

Minutes

University of Hawaii at Manoa Faculty Senate

December 8th, 1999

Law School Classroom 2

64 Senators were present: Iqbal Ahmed, Belinda Aquino, Barry Baker, Horst Brandes, William Burgwinkle, Robert Cooney, John Cox, Thomas Craven, James Dator, Marilyn Dunlap, Ernestine Enomoto, Andrea Feeser, Betsy Fisher, David Flynn, Agnes Fok, Patricia Fryer, Donna Fukuda, Carolyn Gotay, William Haning, Emily Hawkins, Manfred Henningsen, Casey Jarman, Robert Joseph, Nanette Judd, Karl Kim, Peter Kim, Irvin King, Laurence Kolonel, William Lampe, Bruce Liebert, Glenn Man, Joy Marsella, David McClain, Matthew McGranaghan, Chris Measures, Susan Miyasaka, Ralph Moberly, Jane Moulin, John Mount, Charles Mueller, Joseph O'Mealy, Mary Pateman, Robert Paull, Teresita Ramos, John Rieder, Stanley Saiki, Thomas Schroeder, Brent Sipes, Ann Sloat, Thomas Speitel, Martha Staff, Virginia Tanji, Mary Tiles, Jane Tribble, Janice Uchida, Robert Valliant, Richard Varley, Frank Walton, Charles Weems, Joel Weiner, John Wendell, David Yount, Ming-Bao Yue, Sylvia Yuen

1 Senator was excused: Randall Hensley,

4 Senators were absent : Robert Bart, Joel Hanna, Edward Laws, John Melish,

6 administrators were present: Dean Smith, Thomas Bopp, Judith Inazu, Jim Manke, Ken Tokuno, Chuck Hayes

38 others signed in: Jerry Bentley, John Pincince, Jim Tiles, Lance Collins, Pi'ilani Smith, Mamo Kim, Rahul Chattergy, La Rene Despain, Doris Ladd, Bob McGlone, Barbara Pfuff, C Papacostas, Philip Rehbock, Kathryn Hoffman, Ed Porter, Karen Jolly, Roderick Jacobs, Suzie Jacobs, David Hipple, John Pincince, Ken Kipnis, Judy Kappenberg, Linda Johnsrud, Paul Rausch, James Kraft, Sandy Davis, Francoise Arie, Marcus Daniel, Mike Mano, Cynthia Franklin, plus 8 indecipherable names.

Chair Mary Tiles opened the meeting at 3:05

1. The minutes of the Faculty Senate's November 17th, 1999 meeting were approved unanimously by voice vote without amendments.
2. Chair Tiles welcomed visitors to the Faculty Senate (FS) meeting and reviewed the procedures by which the meeting would be conducted, Robert's rules of order and the FS by-laws. Casey Jarman was introduced as parliamentarian who would rule on points of order. Chair Tiles explained that as there were lot of resolutions to be considered only senators and ex officio members of the senate would be allowed to speak. There had been lots of debate already. Senators would be asked to vote by holding up blue cards which they had been issued with.

Lance Collins, vice-chair of the Student Caucus, distributed a resolution from the Student Caucus, which was read out to the Senate by Chair Tiles. In response to requests made in the resolution Chair Tiles pointed out that the task force on the reform of the core no longer existed.

John Wendell moved a motion to defer debate on all the resolutions before the FS. The motion was seconded and then ruled out of order, it being explained that a separate motion to defer would have to be introduced before each agenda resolution was discussed.

Chair Tiles explained to Senators that under the by-laws of the Senate a 2/3 majority of senators present could refer any resolution voted on by the Senate to the Faculty Congress. It was further pointed out that a petition of 100 Faculty members could also convene a Congress meeting and enable a postal ballot of all Faculty on any resolution voted on by the Senate.

It was explained that despite requests to change the order in which resolutions 3A and 3B and 4 were debated the it had been decided that the current order was necessary. Senators were reminded that the Board of Regents could veto any proposal made by the Senate.

3. Chair Tiles then moved to the first resolution on the Hawaiian/foreign language requirement. John Wendell moved to defer the resolution to the January meeting of the Faculty Senate and the motion was seconded by A. Feeser. A short discussion ensued on the reasons to defer discussion and a vote was taken. The motion failed with 14 votes in favour, 45 votes against, no abstentions.

