

Minutes

Mānoa Faculty Senate
Meeting of 20 March 2002
Law Classroom 2

There were thirty-five Senators who signed in: Denise Antolini, Roger Babcock, Rhonda Black, Lonny Carlile, Catherine Cavaletto, Paul Chandler, Craig Chaudron, Hong-Mei Chen, Meda Chesney-Lind, Joanne Cooper, James Dator, Sandy Davis, Carl Evensen, David Flynn, Michael Forman, Pamela Fujita-Starck, Donna Fukuda, Tony Guerrero, Amelia Jenkins, Merle Kataoka-Yahiro, Spencer Leineweber, Peter Manicas, Roy Nishimoto, Jeanne Oka, Robert Paull, Jane Schoonmaker, Gwen Sinclair, Brent Sipes, Wayne Smith, John Stimson, Mary Tiles, Jean Toyama, Charles Weems, Lynne Wilkens, and Sylvia Yuen.

Seven Senators were excused: Eric DeCarlo, Ernestine Enomoto, Richard Frankel, Emily Hawkins, Val Kanuha, Stacey Marlow, and Frank Sansone.

Twenty-eight Senators did not sign in and are treated as absent: Cristina Bacchilega, Elaine Bailey, Robert Bley-Vroman, Douglas Bomberger, Kent Bridges, G D Bryant-Greenwood, Glenn Cannon, Thomas Craven, Katalin Csiszar, H Gert DeCouet, Nancy Dowling, Charles Fletcher, Patricia Fryer, Michael Garcia, Jon Goss, Robert Grace, John Hardman, John Melish, Neal Milner, Thomas Morelli, Damon Sakai, David Sanders, Irwin Schatz, Richard Schmidt, Dan Spears, Elizabeth Tam, Frank Walton, and Kelley Withy.

Nine speakers, guests and other participants signed in: David Morihara, Susan Van Gilder, Teresita Ramos, Kristina Kekuewa, Stephanie Kim, Prescila Espiritu, Ken Tokuno, Denise Konan, and Barbara Polk.

0. Chairma'm Cooper called the meeting to order at 3:04, saying that she liked to reward -- if listening to her could be taken as "reward" -- those who were there on time.

1. With a couple of typographic errors noted for correction, the minutes of the meeting held on 20 February 2002 were approved.

2. Chair Cooper presented the Chair's Report:

2.1. On the Chancellor's search: the firm of A T Kearney has been hired to assist in the search. An e-mail message has been sent to Senators and others requesting that appropriate nominations of potential candidates be sent either to Joanne Cooper or to Gay Reed <ggreed@hawaii.edu>

2.2. Strategic Planning efforts continue. The present stage was described as that of "mushing" [For exposition on this vocabulary, see earlier discussion by Deane Neubauer and Karl Kim]. Chair Cooper invited Denise Konan of the Mānoa Chancellor's Office to comment on the state of strategic planning efforts. Professor Konan mentioned a steering committee retreat just completed, progress being made, drafting of the plan already in motion, an intended 1 May revealing of the draft plan for public commentary, with the intention of presenting it to the BOR after public commentary had been received and acted upon.

Professor Konan also described the present state of system-wide planning. She mentioned the 11 January meeting and said that its results are available on the web. She reported that the system steering committee had been expanded, that five new members and the three others had met on 16 March. They will present their report to the President's Advisory Committee on 22 March, and the goal is to have a final report by 15 April for presentation to the BOR at its May meeting.

2.3. Chair Cooper said that she continues to attend the Mānoa Budget Advisory Committee, together with Frank Sansone and Mike Forman from the Senate Executive Committee. There the primary point is that everything is waiting on the legislature's decisions. She noted that Mr. Morihara, who lobbies for the University at the Legislature, would speak later in the meeting.

2.4. Another meeting which Chair Cooper regularly attends is the meeting of Deans and Directors. A key item of that most recent meeting was the new \$20million SIS (student information system) system. A heads-up here: This new system will check attempts at enrollment against the prerequisites and the student's record. Prerequisites will be strictly enforced, so if that is not desirable in particular cases, faculty are advised to have the prerequisites deleted immediately. This system will operate for the Fall 2003 enrollment.

Burglaries on campus was another topic of discussion. There have been seventeen in the past two weeks, involving forty-one rooms. We are advised to be alert of the presence of suspicious people (other than Chair Cooper, she said), and to make sure that valuables, in particular keys to offices, are kept locked up.

The matter of grievances and complaints continues to be a topic of discussion among the deans and directors. The process, given re-organization of administration, is at the center of these discussions. Sexual harassment and discrimination, contractual violations, and academic complaints are all a part of this concern.

