

Minutes

Mānoa Faculty Senate
Meeting of January 23, 2002
Law Classroom 2

There were forty-five Senators who signed in: Denise Antolini, Roger Babcock, Cristina Bacchilega, Elaine Bailey, Douglas Bomberger, Glenn Cannon, Catherine Cavaletto, Paul Chandler, Craig Chaudron, Hong-Mei Chen, Meda Chesney-Lind, Joanne Cooper, Thomas Craven, James Dator, Sandy Davis, H Gert DeCouet, Nancy Dowling, Ernestine Enomoto, Carl Evensen, David Flynn, Michael Forman, Richard Frankel, Pamela Fujita-Starck, Donna Fukuda, Michael Garcia, Jon Goss, Robert Grace, Merle Kataoka-Yahiro, Peter Manicas, Stacey Marlow, Thomas Morelli, Jeanne Oka, David Sanders, Frank Sansone, Richard Schmidt, Jane Schoonmaker, Gwen Sinclair, Brent Sipes, Wayne Smith, Mary Tiles, Jean Toyama, Frank Walton, Charles Weems, Lynne Wilkens, and Kelley Withy;

Two Senators who were excused: Eric DeCarlo, Roy Nishimoto

and twenty-four Senators who did not sign in: Rhonda Black, Robert Bley-Vroman, Charles Boyd, Kent Bridges, G D Bryant-Greenwood, Katalin Csiszar, Charles Fletcher, Patricia Fryer, Tony Guerrero, John Hardman, Emily Hawkins, Amelia Jenkins, Val Kanuha, Spencer Leineweber, John Melish, Neal Milner, Robert Paull, Damon Sakai, Irwin Schatz, Dan Spears, John Stimson, Elizabeth Tam, and Sylvia Yuen.

In addition, the following others signed in: Lance Collins, Emanuel Drechsel, Denise Konan, Carolyn Brooks-Harris, Ken Tokuno, Kawika Baker, and Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa.

Others present who did not sign in: Ruth Hsu; and Karl Kim and Dean Neubauer who were present for the last part of the meeting.

Chairma'm Joanne Cooper opened the meeting at 3:08.

1. The minutes of December 12, 2001 were adopted with one amendment (At point 2.2.4. on page two, the phrase graduate rates was changed to graduation rates), and with one Senator voting to abstain.

2. Chair Cooper announced that new VP for External Affairs & University Relations Paul Costello would not be able to appear as announced, that he was at a legislative hearing, and that he would be rescheduled to appear at a later meeting.

3. The Chair's Report followed:

3.1. Chancellor's search. A search firm is being hired to assist the faculty in the search. There will be a local press release within the week and the advertisements for the position have already appeared. The closing date is 1 March. A committee to select the short list of finalists for President Dobelle to select among is being organized. It will have fifteen members and will be chaired by Chair of the Faculty Senate Joanne Cooper. In addition to Prof. Cooper, there will be six other faculty members, two deans and/or directors, two representatives drawn from the two union groups representing staff and APTs, a student representing ASUH and a student representing GSO, one person representing the alumni, and one person representing the community.

3.2. Progress is being made toward putting the new General Education Core into effect. This topic will receive more coverage later in the meeting.

3.3. At the Deans' & Directors' meeting, student grievance procedures are under discussion. The old procedures were set up for a system without a chancellor. Now that we have a chancellor, it is felt that changes in procedures, particularly changes involving deans in the stream of procedures, may need to be put into effect.

3.4. Senators were reminded of the 1 February event, "Defining Our Destiny", to begin at 9am. Senators were urged to participate and to encourage others to do so as well. Denise Kanon reminded Chair Cooper that there will be validated parking for participants.

3.5. Strategic Planning for the System continues as well. Consultant Linda Campanella is back in town, at work on this.

3.6. President Dobelle scheduled to appear on KHET's Island Insights program that same evening. Joanne would be posing one question for President Dobelle to answer. She will be giving him a sentence-completion task.

