

Committee on Administration & Budget

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date 2 March 2022
Meeting time 3:00 PM - 4:30 PM
Location

Attendance

Members

Name	Role	Attendance
Healani Chang	Member	Present
Roy Gal	Member	Present
Erik Guentner	Chair	Present
Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa	Member	Present
Robert Paull	Vice-Chair	Present
Ann Sakaguchi	Member	Present
Carolyn Stephenson	Member	Present
Alex Stokes	Member	Present
Mark Thorne	Member	Present
Andrew Wertheimer	Secretary	Present
Christine Sorensen Irvine	SEC Liaison	Present

Guests

Name	Role	Time
None		

Subject	Discussion/Information	Action / Strategy / Responsible Person
Call to Order		Call to Order at 3.09 p.m..
Review of Minutes	1. Review of 23 Feb. 2022 Minutes	Approved with three abstentions.
SEC Liaison Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placed travel advance materials in the CAB folder and forwarded copies of the relevant 2018 MFS minutes regarding CEE. Informed SEC about JABSOM non-response. J. Kinder is updating the timeline information and Chair Sipes and I plan to discuss it with Provost Bruno. SEC Referred the following to CAB: Reorganization Proposal for the College of Social Sciences/School of Communications, College of Arts, Languages & Letters/Department of 	

	<p>Communicology, College of Natural Sciences/Library and Information Science Program, and College of Social Science/ Matsunaga Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution, Consultation letter from Dean Konan. Items uploaded into a folder (School of Communication and Information Reorg) in CAB Issues folder.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAB revision to rules of order regarding College of Nursing was placed on the March Senate agenda. • Confirmed Athletic Director Dave Matlin will speak at the March Congress meeting. • COIA representative Kelley Withy has been asked to speak at the April Senate meeting. 	
ONGOING BUSINESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEE governing documents • JABSOM reorganization • GenEd redesign • GEO/GEC governing documents • CALL Reorg Proposal • Name Change for Nursing • Travel Advance <p>• The name Change for Nursing has been sent for the Senate Agenda,</p>	<p>1. Erik will send a letter indicating to the Dean's office explaining that CAB cannot give support to the JABSOM Reorganization until they respond to our requests for information (with a copy sent to Brent and Bruno).</p>

	<p>as is indicated in the SEC Liaison Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing has been heard in the CALL Reorg Proposal • JABSOM Reorganization: We sent a lengthy request, but only received one document since. We have not heard an official reply from the dean's office. We should write that the Dean's office has not responded and notify the SEC this. We last notified JABSOM on Feb. 2nd to the same effect, asking for specific requests for information from a resolution CAB issued last year. Alex will check the list of requests we sent last year to encourage their response. He will make it into a checklist noting areas that have been addressed or not. • GenEd redesign: Roy reported from the group that explored this. The concerns regarding the content of GenEd include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Basis for the GE committee and its charge, and context of proposal</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not have legitimacy (see our earlier communications) • The UH President is not the person to lay out the requirements for GenEd. (Mānoa autonomy). • Should lay out clearly the WASC accreditation requirements, including diversification 	<p>2. Erik will forward the Report from the informal working group on GenEd Requirements to CAPP. We may review this more fully at our next meetings.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should lay out context and content of the current GenEd program (required courses, foci, etc). Assumes more knowledge of the current GE program than many faculty possess. • Should describe how new proposal maps/changes/etc. those requirements, • Should examine impacts especially since this may extend the time students need for graduation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Capacity/touchstone model is vague and has inappropriate components</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Table on p. 17 lays out list of capacities and touchstones that are required ○ Table incorrectly combines WASC and WICHE (which does not accredit), and they are not the same. List of WASC requirements is incorrect. ○ The term “touchpoint” is never defined from a logistical/implementation standpoint. ○ Method for enumeration of capacities and 	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>touchpoints for classes are not described</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Item 2.2a in 2013 WASC handbook lays out breadth requirements for all students, but these are not addressed (cultural & aesthetic; social & political; scientific & technical) ○ Proposal requires a capstone, but that is not appropriate for GE. Capstones are generally for a concise body of knowledge. Similarly, you cannot minor in GE; minors (and majors) are by definition focused. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Proposed model has major implementation challenges</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assignment of c/ts (see table p.18) to individual classes is up to units, and they have no support or guidance to do this. ○ Model does not clearly describe how c/t are determined or if multiple c/t are possible for a single class. ○ Places enormous burden on units and faculty to determine c/t for classes and find ways to incorporate them in existing classes. 	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Item 5 (p. 17) suggests an assessment committee but provides zero guidance on how to form such a committee, and what the assessment guidelines would be. ○ Proposed committee to assess classes would have 1000s of classes to review, this is not viable ○ Enormous burden on Banner to track accumulation of “points” in c/t system ○ Enormous burden on students to track their progress and find classes to fulfill requirements in a complex matrix. ○ Makes it harder for students to graduate in four years due to complexity of the system, and challenges of work, caregiving, etc. ○ Zero discussion of personnel resources needed at system, campus, unit, dept, faculty level for implementation ○ Zero discussion of allocation of funding for the resources needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>“Core” KHUA course implementation is not clearly</u> 	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p><u>articulated</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Document does not clearly state who (which unit/dept) is responsible for implementing KHUA courses. ○ Document does not clearly state if students are required to take all KHUA courses, and if this will apply at all campuses. ○ Document does not clearly spell out which and how many of the capacities/touchpoints each of these courses would fulfill. ○ It is not clear which departments are charged with determining that certain courses meet the KHUA standards. ○ How will KHUA courses be staffed when there are no additional resources or rewards for teaching interdisciplinary courses? ○ Why is KHUA200 a 200-level course if it is Foundation level? It is called Intercultural/International but focuses on Hawaii/Oceania. 	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Tension between place-based focus and General Education</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposal is framed as Place-based but not all capacities and touchstones (chart on p.17) can or will be place-based. ○ How can faculty legitimately demonstrate a place-based focus and that they are knowledgeable and skilled to teach this? ○ Who or what entity determines if a course meets (unstated) requirements for being sufficiently place-based? ○ The previous HAP model allowed students to develop a place based learning in Hawai'i, Pacific, and Asia. The new model uses Hawai'i as the primary filter for this requirement. ○ Challenge to make 'place based' a center of a General Education within the frame of international and intercultural education. ○ Including host culture in GE is fundamental, but concern that this also could be a limit in what should be exposing 	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>students to the wider world as a step towards thinking globally while acting locally.</p> <p>Erik has not heard from Ashley, but hopes that CAPP will still take these comments under advisement since we had promised further feedback.</p>	
New Business	1. Reorganization Proposal – School of Communication and Information	None.
Guest(s)		None.
Committee Reports		None.
Other		None.
Adjournment	The next meeting of the Committee on Administration & Budget Wednesday, 3/30/2022 at 3:00 p.m.	Meeting adjourned around 4.30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Wertheimer Secretary and Ann Sakaguchi, Acting Secretary

Approved by acclamation on 30 March 2022.