2.5. The All-Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs has been discussing transfer questions revolving about the GenEd core; has to be considered, a proposal for changes to their charter calling for a shift to monthly (rather than every two months) meetings; and has concerns over the present hiring freeze for certain categories of employee.

Chair Cooper also presented a brief report on Senatorial absenteeism: as of the February meeting, three senators had missed as many as six meetings of the Senate; five had missed five meetings; three had missed four meetings, and so on. Concern was voiced about this, and it was recommended that new Senators be asked to commit to full service and participation before agreeing to accept a position in the Senate.

Professor Rhonda Black of the Committee on Professional Service received heartfelt thanks for her work in finding faculty members to serve on the plethora of committees to which faculty have been appointed during this academic year.

Forthcoming meetings: the next Senate meeting is on 17 April. President Dobelle will address the Congress and Senate at the 8 May meeting. In mid-May the finalists for the Chancellor position will appear on campus. That was the end of the Chair's Report. It was 3:15.

Not wearing her glasses, Chair Cooper inadvertantly skipped over the CAPP resolution which was scheduled next. Senator Chandler reproved her for this, albeit gently, and it was agreed that guest Morihara could speak next.

3. David Morihara introduced two guests who came with him, Stephanie Kim, who tracks bills, and Kristine Kekuewa, who works with our congressional delegates. Mr. Morihara explained that he heads UH's Government Relations Team and that he would present an update on what was happening at the Legislature.

In effect it looked at present like our budget would be reduced by 2%. He noted the various proposals, some of which would have a much deeper impact, but it is the case that the House, debating the budget on the floor as he spoke, would be sending their budget to the senate. This is the half-way point in the legislature; the senate would generate a budget of its own. Talk was that perhaps theirs would be - 5%. At issue was the question of taking or not taking from the Hurricane Relief Fund, to buffer such a cut. Morihara mentioned House Bill (HB) 2654, proposing taking \$100million out of the HRF and replacing that with bonds. Overall, in Morihara's judgment, we were looking at a reduction of 2% for next year.

There have been a few additions in the CIP (capital improvements projects) budget, for planning, for UH Hilo, and for community colleges. There is still some

chance that advocacy can change this budgetary picture. He noted President Dobelle's commitment that he would not be asking for anything additional this year, intending to operate on the same basis as this present year.

Morihara mentioned that in the BOR packet there is one remaining bill. This would address claims on certain lawsuits which have been settled. Formerly the Attorney General handled these, but now with autonomy there was need for a separate claims bill. The figure \$144,000 was mentioned.

In addition HB 2587, which concerned performance judges and which Mr. Morihara described as "another grievance procedure option" was no longer moving. He said that there is a hoped-for resolution through negotiation, that there will be an agreement worked out for next year. He also mentioned a few other bills relating to student loans for nursing and education students, and for the Hope Fund (scholarships).

On the federal side, there is \$150 million, based on revenue bonds from the tobacco fund; the administration is committed to raising another 150 million. This is for the Cancer Research Center, the biotech park, and for refurbishing the existing BioMed Building. He said that the Cancer Center is the top priority.

Mr. Morihara invited questions. After a brief pause, he tossed out one: "How can you help? Thank you for asking." He said that any effort to inform senators' legislators will be helpful. He noted that the University serves the community. That is one reason why it needs to be valued. Another reason is that educational opportunities provide another way to diversify the economy. A senator asked how autonomy was working; was it protecting us from the losses of attrition? Would unfilled positions be safe?

Morihara said that in his view autonomy had neither hurt nor helped. UH is not separate; we are still a state institution, in any case.

Senator Cavaletti asked about cuts involving West O'ahu. Mr. Morihara replied that there was no funding for building, but that there was \$8 million for planning and design. He said that the site selection is "a political football" and that there was current activity in rating various possible sites. He said this would continue through the normal planning process.

Another Senator asked for clarification on the point about funds for refurbishing the BioMed Building. After some discussion of the funding splits (150, which was 120 after subtracting site preparation) 8 (or 80?) million for the community colleges, and 50 or 60 for the refurbishing -- these were just estimates, he said), the Senator clarified: what he was asking about was, Would there be some new function for the BioMed building? Morihara said that this was not within his expertise, "not for me to decide."

Senator Cooper asked what the next steps in the budgetary process would be. Morihara said the budget process was half-way through. The key up-coming matter

is the next Council on Revenues projection. There is a mandate in the State Constitution to fit the budget within that projection. The House budget goes to the Senate. The Senate may accept it, modify it, or produce an entirely different budget of its own. At the end of April, the House and the Senate get together. They agree on something and then they send that to the Governor.

