Chancellor's Administrative Staff Council
Monday, May 20, 2019
2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
ʻIlima 202A
Facilitator: Louise Pagotto

Administrative Staff Members: Karen Boyer, Brian Furuto, Carol Hoshiko, Susan Kazama, Noʻeau Keōpūhiwa, Nāwaʻa Napoleon, Louise Pagotto, John Richards, Joanne Whitaker

Members Absent:

Guests: Maria Bautista, Leigh Dooley

Previous Meeting Notes
Approval of Minutes
The meeting notes for May 13, 2019, were approved with amendments.

New Business
Council of Chancellors Meeting – Louise Pagotto
- Land acknowledgments were recited at the commencements for Hawaii CC, UH Maui College and UH West Oʻahu. It will be discussed at the other colleges.
- 3rd decade project: planning for the next 10 years. A consultant is being hired.
- Disenrollment for non-payment (purging) - The policy is being refined. A working group will be brought together to develop a plan for review by the Chancellors.
- Freezing the tuition for 3 years was approved by the BOR. At the 4-year institutions, over 12 credits are free. Maui College and Leeward CC are charging UH West Oʻahu tuition for 300-level classes.
- Background checks - DOE will be responsible for background checks for UHCC teachers who teach in the high schools. DOE will determine who will be fingerprinted.
- Alpha change without notice to the CCs causes problems. Other mechanisms will be considered to relay the information.
- Garret Yoshimi - Accessibility update. Voluntary resolution was delivered on May 1st. On July 26, there will be a meeting for all IT.
- Intellectual property is being discussed with UHPA.
- University of Northern BC is looking to UH to see how to be a system.
- Banner has a function to show percentage of an assignment in team-taught classes.
- Issues for the legislature: 1) Title III programs under scrutiny, 2) Travel, especially travel + personal time, frequent traveling or large group of travelers and, 3) 11-month non-administrative positions.

DE Review – Leigh Dooley
- DE Class review process - Why do we need a centralized system for reviewing DE classes? According to OFIE, Kapiʻolani CC students who are taking at least one online class will outnumber students who are taking all their courses face-to-face in 2 years. Also, DE enrollment will continue to grow.
- Kapiʻolani CC DE plan indicates a preference for reviewing DE classes in the departments, but recent developments at Scottsdale CC, warn that accrediators are looking for a centralized review and oversight system. The DE review looks at the laws that are specific to DE.
- Benefits to student learning: 1) Consistent quality, 2) ongoing tracking, 3) personalized professional development, and 4) satisfy faculty need for support in meeting the rules and regulations.

Basic Requirements Review or BaRe is for brand new courses in DE. Checks for compliance with Federal and State requirements and ACCJC standards. (ADA accessibility, FERPA, regular and substantive interaction or RSI, and student identity verification)

- Review team of 1 instructional designer, 1 trained peer reviewer (compensated), 1 member of the department, with carefully developed rubric.
- Rubrics will be submitted to the faculty member and Dept. Chair. Report submitted to the Dean, VC and Chancellor.
- Next review - 5 years, CoRe review, or, if not compliant, 1 year to remediate and BaRe review again.

Collaborative & Reflective Review or CoRe is for existing DE classes for compliance with Federal and State requirements and ACCJC standards, plus opportunity for reflective conversation about course design and facilitation.

- Review team of 2 trained peers (compensated), the teacher of the class and carefully developed rubric.
- Rubric will be submitted to the teacher and DC. Report submitted to the Dean, VC and Chancellor.
- Next review - 5 years, CoRe review or, if not compliant, 1 year to remediate with CoRe review.

Improvement Support Process - recommended to DCs when classes don't meet BaRe review or do not meet Federal and State requirements and/or ACCJC expectations. Classes that don't meet BaRe or CoRe, the recommendation is to continue to teach for 1 year.
DCs can

- discontinue the class as soon as the subsequent semester.
- continue to offer the class for one year pending re-review
- Continue to offer the class, even if after the re-review, class is not compliant
- Come up with and implement some other strategy

DCs must

- Inform the DE coordinator of decision. Report of compliance/non-compliance will be submitted to Dean, VC and Chancellor annually.

