

Minutes

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Faculty Senate

September 26, 2001

Architecture Auditorium

Fifty-four Senators were present: Roger Babcock, Cristina Bacchilega, Elaine Bailey, Rhonda Black, Robert Bley-Vroman, Douglas Bomberger, Barry Brennan, Kent Bridges, Glenn Cannon, Catherine Cavaletto, Paul Chandler, Craig Chaudron, Meda Chesney-Lind, Joanne Cooper, Thomas Craven, Katalin Csiszar, James Dator, Sandy Davis, Eric DeCarlo, H. Gert DeCouet, Ernestine Enomoto, Carl Evensen, David Flynn, Michael Forman, Patricia Fryer, Pamela Fujita-Starck, Donna Fukuda, Michael Garcia, Robert Grace, Tony Guerrero, John Hardman, Emily Hawkins, Amelia Jenkins, Merle Kataoka-Yahiro, Spencer Leineweber, James Marsh, John Melish, Thomas Morelli, Roy Nishimoto, Robert Paull, David Sanders, Jane Schoonmaker, Gwen Sinclair, Brent Sipes, Wayne Smith, Dan Spears, John Stimson, Mary Tiles, Jean Toyama, Frank Walton, Charles Weems, Lynne Wilkens, Kelley Withy, and Sylvia Yuen.

Two Senators were excused: Richard Frankel and Frank Sansone.

[and five Senators who have resigned have yet to be replaced: Charles Boyd, Sherrel Hammar, Karen Jolly, Philip Rehbock, and Gerard Russo]

Twelve Senators were absent: Hazel Beh, G.D. Bryant-Greenwood, Charles Fletcher, Jon Goss, Val Kanuha, Stacey Marlow, Neal Milner, Wendy Pearson, Damon Sakai, Irwin Schatz, Richard Schmidt, and Elizabeth Tam.

Fifteen Administrators were present: Ron Cambra, Dick Dubanoski, Jan Heu, Gay Reed, Barbara Polk, Mona K. O. Chock, Colleen Sathre, Karl Kim, Chuck Hayes, Jim Manke, Joe O'Mealy, Ken Tokuno, Rodney Sakaguchi, Denise Kaxxx and Ed Laws.

Ten others signed in: Tom Brislin, Ralph Moberly, David Ross, Jean Ehrhorn, George Wilkens, Dean Alegado, Chris Measures, Jim Caron, Barry Baker, and Mark Merlin.

Chair Joanne Cooper opened the meeting at 3:03pm.

1. The minutes of May 9, 2001 were approved.

2. Interim Chancellor Deane Neubauer was introduced by Joanne Cooper and he addressed the Senate. Chancellor Neubauer said that he planned to speak for twenty minutes and then to engage in questions and answers for another twenty minutes. He indicated that he was already meeting regularly with the SEC and that he was willing to be available to the Senate and the faculty even more if that should be desired.

The Chancellor talked about how the planning process had of necessity been changed since the events of September 11. He talked about President Dobelle's vision of Mānoa and acknowledged that economic impact of the September 11 attack would likely be severe. A variety of possible economic scenarios were being used for modeling the University's planning. He talked about the Governor's activities and talked about the University's place. Keynesian economics was mentioned (as something people were surprised to find themselves returning to). DN said that at present there was enormous uncertainty. Acknowledging difficulties the deans are having with budget, he said it was understandable that they are frustrated. We are all frustrated, he said. He talked about decisions that would have to be made by mid next week. Responding to various Presidential initiatives was one major theme in the Chancellor's tasks; he mentioned two major public addresses made by President Dobelle, the first being the speech to the Chamber of Commerce, and the second being the speech at the Mayor's Visioning Conference. An honors college, a film school, the "trimester issue" alternately referred to as the matter of academic calendar (DN's preference) were topics mentioned. In addition, DN said, conversations with faculty about "things we think critical" were a priority. Energy utilization must be addressed. Planning for sustainability in the long term, water utilization and so on fit in here. How we look and feel needs to be addressed.

The Chancellor then brought up organizational matters, mentioning a BOR document on transition in the administration. He reported having named Karl Kim, Ed Laws, and Rodney Sakaguchi to support positions. Then he talked about the decision to review the question of the two other positions authorized in the BOR document (Vice President for Student Affairs alongside Vice President for Academic Services). For the moment at least the prudent step seemed to be to wait on this and review the options.

DN mentioned next his task force on the matter of a dean for undergraduate studies, the Buzzeo history and the continuing need for student information services, and wider issues such as “why UHM is not a friendly place” from the student point of view. He mentioned other issues such as the medical school site, the issue of merit pay for faculty, and the WASC visits which had been held off for a year. DN had just returned from a trip to California where he had been involved in negotiating a system level WASC review. He also mentioned letters he had sent out inviting certain faculty members to serve as a part of the NCAA certification process.

