CTAHR Faculty Senate
Minutes of the 18 November 2009 Meeting


Excused: H. Min, A. Wieczorek, J. Zee


Guests: A. Chang, C.Y. Hu, C. Kinoshita

The meeting was called to order at 1:36 p.m.

1. The minutes of the 23 September 2009 Senate meeting were approved as corrected.

2. Dean Search Update.

   Candidate names are still being solicited.

3. Administration

   Dean Hashimoto and Associate Dean Nishijima were unable to attend.

   Associate Dean Hu discussed how Hatch fund use can impact G fund allocations by the upper administration and impacts on grant cost sharing. Questions should be directed to him. The report is appended.

   Associate Dean Kinoshita discussed lecture allocation practice, which is not a policy, entails negotiation with departments (names have been redacted from the appended report). The previous meeting’s eCAFE discussion was reviewed. Dean Kinoshita solicited input on the response to the comprehensive program review (draft appended). Annette Chang, the new Director of Administrative Services was introduced. She has an open-door. Call or stop by. She wants to work together.

   A. Chang thanked the SEC for the fiscal replacement positions letter of support. A. Lee will replace be the new Fiscal Officer on 1 December 2009. Two other positions will be filled soon too. An additional two positions may be filled using RTRF moneys.

4. Manoa Faculty Senate

   No update.

5. Resolutions
Resolutions of appreciation for Pua’ala Fisher and Wayne Nishijima upon their retirements from the colleges were proposed.

R. Bowen moved and K. Cheah seconded acceptance of the following resolution:

WHEREAS Pua’ala Fisher has been an administrative officer in the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources (CTAHR) for 25 years, and

WHEREAS Pua tirelessly served all faculty, staff, and administration as she supervised the fiscal office, and

WHEREAS Pua guided CTAHR through the complex maze of fiscal policies and procedures, and

WHEREAS Pua has been instrumental in keeping our expenditures moving forward, even though the fiscal reporting requirements have challenged many of us, and

WHEREAS Pua has even gone above and beyond the call of duty in many ways, such as assisting us with our travel,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the CTAHR Faculty Senate expresses its sincere appreciation for Pua Fisher’s years of service, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CTAHR Faculty Senate wishes her good health, happiness and many hours of fun on the golf course in her retirement.

The resolution passed unanimously:

R. Bowen moved and A. Titchenal seconded acceptance of the following resolution

WHEREAS Wayne Nishijima has been in the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources (CTAHR) for 30 years, and

WHEREAS Wayne tirelessly served as a faculty member and as an administrator in order to make CTAHR the best it can, and

WHEREAS Wayne guided CTAHR’s Cooperative Extension Service for the past three years as Associate Dean and Director, and

WHEREAS Wayne selflessly devoted himself to serving on CTAHR’s Leadership Team, and

WHEREAS Wayne worked with CTAHR’s agents and specialists by making it a priority to focus his resources on the challenges being experienced in communities across the State, and
WHEREAS Wayne exhibited the perseverance needed to assemble the facts put forth by faculty, sparse though some may have been, to make us all look good in the Annual Report required by the Federal government,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the CTAHR Faculty Senate expresses its sincere appreciation for Wayne Nishijima’s years of service, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CTAHR Faculty Senate wishes him good health and many hours of relaxation in his retirement.

The resolution passed unanimously.

6. Bylaw Amendments

The changes in standing committee member number presented at the 23 September 2009 Senate meeting were reviewed. B. Sipes moved to accept the proposed amendments. L. Cox seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Committee Reports

The Personnel, Extension and Elections Committees had no report.

Instruction Committee. J.-P. Bingham presented the results of an eCAFE survey and subsequent discussion by the committee (report is appended). Five recommendations were made. L. Cox moved to accept the recommendations of the committee and charge the committee with crafting an eCAFE policy in consultation with Associate Dean Kinoshita and in communication with the Senate. J.-P. Bingham seconded. The motion carried.

Research Committee. J. Kim reported that the research work load is being explored (similar to instructional work load). A survey has been sent out to faculty. The committee is anticipating developing guidelines for research productivity.