4. CAPP Resolution -- Relating to Approval of a Masters of Education in Early Childhood Education (M.Ed. in ECE). Senator Chaudron presented the resolution and its background for CAPP. Senator Chaudron read the resolution and then invited Professor Stephanie Feeney to assist in discussion.

A first senatorial query concerned the sense of “interprofessional training.” Professor Feeney began her reply by noting that this work in early childhood education was “always in the context of families.” She explained that a group had been meeting at UH for years, looking for grants, and generally discussing the organization of a program in early childhood education. Pediatrics, social work, nursing, together with preschool teachers, and so on were groups she mentioned. Various fields working together was what is meant by “interprofessional” collaboration.

Senator Forman asked Professor Feeney to clarify the role of families -- what specifically was the involvement of families that she alluded to in speaking of the work being “always in the context of families.” More particularly, he requested information on how the program would address ethnic differences in approaches to child rearing. Professor Feeney answered that Dana Davidson (Professor, Family Resources, Family and Consumer Science) and Mary Martini (Assoc. Professor, Family and Consumer Science)

were involved. Both of them focus on matters of children and family across cultures. Recognize, Respect, and Build On is an important theme. She mentioned the Hawaiian immersion program as one seeking the sort of support this new program could offer, and she noted that at present no appropriate MA was offered. This program utilizes diverse training paths. She noted the possibility now of four-year degree programs in the community colleges, and she said that this program would serve and develop a group of leaders with a broader range than had been possible in the past.

Senator Garcia then commented on a concern within CAPP that it was difficult to consider and discuss such a program in the absence of outside expertise and advice. He said he thought it was difficult under the circumstances to arrive at a reasoned judgment. Such outside consultation had been requested, but the administration said No to this request, referring the matter to the Senate. Senator Garcia expressed the opinion that this should be an issue for future discussion. He would advise that new programs should be subject to external review.

Professor Feeney praised the CAPP committee for having done “a great job of going into the community.” This program, she said, is breaking new ground; there has been nothing like this in the past.

Senator Chaudron said that CAPP does intend to bring before the Senate the matter raised by Senator Garcia. Chaudron said that the absence of outside review and assistance in such deliberation was “a serious defect.” He acknowledged that external reviews involved cost, but he argued that the University could enhance recognition

from other programs of the excellent programs here, were we to adopt this practice. With respect to the proposed program, Chaudron mentioned benchmarks comparisons, saying it was evident that there is a standard practice in this area.

Visitor Lance Collins noted that there had been a Graduate Council review of this proposed program last year, that need had been demonstrated to that group's satisfaction, and that approval at that level had been passed unanimously.

Professor Feeney commented that the process of seeking approval had been very long. She suggested that Senators read the entire proposal. She said that early childhood is an emerging field. There are few doctoral studies as yet, but various agencies look to higher education for support here. She mentioned the "very great expansion of their pre-schools" by the Kamehameha Schools.

Joanne Cooper asked for a vote on the resolution. It was passed, with 38 in favor, none opposed, one abstaining. The time was 3:29.

Senator Chaudron asked for a few more minutes to report on the status of the move to change the grading practices. CAPP, he reported, was still in the process of gathering information. He alerted Senators to a forthcoming Ka Leo publication (See Vol. XCVI, Issue No. 84, Friday, January 25, 2002; see also the following Monday, at bottom of page 4 for a correction of "a designer's error", printing material which had been omitted in the Friday paper). Comments are welcomed.

Senator Chaudron also mentioned the proposals for a BA in Philippine Languages and Literature, and the certificate in Conflict Resolution, as other matters CAPP is currently working on. Again, he stated that the committee will appreciate input.

Chair Cooper thanked Senator Chaudron.

5. Senator Brent Sipes was then invited to report on the current situation in the GEC. He made a short presentation on Modifications to the GEC. A handout titled "The Proposal for Modification of the UH Mānoa [sic.] General Education Requirements -- Clarifications --" was included in Senators' meeting packets. Senator Sipes said that the changes proposed were for the most part changes for clarification, not really "modification", and he noted that these inconsistencies and typographical errors needed to be changed quickly as the press of the coming date for the Catalog to go to press was rapidly advancing. That was why this was being brought to the Senate today.