DN said that the campus-wide strategy was to have the process broad and inclusive, getting us all involved, in order to insure that all the good ideas got on the table. He urged us all to think about what we want for Mānoa. He reminded to include in such thinking the question of how we fulfill our responsibilities as a state institution.

Then he turned to budgetary matters, about which he said he would be candid and realistic. He acknowledged the presence in the audience of VC Rodney Sakaguchi. He talked about the different streams which fed our financial resources. He acknowledged a \$166 million backlog in repairs and maintenance and said that needed to be addressed. He invited faculty to tell him about needs, saying it was our responsibility to let him be informed. Then he began to discuss what he called “the three intersecting circles”, the academic, the physical, and the spiritual/cultural aspects of planning. That led to more on the time line for this planning. What had been intended (before September 11) to be completed by January was now more reasonably to be completed by the time of the last BOR meeting in Spring 2002.

He mentioned his additional role as interim Vice President for Academic Affairs for the UH system. He mentioned the VP structure: VP who would serve as Chief Academic Officer, VP who would serve as Chief Fiscal Officer, and a third VP “for external affairs” (university relations, government relations).

At this point (3:30) he invited questions and comments. But he turned first to VC Karl Kim and invited him to comment on the document “Communicating Our Vision.”

This document, “Communicating Our Vision: The Mānoa Strategic Planning Process, Fall 2001” had been distributed to Senators as they entered. Chancellor Neubauer invited Vice Chancellor Karl Kim to comment on this and he did so. Focal attention was given to the following stages: The Listening Project (by Oct. 31), the Information Sharing stage (by 15 November), Choices and Alternatives (by 30 November), the Mānoa Strategic Plan Draft (by 14 December), and Campus Review (January 30, 2002).

Major Initiatives had been listed in Chair Cooper’s report; at this point these were linked with contact persons identified for convenience of any faculty member who wished to volunteer service:

initiative	contact
Strategic Planning	Karl Kim and any SEC member
Permanent Chancellor Search	any SEC member
Medical School site	Barry Baker
Naming of Campuses	any SEC member
Naming buildings	Meda Chesney-Lind
Academic Calendar	Sandy Davis
Merit Pay issues	Jim Dator, Meda Chesney-Lind
Budget	Joanne Cooper, Frank Sansone, John Cox

From the floor, the first question asked by a Senator (Michael Garcia) concerned CIP and the matter of sufficiency. Chancellor Neubauer’s reply began with “Yes, and no.” He talked about various strategies for obtaining needed funds. That led to expanded discussion of needs. He mentioned the aging physical plant and described three existing buildings as “money sinks” which ought to be demolished. He mentioned the medical school and the need to refit the biomedical tower once a site for a new medical school was developed. He talked about the possibility that the university would float its own bonds. He talked about needs in the classroom plant, mentioning laboratories that had been useful through 1985, and talked of a need for remodeling at least for 2005-to-2015 use. Tuition revenues would be used for this.

He talked about the rtrf (research training revolving fund) and budget transparency. He mentioned the Mānoa Budget Advisory Group and about funds dedicated to repair and maintenance. He stressed the need to add to the streams which feed our financial resources. The big question is how we put resources together so that it all becomes additive. Consequences of doing so would include increasing attractiveness

for private donors, and he expressed the hope that we would do what we could in this to assist President Dobbelle in being “The Rainmaker”.

He talked about the possibility that the formula for overhead returns on research grants might be renegotiated with the federal government. He acknowledged that this might not appear so desirable from the point of view of a principal investigator, but it needed to be viewed in terms of the overall benefit to the university. Currently 100% comes back to the university and is disbursed 1/3 to the central administration, 1/3 to the deans and directors, and 1/3 to the principal investigator.

A second question from the floor (Chris Measures?) concerned UH West O‘ahu. Neubauer’s response was two-fold. First he presented what he described as “Evan’s position”. He talked about the question of the attractiveness of the site and about discussions with the Campbell Estate. We need to project the future, thinking about what UH will be in 2015. He talked about change in the disciplines, new and different configurations, changing demographics, shift in student ages, shift in student demands toward explicitly job-related competencies, the moving population center, and more. DN noted that President Dobbelle must look at UHM in relation to all these. The goal will be to insure that Mānoa as the one research university in the state is truly free to become a full-fledged R1 university.

When DN shifted to his own take on the question, he focused his attention on political strategy and what he saw as the cost of the UHM faculty appearing/being uncooperative, provoking the enmity of the state legislature. He stated that the present is an opportunity to move on, allowing Mānoa to define itself on our terms. The state needs to see its own need to invest in the university for the future.