9. ACCFSC

L. Cox attended for J. Hollyer. Articulation among campuses remains an issue. Incoming students are under prepared, and the issue is being addressed with the state DOE (especially math).

10. Senate Survey

The findings and comments have been stated as positive feedback, firm but kind, constructive tone. Conversations with individuals will begin in December or January. Summary information will be provided to faculty in a couple of weeks.

11. Dean Search Process
The UHM administration violated an agreed upon search committee process in failing to solicit faculty names from the CTAHR Senate. The SEC expressed its disappointment in the failure but voiced its satisfaction in the current search committee. No Senators expressed concerns or other sentiments.

12. Next Senate Meeting

The next Senate meeting will be held on 17 February 2010 at 1:30 pm in Ag. Sci 219.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:59 pm.

Respectively submitted, Brent Sipes
Lecturer Allocation Practices Presently Being Followed in CTAHR

Every semester, CTAHR’s Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs (ADASA) solicits lecturer requests from CTAHR chairs for the following semester. The ADASA compiles the requests and compares the responses against both the previous year’s requests and against the approximate level of funding available to cover lecturer costs. In previous semesters, the lecturer counts and/or costs often were slightly higher than available funding. In those instances, the ADASA negotiated with chairs to reduce the numbers of lecturers being requested. In some cases, chairs were asked to justify the need for a lecturer for a particular course (especially for small classes). After holding discussions with chairs, the ASADA submitted a list of requested lecturers to the dean and in every semester, the dean approved the list as submitted.

Going into the current fiscal year, the ADASA asked all chairs to be particularly frugal in their lecturer requests. The chairs, individually and collectively, were highly responsive, allowing the college to reduce its lecturer costs for Fall 2009 by 45% (versus Fall 2008). The same percentage reduction (45%) was used as a target for Spring 2010 (anticipated total cost for lecturers for Spring 2010 probably will be less than 50% of the total cost in Spring 2009).

The ASADA does not have quotas nor cost targets for individual departments and sees little benefit in establishing them.

Below is a summary of the request for lecturers for Spring 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APDM 200(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDM 205(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDM 330(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDM 337(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDM 416(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDM 420(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMR 331(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMR 331(1) on-line</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMR 350(1) on-line</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMR 352(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSC 321</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSHN 468</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSHN 475</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREM 310</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPS 310</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPSS 440</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (not including course buyouts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Buyouts:

1  
2  
3
1. Develop a long term staffing plan to assure that the appropriate faculty composition is in place especially in view of the anticipated retirement of senior faculty in the near future.

CTAHR has adopted a Priority Staffing process in which all departments, extension offices, and college administration periodically submit priorities for filling faculty and staff positions. CTAHR’s Priority Staffing Process is transparent and formalized (the preamble, overview, and factors influencing priority staffing decisions are posted on a website accessible by all CTAHR faculty and staff). Under the Priority Staffing Process, CTAHR administration invites all units in the college to identify staffing needs; staffing priorities identified by the various units are discussed at CTAHR’s Leadership meeting (which includes all Department Chairs, County Administrators, Center Directors, and college administration); and CTAHR administration approves positions to be filled. Though the Priority Staffing process has been put on-hold for the near term, the college presently has a fairly lengthy list of staffing priorities and the college will resume the Priority Staffing process as funds become available. In parallel with the Priority Staffing process, as an outgrowth of the college’s strategic plan, CTAHR identified key areas that the college should pursue aggressively (bioenergy and sustainable agriculture have been supported previously); these also play a role in CTAHR’s hiring practices.

2. Provide opportunities to help faculty develop and implement a program of assessment and appropriate learning outcomes across the College using data to make proactive programmatic and curricular improvements addressing impact on planning and budgeting.

In November and December 2008, the college hosted three webinars on program assessment, “Assessing Student Learning: 2008.” All CTAHR faculty members were invited to participate. Around 20 faculty and staff attended one or more of the webinars. A survey of those in attendance showed positive impacts from the webinars.