5.1. The first major clarification discussed was the phrase “other categories” (found on page one in FOUNDATION REQUIREMENTS IN RELATION TO DIVERSIFICATION AND FOCUS REQUIREMENTS).

Senator Garcia commented that the original intent had not been to specify those two, but to address all.

Senator Manicas noted that there were three or four focus categories.

Senator Sipes explained that this matter was being debated, and it was not clear just exactly what categories were being referred to.

Senator Goss commented that in his view CAPITALIZATION really helps. He recommended that the practice be carried throughout the GEC documents.

5.2. Senator Sipes directed Senators to page three of the GenEd document for what he described as the second big problem encountered. (The pages in the packet handout are not numbered. See at numbered line 12 under (A) 2. Diversification Requirements, and above B. Special UHM Graduation Requirements. The problem had to do with the phrasing “6 credits from two different departments”. This becomes cumbersome, he observed, and difficult to explain to students and even to advisors. He used courses in the Art Department to explicate the point. A variety of really different kinds of courses were now lumped together by the “two different departments” wording, and it was proposed that it would free up constraints made on strict reading if the change were made from “departments” to “areas.” Mention was made of Arts & Sciences advising and a “course sheet” or “program requirements sheet” which is used there. The idea is that students cannot take everything in just one department. Courses must be taken which really are of different kinds.

Senator Schmidt queried use of “Hawaiian/Second” (changed from “Hawaiian/Second/Foreign” -- See at 2. under c. Oral Communication, numbered line 36). If, asked Senator Schmidt, “Second” really means anything other than English, why not say so? Senator Sipes replied that the effort, under catalog deadline pressures, was to change as little as possible. Senator Schmidt asked for a “friendly amendment” but Senator Sipes responded that he was “not sure he [would] accept.”

Senator Bacchilega asked for an explanation for the preference for “Second” over “Foreign”. Senator Garcia said that to follow the language, the intent was Hawaiian/Second. He said that he himself liked the ‘amendment’ offered. (There was no formal motion nor second; this was discussed only as a ‘friendly amendment’).

Senator Chaudron suggested that a possible test would be to consider those taking “heritage language” courses, or those who were non-native students at the university. International students, he said, have learned a foreign language and it is English.

Senator Sipes asked GEC member Carolyn Brooks-Harris (Academic Adviser and Department Chair of Arts & Sciences Student Academic Services), who was present, to comment. Dr. Brooks-Harris talked about the practice of granting waivers in these situations.

Senator Chaudron asked whether “second” or “foreign” made a significant difference.

Senator Schmidt asked if it might be acceptable to use “a language other than English.”

Visitor Lance Collins noted that two years ago this had been taken up. He said that English might be as foreign in Hawai’i as is Ilokano. He said that GSO spent a whole month on this. [groaning laughter followed]

Senator Chesney-Lind commented: “Done it once, let’s not do it again.”

Chair Cooper asked for clarification: Was the ‘friendly amendment’ being withdrawn? Given a positive indication, she said: “Let’s move on.”

The next “clarification” to be taken up was “or” vs. “of”. Senator Sipes’ comment about this focused on the fact that spell checkers would not catch the changes needed and that modifications of this sort had been made.

At 3:45 Chairwoman Cooper asked for a motion to accept the modifications/clarifications. Senator Manicas did so move, and the motion was seconded. By a vote of 37 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstaining, the motion was approved.

Senator Sipes announced that the Focus Requirement deadline was being modified to February 5.

Chair Cooper announced that the Senate would next move into item 6 on the agenda, “Campus Conversations.” It then being 3:48 she announced we would engage in this activity until about 4:10.

Before the Campus Conversations got underway, Visitor Ruth Hsu, Associate Professor, English, and as a GEC member, liaison to the HAP board, asked: "What happened to the modification that was a suggested modification to the HAP section? Wasn't that coming up for discussion today?"

Senator Sipes answered that there was "a lot that wasn't discussed specifically."

Professor Hsu mentioned a document she said she had in front of her regarding HAP, and said that she was expecting this to come up for discussion.

