Minutes

UHM Faculty Senate
Meeting of December 11, 2002
School of Architecture Auditorium

Present:
Harriet Abe, Paul Adams, Denise Antolini, Roger Babcock, Andrea Bartlett, Rhonda Black, Robert Bley-Vroman, Douglas Bomberger, Ronald Bontekoe, Rebecca Cann, Glenn Cannon, Catherine Cavaletto, Paul Chandler, Rosita Chang, Meda Chesney-Lind, Joel Cohn, Martha Crosby, Katalin Csizsar, Eric DeCarlo, Linda Duckworth, John Engel, David Flynn, Patsy Fujimoto, Tony Guerrero, Amelia Jenkins, Susan Johnson, Christine Kirk-Kuwaye, Karen Lee, Spencer Leinweber, Matt McGranaghan, Luciano Minerbi, Robert Paull, Joan Peters, Michael Salzman, David Sanders, Frank Sansone, Jane Schoonmaker, J, Brent Sipes, Wayne Smith, David Stegenga, Mary Tiles, Dan Spears, Charles Weems, Lynne Wilkens, Kelly Withy, Lesley Wright, Christine Yano,

Excused
Cristina Bacchilega, G.D. Bryant-Greenwood, Michael Forman, Robert Grace, Merle Kataoka-Yahiro, Roberta Lamb, Damon Sakai,

Absent:
James Cowen, H. Gert DeCouet, Patricia Fryer, Stacey Marlow, Marian Melish, John Melish, Neal Milner, Jeanne Oka, Marvin Ortel, Jeffrey Okamoto, Brian Popp, Irwin Schatz, Richard Schmidt, Dan Spears, Elizabeth Tam, Dan Spears, Halina Zaleski

Others in Attendance:
Sandy Davis, Denise Konan, Jill Nunokawa, Amartit Singh, Tom Bopp, Michael Salzman,

Vice-Chair Mary Tiles called the meeting to order at approximately 3:10

AGENDA

1. Minutes:

The minutes of November 20, 2002, as corrected, were approved by voice vote.
2. Committees

CAB Resolutions

1. Classified, proprietary, and other publication-restricted research

Robert Bley-Vroman presented the resolution that had been postponed from the last meeting. He noted that the Senators had received both the existing and proposed policy. He noted that policy prohibits propriety research, but practice permits it. The problem is that many kinds of contracts have some form of publication restrictions. Currently, research administrators have allowed faculty to personally sign off on restrictions. Result was that the policy was “no policy.” The proposed new policy recognizes the current practice, with one caveat. CAB distinguishes classified research from other restricted research. CAB recommends accepting some of the administration suggestions. The restriction is that classified research not being conducted on campus. CAB will appoint a sub-committee to work further on the policy to further implement the prohibition on campus. According to Marvin Enokawa “this will get rid of the check box.”

Joel Cohn questioned the notion that classified research is “good” if done off campus, but probably not ok if done on campus.

Robert Bley-Vroman responded that this is a complex set of issues. The idea is that secret research on campus compromises intellectual freedom on campus. The impact on students is critical here, as is the campus atmosphere. There are some universities that are overly dependent on military funds.

Dave Sanders, head of CAB subcommittee on classified research, noted that being off campus also suggests that it is “on your own time.”

Doug Bomberger asked how much research would be affected by this.

David Lassner responded that there are 10-15 contracts.

Paul Adams asked if these are contracts with individuals or with the University.

Bley-Vroman noted that they are with the University, or the University is involved in the contracts.

Mike Saltzman said that classified research is problematic in this troubled time and is something that we should not be involved with in any form. He noted that classified research likely produced chemical and biological warfare products.

Luciano Minerbi distinguished between classified research and other forms of restricted research. Included in that might be data that IRB’s require security (like confidential research). He also asked about some research that is both commercial and military.
Bley-Vroman notes that there may be a problem with the first paragraph may not completely encompass all those subtle distinctions.

F: 29
O: 5
A: 4

2. Consultation during UH system reorganization process

Vice-Chair Mary Tiles gave some background to the resolution. She noted that CAB had successfully gotten language inserted in President Dobelle’s reorganization document that required consultation regarding implementation. She noted that since the last senate meeting, the BOR had a meeting where the reorganization was discussed, and that currently the matter is still being discussed.

Bley-Vroman presented the resolution on consultation in the areas of new positions (and the hiring process), the review of budget implications, and their impact on academic programs.

Frank Sansone suggested that representative be inserted between small and system-wide in the resolution.
MCL noted that often the “fair” committee is seen as one from each campus.

Tom Bopp noted that this constellation is representative.

Frank Sansone noted that President Dobelle objects to one person, one vote.

Joel Cohn noted that small could be problematic

Mary Tiles said that there is a need to keep the committee manageable. There is also the problem that at the system-wide council, not all the UHM faculty attend regularly.

Bley-Vroman suggested there is virtue in discussing this with other campuses.

Frank Sansone notes that there’s a virtue in further specifying “representative.” If we are 60% of the faculty, there needs to be clarification.

Bley-Vroman said that the committee was thinking of a committee of about 8 people

Robert Paull suggested that the language be changed to delete “representative” and that be replaced with the following language: “Therefore be it resolved that a small system-wide faculty committee be constituted in consultation with faculty senates of all UH Campuses.”