In 2009, one or more assessment coordinators from each CTAHR department were asked to evaluate the assessment programs (hereafter simply referred to as “assessments”) for CTAHR’s nine undergraduate academic programs. The purpose of this exercise was to gain an in-house evaluation of the assessments and trends in the assessments, and to encourage assessment coordinators to review assessment tools and practices being used in other academic programs so that they can learn from others and, in turn, strengthen their own assessments. Using three ratings (does not meet expectations, meets expectation, and exceeds expectations) and four criteria, the faculty evaluated the assessments of each academic program for the years 2007, 2008, and 2009. The overall trend of assessments within the college was viewed to be improving over time (see Figure 1), though even in the most recent year (2009) the quality of assessments were viewed to vary widely across the college, with the strongest assessment for an externally accredited academic program having an overall rating of 2.8 (on a scale from 1, does not meet expectations, to 3, exceeds expectations), which strongly exceeds expectations, and the weakest assessment in another academic program having an average rating of 1.25, which falls far short
of expectations. We are working with those academic programs that have weak assessments to bring their assessments to a more satisfactory level.

![Bar chart showing average ratings of assessment programs for all nine CTAHR undergraduate programs over three years (ratings performed by selected Assessment Coordinators of CTAHR’s academic programs).]

3. **Improve use of technological innovations for a more contemporary web presence for recruitment and community engagement, for instructional programs, and for improvement of extension delivery across the state.**

CTAHR unveiled it’s new website in November 2009 (http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/site/). The last major revision to CTAHR’s website occurred eight years ago. Changes includes major revision of CTAHR’s website for academic programs (http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/site/Academics.aspx), which is still being fine-tuned. Upgrades to the academic website include the addition of revolving photographs and testimonials of CTAHR students, restructuring of the webpages for prospective students, which now includes career videos (three have been produced and a fourth is in the works), that are being condensed for rapid viewing by prospective students.

The websites of individual departments and related academic, research, and outreach programs within the college are also being upgraded. Within the past year, most of CTAHR’s units made significant changes to their websites. Following is a summary of the upgrades reported by the various units.

**Human Nutrition, Food and Animal Sciences (HNFAS; www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/hnfas)** Major revision:
Addition of scrolling photographs depicting research, outreach and academic programs. On the home page, two "widgets" were added: a daily nutrition tip from the "Got Nutrients?" web site, produced by HNFAS faculty member, Dr. Alan Titchenal. On our home page, links to HNFAS’s downloadable brochures were added to the undergraduate and graduate degree programs, including specific information about the pre-Veterinary and Dietetics programs. Links to HNFAS’s two student clubs -- the Pre-Vet Club and the FSHN Council – were added. Scholarship information was also added. HNFAS upgraded its faculty and staff pages, including individual faculty web pages and links to individual faculty members’ research portfolios. On the home page, HNFAS has links to its "HNFAS Awarding Winning Faculty and Staff” and links to HNFAS Impact stories -- individual stories that feature the research or outreach activities of its faculty. On the research page is a link to the entire HNFAS Research Portfolio, and articles featuring its faculty in CTAHR Research News. There are also links to individual research faculty lab pages. For extension, HNFAS has listed each of its major cooperative extension programs, from 4-H to Nutrition Education and Wellness to the Taste of the Hawaiian Range, all of which have HNFAS faculty as active participants. In addition, direct links to individual programs under larger umbrella programs have been added. HNFAS has added a virtual tour of its major facility, the Agricultural Sciences Building. Finally, on each of HNFAS’s pages, contact information and a button linking the Department to the UH Foundation has been added so that alumni and friends can make donations.

**Molecular Biosciences and Bioengineering (MBBE) Significant revision:**
MBBE’s Bioengineering program was renamed Biological Engineering in Fall 2008. Accompanying the name change was a significant updating of the BE Program website (http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/be/welcome.html) which provides better descriptions of the curriculum and students’ projects.

**Natural Resources and Environmental Management (NREM, http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/nrem/) Major revision:**
NREM Department Website (General)
- Revised the navigation bar.
- Front page features information about classes for the semester.
- Google analytics tracking code was added to the academic portion of the NREM department website.

