

**CAPP Committee  
Meeting Minutes**

**MEETING DATE:** October 28th, 2022 1:00 PM - 2:30 PM

**LOCATION:** Zoom

**ATTENDANCE:** [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

MEMBERS		MEMBERS		GUESTS	TIME
Edo Biagioni	E	Siobhán Ní Dhonacha	P		
Kathy Ferguson	P	Brian Richardson	P		
Patsy Fujimoto	P	Ku‘ulei Salzer-Vitale	P		
Hannah Manshel	P				
Jon Matsuda	E				
Ashley Maynard	P	Raphael Raphael	P		

Subject	Discussion/Information	Action / Strategy / Responsible Person
Call to Order	CAPP Chair Maynard called the meeting to order at 1:01PM.	
Review of Minutes	Minutes of the October 7th, 2022 meeting were discussed as circulated. Motion Ku‘ulei; Second Patsy.	1 abstention, 5 approved.
Chair’s Report	<p><b>Travel Funds/Process Report &amp; Background</b></p> <p>UH Fiscal/Amy Kunz had previously proposed dispensing with Travel Advances (TA - monies disbursed to UHM faculty for research and scholarship et al. related travel). This was an issue for many reasons such as equity and affected many Faculty. Chair Maynard attended meetings, along with others, with UH Fiscal people to advocate for the continuation of Travel Advances, and contributed concrete proposals. This iterative effort resulted in UH Fiscal retaining TA core elements (such as airfare &amp; MI&amp;E). One area that remains problematic is the difference between FAR and lodging. Faculty in general will not be compensated the difference until after Travel Completion submission if Conference lodging, for example, exceeds FAR. Certain UHM categories are exempted from this such as Student Athletes and Study Abroad Faculty, for example.</p> <p>In general, these changes to TA appear to be about a focus on standardization, as versus data driven evidence based workflow or process changes since no time saved or other gain has been reported for the executor of these tasks. Unfortunately, the net effect of this approach upon the traveler is negative, may impede Faculty research support, and fosters inequity as many hundreds of dollars are expected to be floated and are potentially in play, which not</p>	

	<p>all Faculty can easily afford. CAPP requests that these effects are also factored into the decision-making loop with a return to approved TA for all travelers.</p> <p>Interested Faculty can contact Amy Kunz at amykunz@hawaii.edu</p> <p><b>UHM CALL Dean/Chairs Meeting</b>  Chair Maynard attended the UHM CALL Dean/Chairs meeting on October 25. There was a rich discussion. Various Chairs reported upon the effects of some proposed General Education changes such as loss of revenue, impact upon access to Hawaiian or Second Language acquisition, student global learning, impact upon employment pathways related to language proficiency if taking four classes of language is no longer required, and students/departments having to choose between Arts and Humanities courses (not taking both). Continuing to offer language at UHM was affirmed and supported by those UHM departments who currently do so, as had always been the case. Feedback from Faculty and Chairs can be sent to CAPP to be part of the response review process. All stakeholders are invited to send written feedback and offer diverse perspectives.</p> <p>There was discussion regarding the Gen Ed proposal, approval, and vote process based on the communications disseminated thus far, which seemed to the various discussants to indicate room for changes and amendments to the current Gen Ed proposal before the final vote. There appeared to be some confusion expressed regarding exactly what the Gen Ed proposal as submitted was in effect and totality proposing, and discussants reported that the summary sent out by CAPP was a helpful review tool. Chair will keep in touch with CALL.</p>	
<b>SEC Report</b>	<p>Per SEC CAPP Liaison, Provost Bruno &amp; President Lassner visited the SEC, and no major actions occurred.</p> <p>CAPP SEC Liaison asked the following question of Bruno.</p> <p>Question: What is the composition of the Manoa Budget Committee (MBC), and consequent impact on hiring?</p> <p>Provost Bruno answered that this composition provided greater diversity and voices in these decisions, and that Deans were no longer in isolation. This composition was more representative of campus concern, and the inclusion of Dr. Lipe mentioned acted as campus conscience. Main takeaways were greater diversity of voices with Deans no longer in isolation.</p> <p>Discussion followed with some clarification.</p> <p>CAPP would like the SEC Liaison to also ask about why the Faculty hiring process needs to include MBC approval of the hiring “short list”?</p>	