Frank Sansone objected this language as too vague.
Amelia Jenkins asked if would be ok to want a certain percentage from UHM.

Mary Tiles thought that problems exist if we use language that is too specific.

Robert Paull notes that in the past chairs did not attend the All Campus Faculty Senate Chairs because it had no power.

Tiles did agree that this might be the case, but some colleges have senates and others don’t.

Jane Schoonmaker. Suggested “reasonably” representative.

Luciano Minerbi suggested “a proportional representation is recommended.”

Robert Paull said that the problem is that other campuses might react negatively to this proposal.

Bley-Vroman asked whether the CAB members can live with the proposal that was suggested by Robert Paull.

Ron Bontekoe wanted only one voice from UHM.

Bley-Vroman introduced language that includes “consultation with all UH faculty senates.”

Ron Bontekoe suggests that UHM SEC should speak for UHM; otherwise there are some very small senates that are included. He’d be inclined to change the wording to clarify this.

Mary Tiles said that the one vehicle for discussing this is the All Campus Council of Chairs setting.

Frank Sansone moved to call the question.

Question:
For: 43
Against: 0
Abstain: 1

Vote for the Original Resolution (without any wording changes)
For: 37
Against: 0
Abstain: 4
3. Chair's report

Vice-Chair Mary Tiles reported on the BOR meeting. She noted that the organization of the Office of the President was not approved at that meeting. Objections were made by HGEA (particularly with reference to RCUH). Mary Tiles also said that the proposal for VP for Research will no longer include responsibility for RCUH; it will be a wholly UH position. Other objections were registered at the BOR meeting by the Student Caucus and Senate of UHM Student Affairs; here the outcome appears to be more positive. We have not seen the new reorganization proposal. There is an all campus council of senate chairs meeting before the BOR meeting tomorrow.

Mike Forman and Mary Tiles also met with Chancellor Englert to get the revolving funds released. This has happened, and these revised reallocations will be transmitted shortly. VC Sakaguchi has fallen ill, so things are a bit confused at the moment.

Robert Paull asked for clarification on the RTF in the context of “revised.”

Mary Tiles clarified by reading from that the follow-up letter reading directly from the letter from Chancellor Englert which gave the distribution basis.

Frank Sansone explained that this is the same scheme that was used last year; so those funds should be available to the fiscal officers of various units.

Mary Tiles clarified that this withdraws earlier proposals that had been made. There will be some “winners” and some “losers” in this scheme.

Frank Sansone noted that these are very small loses.

Kelly Withy asked who made the commitment.

Tiles said that the Chancellor made the commitment.

Withy asked which proportion would go to the units and this was clarified.

Jill Nunokawa, Chair of the UHM Student Services Faculty Senate and Civil Rights counselor, spoke about the position of the Student Affairs Senate on the proposed re-organization of the President’s Office. She had the latest draft of the re-organization. She focused specifically on page 5; the chart links the VP on student affairs to the VP for academic affairs. There are other questions as well, she contends, and she said that both her Senate and some students remain opposed to the proposal.

Mary Tiles noted that we still have not seen a copy.

Jill Nunokawa said that the students are not in support of the new revision.
Matt McGranaghan asked if it is posted on the web.

Mary Tiles said she can’t find it.

Dave Saunders said that as of 2:30, it was on the web.

Mary Tiles urged folks to volunteer for the various VC search committees, asking senators to let David Flynn or Rhonda Black know if they are interested. She also mentioned that there is a recently completed survey on quality of faculty work life, commissioned by ACCFSC. Tiles also found the system report, which was done for WASC to be quite worth reading with interesting data giving a picture of the system over a ten-year period. In many respects, we are almost where we were a decade ago. There has been less change than one might think.

The Faculty Ambassador’s program has funding. Anyone interested, should contact Kathy Ferguson. Also, the proposed increase in rent for faculty housing has been rescinded.

Ron Bontekoe noted that the tenants of faculty housing are being “turfed out” after a couple of years; meanwhile, graduate students and staff have been moving in. Faculty are feeling powerless to advocate for themselves, but there is a clear need for some body to advocate that faculty be allowed to continue staying there.

Mary Tiles said that both SEC and UHPA could take this under consideration.

4. UHPA report on negotiations

Mary Tiles, as UHPA President, noted that there have been meetings, some of which are very constructive. We have five members on the negotiating team with Mary Tiles as ex-officio. The “not so good news” is that it is not clear that there will be a contract in time for the end of the legislative session. There are no concrete proposals, as yet, on salary. She then reviewed the UHM biennium budget request. There is a line item for increased salaries. This is not a negotiated amount. UHPA does not feel that the sum mentioned is sufficient. UHM salaries were then compared to different peer groups. The differentials in average salary differ by rank. Other issues were reviewed, including multi-year contracts for non-tenure track faculty, performance judges, the problem of temporary positions and variable time positions. Community College workload is a sticking point. We are shifting travel to federal rates. Health fund contributions are also problematic, but unfortunately much of this is non-negotiable.

Paul Chandler asked about parking.

Mary Tiles noted that this has not been high on our radar screen.

Luciano Minerbi asked about the goals in the UHM budget request.
Tiles noted that these are tied to the Strategic Plan.

She is concerned that there is not a clear path to a contract.

5. Other Business

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Vice-Chair Tiles at 4:50pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Meda Chesney-Lind, Secretary