Undergraduate Program
- Undergraduate program webpages are updated every summer, including updating links, making changes or clarifications in degree requirements or program operations, and new advising handouts.
- Links to class syllabi were added to the Course Offerings webpage.
- Webpage on undergraduate admissions was revamped to FAQs for prospective students.
- Jobs webpage was reorganized and reoriented toward career help, with more links to online information including career videos.
- Images were added.

Graduate Program
- Detailed descriptions of the application process were added to assist students in successfully completing their application to NREM program and UH Graduate Division.
• NREM Graduate Student Guide was posted online to guide both current and prospective students.
• Links to Forms I-III for all NREM graduate degrees (M.S. Plan A, M.S. Plan B, M.S. Plan C, and Ph.D.) were added.
• Descriptions of our graduate degree programs were added to align with recent important changes in the departmental graduate program.
• Visuals and format were updated to make the website more attractive and user-friendly.

All of these changes have proved to be extremely useful to both students (current and prospective) and faculty in our department.

Plant and Environmental Protection Sciences (PEPS, http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/peps)
Significant revision:
PEPS continued to update and maintain the department website. In addition, several faculty have created research/extension websites addressing specific department activities, which are modified/updated regularly.

Center on the Family (COF) Major revision:
The COF website includes comprehensive databases on Hawaii’s children, families, aging, and communities, which a range of users utilize to inform and develop policies, programs, budgets, proposals for funding, curricula, reports, and other purposes. In the last two years, eight new publications have been posted on the website. The most recent two—Managing Job Loss and Financial Stress and Raising Resilient Children During Tough Economic Times—address the downturn in the economy and provide helpful resources as well as positive actions that can be taken by those experiencing financial distress. The former is being disseminated throughout the state by the Hawaii Department of Labor to individuals facing unemployment and work furloughs. Through its Kids Count project, COF’s databases have had a more prominent national presence in the last two years. The Hawaii profile on the national Kids Count Data Center is populated by COF. It presently consists of the latest available data on 21 indicators relating to children, including definition, data sources, and notes. For each indicator, data are presented at the state and county levels.

Extension Major revision:
Recently, the CTAHR Extension website was completely revamped to make navigating and locating information more logical and simpler. One of the four counties (Maui) also came on line with its county-specific website. Unfortunately, because of limited resources, the other three counties have made little progress in developing their county websites. Individual faculty in those counties, however, have made significant improvements to their individual websites, including forestry/agroforestry (descriptions of major tree species, field demonstrations, etc.), plant diseases/plant doctor (up-to-date pathogen/host checklist), invasive species (videos of ongoing trials), sustainable/organic farming (training videos, posting of workshop proceedings, etc.). All of these sites have incorporated the use of videos to enhance viewer understanding of the information. Several new features have improved access to information, e.g., a depository for presentations that include PowerPoint slides with audio, and a link to UH ScholarSpace where many CTAHR out-of-print publications have been scanned and posted (this was done in
collaboration with the UH Manoa ‘s Hamilton Library) to make these otherwise unavailable publications available to all.

Research Significant revision:
The CTAHR Research website presently is being upgraded and will be launched soon (http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/AspNet/Projects.aspx). New features include descriptions of CTAHR research projects and individual researcher pages as well as listings of new patents. To highlight research projects and publicize the excellent and high impact research being conducted by our faculty and students, CTAHR has established an on-line newsletter, CTAHR Research News Magazine (http://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/ctahr2001/Research/ResearchNews.html).

4. Take steps to improve student concerns related to frequency of course offerings and better coordination across departments and colleges.

Though from time-to-time a small number (fewer than 1%) of students have complained about not being able to graduate in a timely manner because of the unavailability of required courses within or outside their majors, infrequency of course offerings has not been identified as a general problem by CTAHR students. Because CTAHR has had a policy of mandatory advising for many years, difficulties stemming from the unavailability of courses generally have been averted. Also, recent cross-listing of courses among CTAHR departments and some departments outside the college has prompted better coordination of course offerings.