Next Senator Weems commented that HPU had been “eating UH’s lunch”, and asked about night school. DN thanked CW for the question. His reply included presentation of a distinction between elite schools, mass schools, and convenience schools. The University of Phoenix is the primary exemplar of a convenience school. In thinking about what HPU is, DN talked about its success resulting from cultural sensitivity and market sensitivity. We need to reflect on structural change in society. We need to think about who we want to be, and about what our “demand pull” is. HPU is seen as very student friendly. Exiting students at UHM describe us as the opposite. Neubauer offered a comparison between us and UC-Irvine, both with

about 17,500 students. We have considerably more research and training money. Research across the curriculum, important there, ought to be important here too, in Neubauer's vision. TOEFL scores might be an aspect of examination of our future as well, he concluded.

At 4:05 Chancellor Neubauer reiterated his willingness to be available to meet with the Senate.

Chair Cooper thanked DN and KK, and turned then to her own report.

3. Chair's report. Assisted by Senator Brian Sipes with her powerpoint® presentation, Joanne Cooper presented a report on the work of the SEC over the summer. She thanked the SEC from last year who worked long and hard through the summer, and she introduced the new SEC members. She listed as goals: (1) working with the new administration to establish a new culture on campus; establishing regular and smooth communication with the new administration. She reported her own regular participation in meetings with the Deans and Directors, with the University/Community Partnership, with the All-Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs, and with the Mānoa budget Advisory Group. She expressed the hope that these changes toward greater openness meant that there would be more faculty involvement. A second goal (2) is to insure the success of the new GEC (Chair and Senator Brian Sipes was introduced and it was noted that he would speak later in the meeting). It was reported that all focus boards were staffed and working.

At 4:15, Senator Craig Chaudron was asked to report briefly on Committee on Academic Planning and Policy (CAPP) activities. CAPP has held three meetings since August and a number of projects have been started: reviewing three proposals from the College of Education; review of the proposal to merge Lyon Arboretum into the College of Natural Science; move of Marine Option Program into the College of Natural Science; and a resolution on Grade Transfers.

4. Sen. Roger Babcock was called up to present this resolution, Relating to the Suspension of Differential Grade

After a moment of new-officer confusion, it was established that a resolution from a standing committee requires no motion of introduction, and the Senate moved directly to discussion of the resolution.

Senator Garcia questioned the wording “outside the University system” as redundant; this was accepted as a friendly amendment and Senator Chaudron took pen to overhead to strike the offending verbiage.

Senator Jenkins queried the CAPP members as to scope of application. It was agreed that the resolution applied to graduate as well as undergraduate transfer situations. Senator Chaudron commented that any program was still free to set its own higher standards, beyond any standards set by the University for admission or transfer.

Another Senator questioned the information provided about other universities’ practices.

Yet another Senator pointed out that criteria should read criterion, the singular being intended.

A brief discussion over the form and meaning of the phrase “accept for transfer” followed; the outcome was that the text as presented was left standing.

Finally Senator Dator called the question.

The resolution passed, with 39 aye votes, 3 nay votes, and one abstention.

[43 votes total]

5. At 4:30 Chair Cooper called on Senator Sipes to present the GEC report. That report was also made with powerpoint®. Discussion focused on the “hallmarks” and criteria. Senator Sipes explained Foundations, Hawaiian and Second Language, Focus, Diversification, and the Wild Card.

The boards have been working since last spring. Working drafts will be made public with a target date of 28 September. The intention is to have a period for comment extending from mid-Fall semester to the end of the semester. Then the boards will revise the drafts. In response to a question from Senator Forman, Sipes explained

that the hallmark work will be disseminated in a variety of ways including email and hard copies to department chairs.

Contact information was provided:

gened@hawaii.edu

<http://www.hawaii.edu/gened>

telephone: 956-6660

Bilger 104

6. Senator Garcia presented a RESOLUTION (on HECO) and discussion ensued. This resolution was not submitted through a standing committee. It received the necessary motion and second, supporting the discussion.

Senator Grace asked two questions: (1) Should the Senate get involved in this matter?

and (2) Have some of the whereas-es presented over-simplistic argument?

Senator Garcia answered that the matter affected the campus, with some plans having powerlines run through the campus so, he argued, the Senate should take this up. Grace and Garcia were left to disagree over details of fact in the whereas-es.

Senator Chesney-Lind called the question. The resolution passed: 31 aye votes / 1 nay vote / 3 abstentions. [35 votes total]

7. The Senate meeting was adjourned at 4:46pm.

The Secretary apologizes for not knowing all the Senators' names and not recognizing in the record all of those who made comments or asked questions. It will be a help if Senators will resume the practice of identifying themselves when speaking for the record -- at least for a while.