Chair Cooper intervened with a comment about the limited discussion, that only types of changes had been brought up.

Senator Garcia noted that there were many changed that we did not talk about. He said he wanted an opportunity to look at all the changes, and he voiced concern and surprise that "this thing is being forced through."

Senator Bacchilega expressed her concern for details of the hallmarks, asking if we had a say about these as a Senate.

Chair Cooper said that her understanding was that there was ample opportunity for comments to be expressed on the web.

Senator Sipes said that hallmarks are under the purview of the boards, that the Senate can choose to assess how the hallmarks are used and make suggestions back to the boards. He said that the governance document never specified any approvals other than those given by the boards.

Senator Sansone asked for clarification: "What is the status?"

Senator Sipes replied that the boards have approved the hallmarks and they have gone to GEC. He expressed his view that it is "not the purview of GEC to assess."

Senator Sansone replied that he was "not sure this is really correct."

Senator Bacchilega said that she had two concerns, once the hallmarks were approved, distributed to chairs, and put on the website. The first is that they were not widely distributed, and the second was that we as a body were not discussing this, if matters being approved were "not in agreement" or "not consistent."

Visitor Hsu voiced the opinion that “part of the problem is that GEC really doesn’t have time,” that the committee was “not structured to be able to deal with the February deadlines.” She said that in the HAP board there are real problems with procedure, noting that the latest version has already gone out. She voiced her view that there is “lack of smooth running of GEC, that there are issues for the Faculty Senate to take up, and they are not just SEC/GEC.

Chair Cooper intervened, saying that the Senate and the SEC need to rely on work done by the committees. She noted that anyone can bring a problem to the Senate, but that for now we needed to move on.

Visitor to the Senate and former Senator Professor Lilikala Kame‘eleihiwa, Director of the Center for Hawaiian Studies, said that she had expected more discussion. She noted her concern with what she recalled from last year, saying that she had expected to find two separate focus courses: one on Asia and a separate one on Hawai‘i and the Pacific. Somehow, she said, the two had gotten lumped. This is a very serious issue, she observed. She expressed the view that everyone needed to learn about Asia and everyone no less needed to learn about Hawai‘i and the Pacific. She said she hoped the Senate would consider her concerns and that there would be a review next year. This is a matter of grave concern to the Center for Hawaiian Studies. She would return, she said, to the next Senate meeting, with something to hand out for consideration. The way the hallmarks are passed out was, she said, not acceptable, “not acceptable to us, as not Hawaiian” in the manner in which they had been passed out.

Chairwoman Cooper asked that faculty try out what we have and then look at the problems encountered. Some issues are indeed hotly contested. We need, she thought, to try it out before we really can say what needs to be changed.

Professor Kame‘eleihiwa commented that there were participants with vested interests (in keeping things unchanged) and participants who wanted change. She said that in her opinion the hallmarks are “extremely shoddy”, too much made at the very last minute. She felt that posting them on the web simply insured no discussion, if “nobody knows it’s there.”

Senator Schoonmaker said that the catalog deadlines were a significant factor. She tried to ask if Professor Kame‘eleihiwa would support putting the HAP portion on hold until sufficient deliberation had taken place -- unfortunately from this point for a few minutes this Secretary can report no further in detail on what was said, because there was interruption of Senator Schoonmaker repeatedly by Visitor Hsu, and

overlapping talk between Senator Schoonmaker, who had been given the floor, and Professor Hsu.

Professor Hsu, who prevailed in taking the floor at this point, expressed her concern that the issues had more to do with governance, that this should be of concern to the Senate. She began then to explain details of voting within the committee for which she is liaison to the GEC, and she claimed that the committee was operating with a “process that has been corrupted.”

The time was 4:02. Chair Cooper asked that the Senate take up the matter of Campus Conversation (6).

6. What follows is a summary of summaries. The Secretary has collected notes from SEC members who led conversation groups. Each of the SEC members was working with a sheet containing a list of five topics/questions. Below you will find responses gathered from across the various groups and ordered by the five.