All undergraduate students are surveyed in the semester in which they plan to graduate. Two of the items in the exit survey are relevant to students’ perception of the availability of courses that they need and want: (1) availability of courses in my major; (2) organization of the curriculum in my major. The cumulative responses over the last four semesters are summarized in Figure 2.
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Figure 2. Summary of exit survey responses by graduating CTAHR seniors (total of 208 responses collected over last four semesters).
The survey suggests that students are generally satisfied with the availability of courses in their major and the organization of the curriculum in their major.

CTAHR chairs were queried on whether the frequency of course offerings was a problem in their academic program(s). The chairs generally responded that prior to this academic year, infrequency of course offerings was not a problem for their academic programs; however, in light of the 50% cut-back in lecturer counts throughout the college in the 2009-2010 academic year, the Family and Consumer Sciences Department expressed concern that offering the necessary courses and sufficient numbers of class sections is becoming a problem for the two academic programs in that department. The college is striving to make sure that our students are not negatively impacted by reductions in lecturer counts by working with the departments to ensure that support for lecturers is available to offer required courses. All of our departments have made special efforts to cull courses that are offered infrequently or have not been offered recently, and all programs continuously revisit their curricula to ensure that students have a clear and timely pathway toward graduation, and to the extent practicable, academic programs have eliminated graduation requirements involving historically under-enrolled courses.

The chairs of smaller academic programs noted that some courses are offered only once every two years, so students need to be mindful in scheduling their courses, but with proper advising, students have been able to enroll in all required courses in the appropriate sequence and for the most part, students have not faced problems graduating in a timely manner because of infrequent offering of required courses. Problems have occurred, however, when students fail required courses. In a few instances, under-enrolled courses have been offered and in rare instances, curriculum committees/advisors have resorted to course substitutions or have offered 499 (directed research) courses in place of required courses so that students could graduate in a timely manner. One chair indicated that owing to the current difficult fiscal situation, staffing likely will suffer and course offerings could become tighter in the near term.

Though perhaps not direct evidence that frequency of course offerings is not a major problem for CTAHR students, data provided by the OVCAA on number of years-to-graduation (Figure 3) suggests that, while far from the four years goal of our college, CTAHR’s students graduate in a relatively timely manner.
5. Address concerns related to implementation and evaluation of mandatory advising and the impact of advising on faculty workload given the heavy instruction, research, and extension requirements of limited faculty resources.

Academic advising imposes a significant tax on faculty resources, particularly in academic programs having large numbers of student majors. The burden will worsen as faculty resources erode over the next few years. CTAHR attempted to include advising responsibilities in the college’s formal workload expectations, but has been unsuccessful in gaining adoption of the proposed formulas as workload factors.

This semester, all CTAHR chairs were queried on whether UHM’s policy of mandatory advising has impacted faculty workload in their departments and the general response to that question was, so far, it has not. That response is not surprising because CTAHR has had a policy of mandatory advising for many years. The College discussed the option of hiring professional advisors (APTs) to support departments, but the departments generally have observed that Star Academic Journey/Planner has reduced (and in the future will further reduce) advisor workload, leaving more time for mentoring and career planning, which can best be carried-out by faculty members, not professional advisors. All departments have the option of requesting professional advisers through the Priority Staffing process, but, so far, all have identified tenure line faculty as priorities over professional advisors. At least one chair expressed concern that the current fiscal
situation will strain faculty resources, thus the quality of advising could be impacted in the near future.
Hatch Fund Allocation Procedure

Report to Faculty Senate, November 18, 2009

CTAHR will receive about $1,413K Hatch allocation in FY2010. The following is a breakdown of budgeted Hatch allocation:

Salary for Faculty and Staff: $500K
Unit upkeep/Multistate travel: $80K
Formula allocation to units: $250K
2009 RFP allocation: $180K
New faculty startup: $200K
Salary for RA's: $326K

A total of $1,536K is committed, which leaves us $123K in deficit. Because of the three-month lag between federal and state budget cycles, plus unspent allocations, we should not have a problem meeting our budget requirements. RAs salaries are an unanticipated expenditure this year, which derailed our RFP process. Since we will continue to support RAs next year, there will be no call for RFP next year.