A senator suggested that a compromise resolution requiring one year of language be presented in place of the existing resolution. A motion was made to suspend the rules to enable this to occur but no second was found for the motion.

John Wendell asked whether Hawaiian Creole English would be counted as a second language, he also asked if the current resolution before the Senate would change the Executive Vice-Chancellor's ability to grant waivers of the need to complete a second language. It was stated that the current resolution would have no effect on this.

Bill Burgwinkle, a member of the Task Force then spoke to the resolution and urged its passing. He explained that many of the ideas suggested had been considered by the task force but rejected for a variety of reasons. One year was not considered long enough unless there was ability to study language in high school, which was not possible for most heritage languages.

Chris Measures urged senators to vote against the resolution so that his "pro-choice " resolution could be debated. He said that the debate over the second language was rancorous and was splitting the faculty at a time when it needed to be united to show leadership. He said that the 16 credit load was a disincentive to student enrolment, and that the introduction of a tuition return formula which valued each SSH at \$57.89 had brought monetary considerations into the issue of student requirements. It was estimated that the tuition revenue from a 16 credit

language requirement was worth up to \$1.5 million dollars to the College of Language Linguistics and Literature from each annual intake of students.

A senator spoke urging that the resolution be adopted since failure to pass it would serve to Balkanise Manoa. It was further stated that by allowing students to test out it would encourage HS to provide more opportunities for language classes

Mamo Kim said that if colleges could set their own policy on a second language requirement undeclared students would not know what courses they should take.

Tom Schroeder pointed out that the second language requirement was introduced at the same time as the Manoa Writing Requirement and at that time was meant to put the HS on notice to provide these opportunities. He stated that this attempt at social engineering had clearly failed.

John Wendell said that since EVC Smith can waive the requirement for a Professional School to require a second language, the resolution needed to be amended to prevent this from happening.

A speaker from the College of Engineering explained that the waiver was granted under a special clause.

A motion to call the question was seconded and passed by a vote of 59 in favour, 1 against, and 1 abstention.

The resolution was voted on and receiving 36 votes in favour, 28 against and 0 abstentions was deemed carried. The secretary noted that this tally was one more than the number of senators who had signed in.

John Wendell moved that the resolution be sent to the Faculty Congress, the motion was seconded. It was pointed out that 2/3 of those present would need to approve this and a count of Senators present yielded 64, one of whom had not signed in and did not have a blue voting card. This senator then signed in and was given a voting card. 28 votes were cast in favour of sending the resolution to Congress, this being less than the required 43 the motion failed.

4. Resolution 3A was introduced by Chair Tiles. Bill Burgwinkle, a member of the task force, explained that the proposed core reflected a reduction in the number of credits claiming that it was possible with double counting, for students to fulfil their general education requirements (not counting language) with 31 credits. In response to a question that raised concern about the reduction in the number of science credits in the core from 10 to 7 and whether this lower number would meet WASC accreditation standards, it was stated that the equal split of general education classes between Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences, called for in the WASC standard 4B3 could be interpreted in several ways depending on how the basic skills section was counted. A discussion then ensued about the

relative merits of resolution 3A which requires 2 global civilisation courses that are both global and comparative and resolution 3B that requires one of the courses to be focused on a Hawaiian/Asian perspective. It was stated that the History Department and most of the task force favoured 3A, and that 3B had only been added in the last few weeks of the Task Force's work.

Pi'ilani Smith, President of the ASUH then said that a vote for resolution 3A was a continuation of the Euro-American perspective, she stated that the current course on Global Civilisation failed to give students the truth about indigenous peoples. She stated that the UH Strategic plan called for indigenous culture and that in her view Resolution 3A did not, while resolution 3B did.

Mamo Kim, president of the GSO, also recommended rejection of 3A since she said that the mission statement touts UH as an international culture but that the current courses, History 151 and 152 are Euro-American in their perspectives and the TAs are teaching fallacies to their classes because they use missionary papers. She said that many colleges that did not even tout themselves as diverse required diversity courses.