	<p>There is specific concern about there being a new budget review/approval of the candidate short list, formed after iterative hiring review steps, and composed of the strongest candidates being considered.</p> <p>Deans are not isolated, and have traditionally worked directly with departments et al. re: hiring processes regarding budget availability so this step has not been missing to date.</p> <p>Therefore, the rationale or need for an additional review of the existing department/college/school hiring budget does not appear to be clear.</p> <p>Departmental inclusion and diversity processes are the remit of each Department.</p> <p>Additionally, this new layer of budget review/approval by the MBC circumvents the process of faculty governance and peer review in the Faculty hiring process.</p> <p><b>SEC Liaison very willing to pose questions on behalf of CAPP, and will ask this question:</b> Why does this budget committee need to review the Faculty hiring short list?</p> <p>Liaison was asked if anyone on the SEC opposed this new review layer? Liaison shared there are concerns, and the SEC is going through a process regarding this.</p> <p><b>Posed to Bruno &amp; Lassner:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ SEC asked about Christine Sorensen's presentation on workforce satisfaction. President Lassner stated did want to respond to that, and there will be a meaningful response to that at some point.</li> <li>➤ SEC asked about the impact of the highest number of Undergraduates enrolled in years. Response was that this should lead to some permanent additional appointments. Goal has consistently been to return to 20,000 students on campus. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Capacity in response to high enrollment was discussed across a number of metrics, such as will there be the same number of faculty even with increased enrollment? Will there be more Tenure-track positions created which support sustainability and stability over time? As versus an instructor hiring model, as there has been?</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ President Lassner stated would apparently support changes to the General Education proposal before a final ye or nay.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion followed, including reaffirmation that curriculum remains the purview and remit of the Faculty.</p>	
<b>Graduate Council Report</b>	<p><b>Edo submitted the following via email:</b> There were no specific action items at this month's Graduate Council</p>	

	<p>meeting on October 18th. As a result, we discussed a number of longer-term items, beginning with a question-and-answer session and continuing and concluding with an in-depth discussion of the Academic Probation (AP) notation on the transcript of graduate students who take longer than 7 years to graduate.</p> <p>As some of you already know, the AP for time to degree is removed from the transcript once the student graduates, so most of the concern among faculty on grad council is about its effects on students before they graduate, both psychologically, and perhaps being a negative mark for students who are looking for academic jobs before graduating (the only other reasons for AP are for low grades or misconduct such as cheating).</p> <p>Dean Krystyna Aune and Associate Dean Julianne Maeda of grad division (GD) reported the results of a survey of grad chairs. According to the survey, many grad chairs found this use of AP satisfactory, but a few felt strongly that it was not, for reasons such as the above and also because 7 or more years is a normal time to graduation for Ph.D. students in some programs.</p> <p>Dean Aune and Associate Dean Maeda also defended the current practice as the only mechanism that GD has to encourage students to graduate sooner rather than later, but also acknowledged that this is not common practice among peer and benchmark institutions.</p> <p>The discussion wrapped up without a resolution. There were several mentions that a more flexible mechanism, that would allow some students to take longer if appropriate without having to have the AP notation on their transcript, would be an improvement. An option that was mentioned more than once was to involve the student's graduate chair and only give the AP if the graduate chair feels that the student is not making satisfactory progress.</p>	
Evaluations	<p><b>Timing of CES student survey evaluation circulation each semester, and governance issues.</b></p> <p>Chair: Of these two issues, governance is the more serious issue.</p> <p><b>Timing:</b> Background recap. CAPP previously requested that the CES student survey be opened one week prior to end of course as versus two weeks. Two weeks prior had been a UH System decision. This request was delivered via normal protocols with CAPP as an agent of the MFS. There has been no evidence based support or concrete benefit to yield or other shown or reported by proponents for a two-week window. Discussion noted research shows a one week window is more effective across a number of parameters. For example, not the same point in time or experience between those students who submit early and those who submit later in a two week window. Surveys used to be paper based distributed by a student on the last day of class, handled confidentially, and routed back to the Departmental office.</p> <p>Governance:</p>	