ISP: improvement with support

- Recommend that the class continue to be taught for one year, while the teacher works to bring the class into compliance.
- If still not compliant after a year, the class will be re-reviewed in one year.
- If class is compliant, recommend CoRe review in 5 years.
- If class is still not compliant after re-review, recommend to the DC to remove the class from the schedule in the subsequent semester and class will be re-reviewed again upon request.

Roll Out

- New DE classes will undergo BaRe review in the second semester of implementation.
- Established DE classes will continue to be taught without review until the department is up for full-department review.
- Full department review - Over approximately 6 years, at the rate about 2 departments per year, each dept will experience full-department review. All DE classes in the department will go through CoRe.

Faculty View

- For a faculty member who has never taught online, they need to identify the course they want to teach, take TOPP and respond to emails from DE team.
- For faculty who have been teaching online for a while, keep teaching your class and respond to emails from the DE team.

- For experienced online teacher who would like to teach a new class online, take TOPP if they haven't yet. If they're not taking TOPP, work with your DC, let the DE coordinator know you'll be teaching a new online class and respond to emails from the DE team.

Question: Who keeps track of all the reviews? Response: The DE coordinator using smart sheets.
Concerns:
- Delays in delivery with this review process. Response: New course can be taught and will be reviewed in the second semester.
- DC has sole authority for decision making but the authority lies with the college. By the time the Dean hears the decision, the non-compliance has already happened. The DC should not solely make the decision as it puts the institution in jeopardy.
- Language needs to added to document that the DC must notify the Dean. Reports will come from the DE Coordinator.

Question: What are the most common compliance issues? ADA. Some are teaching out of WordPress, not Laulima so they are out of compliance with FERPA. Publisher LMS may not be compliant with FERPA. RSI needs to be monitored. Student identification verification - Laulima is bare minimum.

Some Cost Options - the only $ needed is for peer reviewers.
- BaRe - 1 peer reviews, approx. 12 hours per review, 10 per year, 5 per semester
- CoRe - 2 reviewers (plus the teacher), Approx. 8 hours per review, 40 classes per year, 20 per semester.
- Quality Matters (QM) used by UHCC 5-week program. $1,000 for initial review, $400 for re-certification. $200,000 in the first year, $26,000 per year in subsequent years.

If we use QM rubric to conduct reviews, cost of training $200. Approx. 20 hours per review, 3 reviewers, about $75,000 per year.
- Teaching equivalencies (TEs) 2 peer reviewers per semester on 3 credit TEs each.10.5 hours a week is $23,076 per year for B step lecturer fill behind.
- Summer stipends - pay reviewers per review in the summer. Pay rate of $20 per hour or $15,200 per year. Hidden costs - DE coordinator is 9 months. If working in summer, need overload or to be 11-month. 1 Bare Reviewer is a department rep. Do they need TEs? CoRe teacher may need a summer stipend as well.

OCET Update – Carol Hoshiko
The new OCET catalog was distributed. See the full color catalog at kccocet@hawaii.edu.

Integrated Planning – Louise Pagotto
The ELT went through an exercise to consider how the college's plans integrate. How does information flow? Is there a distinction between the review documents (ARPDs and CPRs) and the plans?
- Strategic Plan vs. Strategic Directions. Instead of what do we want to do, should the question be where do we want to go?
- SSPs are a pathway. All of the SSPs align with a strategic direction but the SSPs don't aggregate up. Should the SSPs be the action plan in the ARPD?
- ARPDs are a subset of the CPRs. Some areas do an SSP without a ARPD or CPR. We need a matrix to show what areas do which reports.
- Review the CPRs, look at what the programs want to do going forward and use it for an academic plan.
- What plans do we really need?
- How do we decide what programs we should have? Does any administrator have anything to do with new program development? If the industry needs a new program, how does an experimental or new

program get on the table? We need to Involve DCs in the financial implications of new courses and programs.