One general comment submitted by a SEC member, in agreement with a comment from a second SEC member, was that “things were a bit stilted and strained (given what had just happened in the meeting). [See also #5, below].

6.1. Chancellor Search:

6.1.1. -Thoughts?

There was considerable concern with the make-up of the committee.

If there are to be only seven faculty members involved, they need to be drawn from diverse groups, to be representative. (The senators in this group had not all heard the information about breakdown of the faculty group into Arts&Sciences, researchers, and professional schools. They were relieved to have this information) At that point, however, it was pointed out that without a list of current nominees for the search committee, it was not clear what kinds of faculty nominations were needed. It was suggested that certain emeriti might serve well in this task.

It is important to have a local perspective included.

Possibly legislators ought to be included.

It would be important to have more than just a single representative of the community, to break down the “Ivory Tower” factor.

People want to be assured that faculty did have a meaningful presence on the selection committee. Some remembered only Barry Baker as the only UHM member in the Presidential search. Others shared the concern the faculty need to be a majority, or at minimum, a strong plurality.

On the chancellor position:

Make sure that research at Mānoa reports to the chancellor, and not to the president.

6.1.2. Suggested members:

William Chismar
Richard Schmidt
Hazel Beh (Is she on leave?)
Laura Lyons
Fred MacKenzie
Naline Andrade
Sylvia Yuen
Marian Melish
Gordon Green
Yoshi Koga (emeritus)

6.2. Campus Climate in General?

One concern was raised about disputes among faculty members being carried beyond the campus, that this was destructive.

Strongly voiced was the complaint that there is presently absent any place for faculty to gather, converse, network in a pleasant atmosphere. One member of this group expressed the view that the current 'faculty' lunchroom "feels like a 'sanitorium'." This group wanted to have more coffee carts on campus, more pleasant places to sit while enjoying their java. A participant said that she and others feel isolated, and simply shuttle to and from offices rather than engaging in building a community. One of this group commented that "e-mail is efficient as a means of communication, but is not effective at building an actual community."

Provide more useable facilities for events (especially theater-type venues).

Make access to campus easier at night (improve lighting, more signs)

Have food service operations run at night to allow folks visiting campus to find something to eat / drink.

Put a Starbucks at the Library entrance area. (There was some dissent on the selection of Starbucks).

Some expressed insecurity and doubt, but at the same time a sense of being hopeful. It was said that one cannot plan initiatives if big change is coming.

One suggestion was to let students lead in programming events.

6.3. Acknowledgement of Grant Recipients -- Suggestions for How to Honor These Faculty; Press Conferences? Receptions?:

Send them simple "Thank You" messages. (To some extent this is already being done, or the doing has begun).

KuLama should make announcements and acknowledgements

Give them acknowledgements which they could use in promotion applications
People did feel good about the recent PR that UH has been receiving (mention was made of the new Advertiser page). One faculty member wondered aloud what had ever happened to the idea of doing a research magazine.

6.4. How Might We Involve Retired Faculty in University Life? As Mentors to New Faculty? Involvement with Students?

Colleagues, more often than not, appear to want a slower transition into full retirement. This is due at least in part to the fact that research grants and other projects don't all end at the same time or correspond with the official date of retirement. It would be especially attractive to be able to engage 100% in research, with no teaching, and no committee work.

One recommendation was to permit extension of the partial retirement status to beyond five years.

Some said that if indeed retired professors want to be involved, they would be glad to have them as mentors. The impression, though, was that "retired faculty retired to get away." One suggestion was that retired faculty who wanted to be involved might serve as faculty mentors for freshmen for the General Education requirements.

Another group said that there was very little interest in this, but that that was surprising, considering that "a growing number of us will be retired profs and might find out we wish we were able to be more active than retired folks are now.

Finally the view was expressed that one should "love 'em" and then "let them go."

6.5. Issues of Concern?

Articulation of the General Education requirements with the community colleges; how can we evaluate community college transfers?

The "unrest" on the General Education issue is a serious problem and must be resolved "as quickly as possible."

Adjournment was at 4:20.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael L Forman
Secretary of the Senate