Mr. Morihara invited Senators to call him if they wished, and provided the information that he could be reached at 956-5090 and located at Bachman 105.

Senator Chesney-Lind wished him "Good Luck!" in the rest of the session. The time was 3:28.

4. CAPP Reports.

4.1. Resolution relating to the Establishment of a B.A. in Philippine Language and Literature. Senator Paul Chandler read the resolution for CAPP. He noted that experts, the people who put the proposal together, were present to answer questions. He himself asked about the selection of Filipino / Tagalog, and Professor Teresita V Ramos explained that Filipino is the name of the national language.

A Senator asked what number of majors might be anticipated for this program. The reply focused on a certificate currently available and on the results of a survey. Professor Ramos said that 61% of the certificate students surveyed "seemed interested." There are 300 students enrolled each semester.

Senator Manicas asked about the locus of what he took to be an interdisciplinary program. Professor Ramos replied: Department of Hawaiian and Indo-Pacific Languages (and Literatures). [Later discussion suggests that some heard this reply as "Hawaiian Asian Pacific"].

Chair Cooper asked if the program would necessitate additional faculty. Senator Chandler said that the current faculty would be able to handle the new program. He noted that for the future, given the likelihood of retirements, that replacement would then be in order. He added that there was no requirement at present for additional funds.

Senator Schoonmaker asked about curriculum development requirements. The reply was that there are none needed at present.

Then the question which revealed the misunderstanding noted above was asked: Had LLL been involved in the planning, what did LLL think about this proposal? (Dept. of Hawaiian and Indo-Pacific Languages and Literatures is a part of LLL; the School of Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Studies is a separate college). This confusion was unravelled to the satisfaction of those who had asked.

Senator Chaudron then noted that investigation by the CAPP committee turned up the finding that there is no equivalent program elsewhere, but that Cornell and UCLA have been thinking about setting up such a program. It would be a great step for UH to take, to be the first to have such a program.

Chair Cooper noted that students were already being drawn to attend UH specifically for this program.

Senator Chaudron added that Professors Ramos and Espiritu had reported receiving inquiries from outside students interested in enrolling at UH just for this.

A final question sought clarification regarding the difference between the existing certificate program and the proposed BA degree program. The difference in required credit hours (15 for the certificate, 36 for the major) was presented as the answer.

The resolution was approved: thirty-three voted for, none against, and none abstaining.

4.2. Senator Sipes reported on the GenEd activities of the past month. The number of approved courses was listed on the back page of the meeting packet. Senator Sipes expressed thanks to the GenEd Committee, to the Board committees, and to the faculty who made proposals and who commented on proposals.

Senator Sipes said that a major lesson of the year was that "Faculty governance is not as easy as it sounds on paper." He also said that it was a matter of pride for him that GenEd had been (in his opinion) "SEC's biggest problem."

He presented a brief historical overview: in 1999 the proposal for a new core was passed, and the old core was grandfathered in. Now, he said, finally there were a lot more new courses being added to this core. He said faculty should continue to look to develop new courses which would meet the requirements. Noting the figures given in his tables on the back of the packet, he said that even though these were impressive numbers, they were "not as high as we'd like." He nonetheless said that he wanted to "applaud you all."

A first question from the floor regarded transfers. Senator Oka said that the situation was still the same as always.

Senator Tiles sought clarification because of a rumor she said she'd heard. The question had to do with "doubling up" on writing-intensive and focus or foundation credits. Senator Sipes explained that with foundation courses the answer was no, but with diversification courses there might even be some "triple-dipping." There was, he said, no conflict.

Senator Oka asked if it was OK to double-dip with foundation courses in the major. Senator Sipes said that the GenEd committee does not deal with majors.

Senator Oka then asked if GenEd was leaving this to departments. Senator Manicas said, Yes, it was being left to departments. Senator Sipes said they were actually encouraging double-dipping.

The next question was about governance. Who gives approvals? Is it Boards? Is it the GEC? Senator Sipes referred to the AY 2000 Senate Documents as the basis for the answer.

A follow-up question then was: What is the role of the boards? A further clarification made this into a question about the process and the timing for any adjustments. Senator Sipes said that a part of the answer was tied to the Catalog. He urged interested faculty to begin now to prepare new submissions. He said that for focus courses, semester-by-semester submissions would be accepted. Senator Schoonmaker clarified that the end of December is the next Catalog deadline. Senator Sipes reminded faculty that all the other, previously-existing "hoops" for new courses (such as those of various college curriculum committees) would still have to be jumped through, as a part of this regular process.

