalei Kanuha, UHM	Todd Sammons, UHM GenEd Office (guest)
Lisa Fujikawa, UHM (recorder)	Lokelani Kenolio, WCC	

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Chair Keala Chock.

1. Introductions. See attendance, above.

Minutes from April 25, 2011 Meeting were approved with corrections.

2. Annual Program Review

a. UH Maui College (Kiope)

- The online Schedule of Classes (SOC) now reflects the HAP designation.
- There are no new HAP courses, although there are new courses in Hawaiian Studies.
- Kiope hopes that PACS 108 will be HAP soon.
- Kealani Cook is a new professor in History who may be offering a HAP course soon.

b. Kaua‘i CC (Dennis)

- There are no new HAP courses.
- The Board hasn’t looked at HAP student learning outcomes (SLOs).
- KauCC is currently looking at changes to the Liberal Arts degree.

c. Windward CC (Loke)

- There are two new members on the HAP Board.
- The website is being updated.
- There are no new HAP classes; existing HAP courses are renewing designation.
- SLOs have not been completed.
- GenEd is going through a few changes

d. Leeward CC (Ku‘uipo)

- PACS 108 and HIST 284 (History of the Hawaiian Islands) were approved for HAP. Jayne Bopp’s SOC 251 was also approved.
- The Board website was updated and improved. The site now includes sample syllabi, a checklist, and deadlines through 2014. (See info packet distributed by LCC.)
- The Board is trying to improve communication.
- A Laulima site was created for the Board.

- The Board approved having course-based designations, in part because there were problems hiring lecturers and then designating sections retroactively. LCC is currently working on a form for the new course-based designation.
- e. **UHM (Kalei)**
- The last year was a “standard” one, although it seemed that many proposals were new.
 - The Board had a hands-on orientation/training for new members. The Board also met with faculty who were interested in proposing a new course for HAP.
 - Interaction with other Focus Boards was a plus.
 - The Board had several discussions about what constitutes “Native” and “indigenous.” The Board also discussed nationality/ethnicity/culture.
 - Timely review of proposals is a challenge; sometimes it’s hard to get all Board members to review.
- f. **Honolulu CC (Keala)**
- Recertification of courses continues.
 - HWST 270 is part of a new AA in HWST; Tiani Akeo’s section is being reviewed by the Board for a HAP designation.
 - The process has been enhanced, and several forms have been modified.
 - Most faculty are lecturers; transfer of certification is a challenge.
- g. **Kapi‘olani CC (Nawa‘a)**
- There are two new instructors for ENG 272M: Dennis Kawaharada and Porsche Fuentes.
 - PACS 257 was also approved under Michelle Tupou.
 - Rolling class information from one semester to the next caused some problems with designating courses. From this semester, class information no longer rolls.
 - The Board is getting a better handle on HAP courses.

3. Old Business

a. **Retroactive designation of HAP courses**

- The discussion of retroactive designations came about because an instructor was hired at HonCC, and it wasn’t until mid-semester that HonCC found out that the instructor had HAP approval at another campus (KapCC). HonCC held a special meeting to approve the course for their campus and get it designated mid-semester (i.e., retroactively).
- UHM does not retroactively designate sections, because it violates the policies of “equal access” and “informed consent”– making sure that all eligible students have “equal access” to the designated course and that when they register, they are doing so with the knowledge that the course will (or will not) meet the HAP Focus requirement (“informed consent”).
- At WCC, if a lecturer comes in and uses an already-approved syllabus, the lecturer can fill out a “short form” rather than the regular “long form.” This is not considered to be retroactive designation; since the section is already designated, it is just a matter of getting the newly assigned instructor approved.
- LCC hires many instructors “late,” so there is a push to move to course-based approvals to avoid designating courses after registration has begun. (Ku‘uipo felt that an instructor change that resulted in designation of a section after registration began did not constitute a retroactive designation.) Keala asked if the group wanted to discuss standardizing procedures for late hires. There was no response from the group.

- Course-based designations at LCC will begin in Fall 2012. There will be a list of approved instructors, but instructors will still have to submit a modified syllabus, etc. if they are not on the list. Course-based candidates include HWST 107 and PACS 108.
 - At UHM, courses need to have a “track record” of being offered with a Focus before receiving a “course-based” designation. The department must also assign a Course Coordinator who will ensure that all course instructors teach the course in accordance with the HAP Hallmarks.
- b. Systemwide HAP Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).** It was decided that campuses will send their SLOs to be posted on the HAP website to share.
- c. Assessment**
- At UHM, the Assessment Office (AO) has been charged with providing evidence that the WASC mandates are being met in all aspects of General Education. It wasn’t clear where in the process the AO was with HAP assessment. The General Education Office (GEO) sends out surveys to HAP instructors every semester, but that does not constitute sufficient assessment by WASC standards.
 - Todd felt it was important to determine the SLOs first before working on assessment.
- d. Systemwide Website for HAP Focus**
- Some members expressed a desire to have a list of all HAP approvals systemwide on one website. Joanne said that this has already been done for Foundations, but that it relies on a representative from each campus to keep the list updated. Joanne said that her office had also tried to create a list of Diversification (Div) courses by pulling information from Banner, but they ran into problems because not all campuses have input Div information into Banner, or else, have not input it in the same place.
 - Miki questioned the need to have all courses listed in one place and suggested that the System site have links to individual campus lists instead.
 - Ku‘uipo suggested starting with links to each campus’s website, and asked which campuses currently have a site.
 - UHM has a GenEd website, but the site does not have a list of approved HAP instructors/courses.
 - WCC and LCC have a site.
 - HonCC, KauCC, and UHMC do not have a site.
 - KapCC also does not have a site, although the information is in Laulima.
 Keala asked that all representatives go back to their campus to see what is possible. He said that for his campus, the issue was that the sites are on intranet, which is not publicly accessible.
- e. Procedures for Modifying Hallmarks and Explanatory Notes**
- Lisa gave a summary of what happened when a proposal to change one of the Foundations-Symbolic Reasoning (FS) Hallmarks was brought before the Multicampus Foundations Group. Because the proposed change was a significant one, an FS Working Group was created to look at the proposal and then make a recommendation to the Multicampus Group. The Multicampus Group voted to approve the Working Group’s recommendation and asked each representative to take the proposed change back to their campus for final campus approval. The Group is currently awaiting final approval from each campus. Once all campuses have approved the change, it can/will go into effect. It was unclear what