John Wendell said that since both student presidents were in favour of resolution B it was unlikely that A would be approved by the BOR if students were not behind it.

Another speaker said that an informal poll of his students showed 9:1 in favour of alternative A, and that people did not understand what alternative B meant; he speculated that it could be satisfied by a course on indigenous culture in Japan.

Andrea Feeser said that she thought that the indigenous cultural perspective was very important; she said that as a teacher of Art History she was "out of her depth" in presenting Hawaiian Art, and had benefited from her colleagues who had a cultural perspective.

Another speaker said that Asian perspectives already existed in 3A. Mamo Kim responded that if 3A passed it would be the same as now, nothing would change.

Tom Craven wondered whether the courses under 3B would transfer to mainland universities.

Manfred Henningsen asked if there was a Senator from the History Department who could speak to this issue (there was none).

Senator Feeser then moved a motion to overrule the Chair's ruling that only Senators could speak. A count of Senators present indicated that this motion would require 35 votes. As only 17 voted in favour of overruling the Chair, the motion failed.

The question was then called and 34 voted in favour, 23 against and 4 abstentions, the resolution was passed. Since resolution 3A passed, resolution 3B was not considered.

John Wendell then moved to defer debate on resolution 4 he accepted a friendly amendment from John Cox to defer indefinitely. John Wendell then read a letter from Lance Collins that claimed amongst other things that the impact of resolution 4 was to completely dismantle the current system of governance, and that its appearance on the agenda was indicative of "back-room deals".

Bill Lampe responded that the appearance of the resolution on the agenda was a result of a request to the sponsor not to submit the resolution during the new business section of the last Faculty Senate meeting but instead to submit it to the SEC for inclusion on this month's agenda. Thus there was no back-room dealing as the by-laws were followed in the submission of this resolution.

Several Senators then offered alternatives to an indefinite delay in voting on the resolution. Several Senators said that the resolution would absolve the Senate from academic responsibility and wanted to vote the resolution down now. The motion to defer discussion of the resolution was voted on and with 10 in favour, 48 against and one abstention it failed.

Chris Measures spoke in favour of the resolution and explained that contrary to popular belief the resolution did not change the governance structure of the University. He pointed out that careful reading of the resolution showed that any general education core designed by the Schools and Colleges would have to be approved by a campus-wide body of Faculty set up by the Faculty Senate. He further pointed out that the intention of the resolution was to allow some choice in the setting of the core and that the resolution specifically stated that units would be expected to adhere closely to a common core to facilitate transfer of students between majors.

Bill Burgwinkle said that the task force had considered such an option but rejected it. A speaker pointed out that Ka Leo was opposed to the resolution. Bill Lampe pointed out that so was Ron Cambra, Dean of Students in Arts and Sciences. Chris Measures pointed out that Ka Leo had not even published the text of the resolution and that in a subsequent phone call to Ron Cambra it turned out that his opposition had been based on the incomplete Ka Leo report.

Another speaker expressed concern that since 80% of incoming students initially registered as Arts and Sciences, varied cores would make transfers too hard.

Bob Paull said that many colleges across the US did not have a common core and that the Faculty Senates of the Schools and Colleges needed to have a say in the process. He pointed out that the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate voted down Manoa Faculty Senate resolutions, there was a need for some say in governance outside of the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate.

Another speaker said that this would be a vote against a general education core.

Tom Craven asked why the College of Language Linguistics and Literature (LLL) were left out of the fields designated in the campus-wide approval body. Chris Measures replied that the areas suggested (Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences) were the

areas that WASC recognised for general education, and that Professional Schools were included to give them representation in the process. Thus LLL would be included as part of Arts and Humanities.

Tom Schroeder pointed out that at the University of Michigan language was defined as part of the Arts and Humanities.

Another speaker pointed out that over 50% of the faculty at Manoa were in Arts and Sciences but that they had only 1/3 of the seats on the Faculty Senate, thus resolutions passed at the Faculty Senate could be overturned by a vote of the Faculty Congress.

A motion to call the question passed by voice vote. Voting for the resolution was 6 in favour, 51 against and 1 abstention; the resolution failed.

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote at 4:59.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Measures
Secretary