The procedure for Hatch allocation is fairly straight forward. We will try to use available Hatch funds for faculty and staffs salaries. Unit upkeep and multistate project travel are second in priority. These are mandatory expenditures. Formula-based allocation to units to support existing projects has the highest priority under the discretionary expenditure category. I established this process in 2005 with the support of all unit leaders. $250K is reserved for this distribution based on research FTE accounted for on approved projects within the units. This process replaced the previous RFP process to fund all research projects. Details for this procedure were distributed during last faculty senate meeting. We added the RFP process to fund new projects using review panels to fund new projects at $20K each per year for up to three years last year. We are committed to fund continuing projects for the second year at $180K. Unfortunately, due to mandatory budget reductions, we were forced to discontinue this year's review after we received 17 applications.

In the past we saved $250K each year for reserve. This reserve has been used to fund new initiatives, equipment purchases, and bridging needs. However, because of the loss of special grants in 2007 as well as recent budget reductions, we can no longer afford to keep a reserve. Due to loss of S-funds, we have shifted much of the new faculty startup commitments to Hatch funds. This practice will continue until our budget reduction is restored by the Central Administration. If the budget situation does not improve, we may be forced to divert formula funded allocation funds to support other pressing needs.
eCAFE Survey Results, Analysis, and Recommendations  
CTAHR Faculty Senate Instructional Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Good Tool?</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>College?</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure track</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Change?</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Not use</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Familiarity** = Familiarity with the CAFÉ system  
**Good Tool?** = Is the CAFÉ system a good tool for evaluating courses and instructors?  
**College?** = Is it appropriate for the college to include its own questions  
**Change?** = If the college adds its own questions, will you alter or change your use of eCAFE?

Survey Comments

**Support**

- Standardized questions help with standardizing evaluation of courses and instructors  
- Standardized questions help with cross-program comparisons

**Concerns**

- Classes are very different and not amenable to standard questions  
- Low response rates and self-selection of online survey will bias results  
- Some departments already require standard questions; adding CTAHR questions may be excessive or contradictory/incompatible  
- Some courses are team taught, so it's hard to evaluate each separately  
- Some courses are cross-listed, and students may answer questions differently. Does CTAHR really want to survey non-CTAHR students?  
- Some questions (#5 on suggested list, e.g.) are about student performance, not course or instructor quality; need to modify these  
- eCAFE may not be the best or even an appropriate evaluation tool at the college level  
- Since the recommended set of college questions are standard eCAFE questions intended to evaluate a specific course and instructor, they cannot be uniformly applied to the diverse set of courses offered in the college

**Recommendations**

It may be appropriate for the college to develop and include its own questions, but it is our understanding that all academic policies, including how courses and instructors are evaluated,
should be subject to faculty governance. At the college level, this suggests the CTAHR Faculty Senate should develop this policy in collaboration with the administration. We have specific issues and recommendations, some of which are listed below.

1. There needs to be a written policy on the purpose and use of college-wide questions in eCAFE. This should be shared with all faculty and approved by the CTAHR Faculty Senate.
2. The purpose should not be to evaluate course-specific performance of instructors. The 3 UH-wide questions already included are intended to achieve this purpose.
3. Student learning outcomes at the college level are program-wide, not course-specific. If the purpose is to assess achievement of college-level SLO’s, it will be impossible to accomplish this in a few eCAFE questions.
4. Some departments/programs already have their own questions that are included in eCAFE surveys. Adding college-level questions risks overwhelming students, discouraging completion of the survey, or taxing students’ patience in providing honest and thoughtful responses.
5. We recommend that the administration work with the Senate to develop a policy on improving UHM Form-1 applications so that course proposals and syllabi include program- and/or college-specific student learning outcomes (SLO’s). As a part of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review of instructional performance, faculty will be asked to provide evidence of how well they achieved the SLO’s, including student responses from eCAFE surveys. The Senate and administration can work with department personnel committees (DPC’s) or other faculty committees to develop recommended forms of evidence besides eCAFE questions, based on the type of SLO. This policy could help departments assess their own programs and faculty.