would happen if one or more campuses did not agree with the majority, since both the FS Working Group and the Foundations Multicampus Group operated on consensus.

- Joanne felt if all campuses had to agree, it was essentially assuring that no changes would be made. She pointed out that the All-Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) reviewed a document regarding common course numbering, where each campus was asked to endorse the document. Eight campuses endorsed the document, one did not, and one did not respond. The document was ultimately endorsed by the ACCFSC as a group, although consensus was not reached.
- How does the HAP group get answers to this question about who is authorized to make decisions? Ku'uipo asked if the System W Board was empowered to make such decisions. Todd responded that there are no procedures in place for that group to make changes. Consequently, it is not clear where the authority to make changes lies, and whether consensus is required to make such changes. The documents that established the multicampus groups only have parameters for creating and maintaining the groups, not for making changes.
- Several members felt that the group was already empowered to make the changes being discussed, but agreed there was nothing in writing addressing this issue.
- Keala questioned if further discussion at the campus level was necessary. Todd said that the Foundations representatives talked to their campuses about governance,,and it wasn't clear where all the campuses stood on the issue.
- Keala reiterated that he felt the group is qualified to make decisions. However, at some campuses, the HAP Board is under the General Education Committee (GEC), the Curriculum Committee, and/or the Faculty Senate. Those campus representatives felt that courtesy dictates that proposed changes be taken back to the campus for approval. Others felt that the Faculty Senates defer to the recommendations of the committees/boards that have the responsibility for specific requirements or areas. Keala felt that this deference of decision-making falls in line with the multicampus articulation agreements.
- Joanne asked why the HAP Multicampus Group shouldn't have the authority to make substantive changes. Several representatives felt that the Boards on the individual campuses should also have the responsibility to review proposed changes.
- Todd said that the Hallmarks are sacrosanct, but believed that the group could add to the Explanatory Notes. He felt that additions to the Explanatory Notes could be made as long as no changes were being made to the existing Hallmarks/requirements which had been agreed upon at the time the different campuses joined the Multicampus Group.

5. New Business

a. Definition of Native/Indigenous

- The interpretation of Native/Indigenous is currently not clear; the group would like to clearly define the terms and put the information in the Explanatory Notes.
- Ku'uipo said that she felt that the meaning of Native/indigenous was fairly straightforward for Hawai'i and the Pacific, referring simply to the aboriginal people. Asia, on the other hand, was unclear. Does "Native" refer to people who were born in Japan, or who merely people who lived there? What about the Ainu? A decision needs to be made.
- It was suggested that a motion be made to modify the existing Hallmarks and/or Explanatory Notes to clarify the two terms. Joanne suggested that the group try to go through the process of making modifications and see if they are met with any resistance from individual campus groups (e.g., General Education Committees, Curriculum

Committees). Joanne's feeling was that the committee has a lot of specialized knowledge to which other faculty may defer, thus empowering the group to make the final decision.

- Lisa explained that the current Hallmarks were derived from the official Board of Regents-approved document that created Manoa's current General Education requirements. Consequently, she did not believe that changes to the Hallmarks could be made without wider consultation.
- The group determined the issue can be resolved in one of two ways: Allow each Board to have its own discussion and define the terms for their campus, or have a task force with representation from each campus come up with a common definition for all campuses. This will be the first item of business on the Fall 2012 meeting agenda.

b. Articulation of HawCC and UHH courses

- If/when HawCC or UHH sends a request to have a section articulate as fulfilling the HAP Focus requirement, the group agreed to review the request so that one common articulation decision can be made.
- Loke wasn't sure if courses that fulfill the HAP Focus would also fulfill Hilo's Hawai'i Pan Pacific (HPP) requirement. There don't appear to be Hallmarks for the HPP requirement, but the description looks similar.
- A discussion that arose at the Puko'a Retreat at Punalu'u raised concerns about the non-participation of HawCC and UHH in the multicampus agreement. Participants felt that it could be detrimental to students who transfer to a participating campus. The example given was a transfer student from HawCC who has an AA in Hawaiian Studies.
- The group wanted to encourage both HawCC and UHH to join the Multicampus Group. It was suggested that guests from both campuses be invited to the next meeting, or alternatively that representatives from the group meet with representatives from the two campuses. In the end, the group agreed to invite the Chair of UHH's HPP Committee to the Fall 2012 Multicampus Group meeting. The group also wanted to invite someone from HawCC, but wasn't sure who should be contacted.

c. Election of 2012-13 Chair. Keala Chock will continue to serve as Chair of the HAP Multicampus Group in 2012-13.

d. Multicampus Group Website

- Ku'uipo created a Laulima site for the group last year. The intent was to use the site as a means of communication among members.
- Links to individual campus websites, minutes, and agendas can all be posted.
- All members have "maintenance" capability.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Next meeting: Friday, September 28, 2012, 2:00-4:00 p.m. O'ahu members will meet at KapCC.

Prepared by Lisa Fujikawa, UHM General Education Office