	<p>During Summer 2022 the <a href="#">ACCFSC reportedly</a> ruled that the CES survey be once again disseminated two weeks prior to the end of classes. This action to reverse the one week window was apparently based on the concept that CAPP proposed the change as a committee of the UHMFS, and not based on the vote of the entire UHMFS via the Resolution process. This interpretation of the UHMFS process and structure is not in accordance with established Faculty Governance protocols.</p> <p>Discussed previous CAPP Resolution regarding evaluations and survey instruments.</p> <p>This issue will continue to be monitored.</p>	
<b>Gen Ed Proposal</b>	<p>Discussion of process to consider the Revised Proposal for a General Education Baseline Curriculum for the University of Hawai'i System.</p> <p>A number of CAPP members attended General Education Town Halls.</p> <p>a. Comments and notes from Gen Ed Town Halls</p> <p>There was in depth discussion - see salient points and summary below: There appeared to some to be a very strong push for voters to approve the "baseline" and to "approve now with blind faith, trust can change and add things later", which seemed to be very unwise for a change so wholesale and far reaching.</p> <p>Another member commented that this lack of specificity, conversely, may offer more needed latitude down the road.</p> <p>Additionally, the General Education proposal nuts and bolts do not yet appear to be as optimally transparent, clear, and easily accessible as needed to fully unpack and understand (and then effectively implement) such huge changes in granular detail.</p> <p>For some, there was a strong sense and experience that the goal posts keep moving and that this is a moving target, which seems counterproductive to and not supportive of a clear, collaborative, and transparent process for such a fundamental and monumental revision.</p> <p>Discussion about the positive impact of a required Hawaiian curriculum course for all students. This was strongly supported.</p> <p>Discussed the General Education Proposal poll/survey instrument "Consider.it", and some of the positive aspects of that such as entering answers before seeing other responses/ majority opinion, thus discouraging "group think", for example. <a href="#">Link Here</a> &amp; <a href="#">Link here</a>.</p> <p>Also noted there appeared to be at least some skewed questions which could be restated to reflect more solid research methodology, thus providing more reliable data.</p>	

	<p>Discussed that there overall appeared to be a lack of nuanced and contextual understanding of the central role of faculty in the University, and the “lumping together” of all employee categories, which is not wholly helpful in an endeavor such as redesigning General Education curriculum and requirements.</p> <p>Discussed what appears to be excessive administrative overreach and changes made without consultation or buy-in, such as the creation of an eDossier system that may not allow an existing DP process to align, and therefore, forces change without consultation or autonomy.</p> <p>Discussed how the GE Proposal may affect the 10-campus system, and meeting with other campuses to learn more from Faculty colleagues and stakeholders, and to connect more deliberately. Brian suggested Lance Uyeda from WCC. Chair will follow up with an invite.</p> <p>Discussed methods to capture granular faculty feedback in real time, and settled upon using, editing, and updating the Google Form used last year with success.</p> <p>a. Comments and notes from Gen Ed Town Halls</p> <p>b. Summary document: Next steps?</p> <p>Chair referred to last year’s rich submission feedback from the History Department, and how useful that was and would be again.</p> <p>Discussed methods to capture granular faculty feedback in real time, which will be an iterative process, and settled upon using, editing, and updating the Google Form used last year with success. Chair will make Google Form available to members for editing and review.</p> <p>Discussed action dates - sooner is better overall. CAPP plans to get a “temperature check” or informal reading of the MFS committees assigned to review the proposal by 11/30/22. CAPP plans to use that input to propose whatever changes appear necessary for UHM students, keeping in mind possible effects on transfer students.</p> <p>Resolution will likely not be ready sooner than April or May 2023.</p> <p>Chair referred to the CAPP Summary Report from last year as good GE background for CAPP members.</p> <p>c. Visit from Windward CC Faculty Senate Chair and other Senate Chairs?</p> <p>Discussed how the GE Proposal may affect the 10 campus system, and meeting with other campuses to learn more from Faculty colleagues and stakeholders, and to connect more deliberately.</p> <p>Brian suggested Lance Uyeda from WCC meet with CAPP. CAPP needs to approve. Unanimous yes vote. Chair supports and will follow up with an invite for a 1:30 PM arrival time.</p>	<p>Approved unanimously.</p>
--	--	------------------------------

	<p>d. SEC meeting on 11.7.22:</p> <p>Chair will attend, and invited Vice-Chair. 3:00 PM November 7<sup>th</sup>. Attendance will be up to 30 minutes.</p> <p><b>Business below moved to the 11.4.22 CAPP Meeting:</b></p> <p>e. Update on possible FW2 requirement</p> <p>f. How to get appropriate faculty input on revised proposal, including the H/SL requirement, "signature high-impact practices," etc.</p>	
<b>One Health Certificate/ICSP</b>	<p><b>One Health Certificate:</b></p> <p>Brian is waiting on the Program Review Template from the Chair. The Chair will follow up.</p> <p><b>ICSP:</b></p> <p>Chair reported that 10.10.22 action items and word change were not yet implemented. The Task Force has not been assembled yet, which impacts program recruitment and outreach. Is the program still going to exist? November is too short a timeline.</p>	
<b>Other</b>		

The meeting was adjourned at 2:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Siobhán Ní Dhonacha