Chair Cooper asked Senator Sipes what were to be the next steps of his committee. Before he could say anything, the word "ASSESSMENT" resounded loudly from somewhere to my right (Ken Tokuno).

Senator Sipes answered then that assessment was to be a major activity of the committee. Mentoring was another thing under investigation, and that there might be some "tweaking of the hallmarks," some of which would have to do with phrasing and will capturing the spirit of the overall changes intended. Articulation is another concern of the committee, both with respect to transferring from within the system and transferring into the system from outside. He said that the committee was grappling with such problems already, and found that the foundation courses were relatively trouble-free in this respect, but that there were more difficulties involving the focus courses. He said that there were diverging opinions about solutions, especially with respect to upper division courses.

Senator Manicas urged that faculty be supportive, particularly of the people from Admissions and Records. Faculty must be willing to assist in evaluating courses submitted by transfer students. He said that faculty would need to help a lot in this area. We might work in advance to have information available, and the websites ought to be developed in this respect.

Chair Cooper reminded us all that the key idea here is to improve the lives of students by making graduation possible within a reasonable time. If we do not facilitate transfers, we will not be accomplishing that end.

Ken Tokuno offered the following information: half of every Fall semester's entering students are transfers, he said, and half of that .5 are from outside the system. Thus the outside transfer is an important group.

Senator Chesney-Lind commended and thanked the GEC and the focus boards. She said that doing all this while the semester was in motion was like building a car while you were driving it.

Because our next guest had not yet arrived, Chair Cooper asked if there was other business.

Senator Chaudron mentioned certain issues coming before CAPP. He said that the accelerated BS in Nursing and an Advanced Certificate in Conflict Resolution were two matters in progress. He said that comments on these were welcome.

Chair Cooper expressed her thanks to CAPP for all its work.

Senator Tiles, reporting for CAB, noted as active issues ongoing consideration of classified research. "The more you look, the more complicated it gets," she said. The committee is looking for guidance and help. One view is that cans of worms are best left unopened. Existing BOR matters concern academic freedom and publishing of research. Patents and copyrights are tangled with intellectual property rights and constraints imposed by funding sources. One problem involves the ORS (Office of Research Services) form 5. The implications of checking one box or another there are unclear to many. Senator Tiles like Senator Chaudron voiced a call for people with experience to provide input for CAB and CAPP in these matters. The Supercomputer, and attendant requests for affiliate status in conjunction with work there, was another matter she brought up.

Senator Chesney-Lind asked about the initial change in the way the university signs contracts. Today the group overseeing this is entirely non-academic. SEC has been concerned about that change. An academic leader ought to be included in the oversight group. Senator Tiles agreed and said that CAB intended to take that up.

5. Chair Cooper welcomed Susan Van Gilder of A T Kearney (at 3:58). Mrs. Van Gilder said she wanted to provide the Senate with a little information about her firm and the Chancellor's Search and to invite questions. She said she was employed within the Education Practice section of A T Kearney. This is the subsection of the firm which specializes in higher education searches.

She had worked eight years for the firm in the Washington, DC area and recently had transferred to O'ahu in conjunction with reassignment of her husband, a DOD employee. She said she had personal experience of more than one hundred academic searches, including searches for presidents, for chancellors, and for deans. This was so for a variety of schools of different types. She works on all phases of these searches. The practice includes going out and actively recruiting people to put themselves up as candidates. Most candidates, she said, are hesitant to throw their names into searches. They want to be assured of some goodness of fit between what they have to offer and what is being sought. Some potential candidates may not be aware of the opportunity.

The representatives of the search firm need to have a clear understanding of what kind of candidate is being sought, and of what kind of opportunity is being presented. This is challenging. The process involves talking with possible candidates and often is gruelling, with sometimes weeks of back-and-forth.

Chair Cooper asked Mrs. Van Gilder to mention some searches in which she had been involved. Mrs. Van Gilder mentioned searches for the presidency for Smith

and for the University of Michigan, for the provost of the University of Illinois, for Rice, for other, smaller institutions (mentioning Colby and Bates). She noted that her firm prided itself on doing repeat work -- on being asked to find more than one candidate for more than one position at a given school.

Senator Antolini asked about transparency and confidentiality in the search process. She asked specifically at what point candidates would be publicly known to be candidates.

Mrs. Van Gilder mentioned the Honolulu Advertiser's editorial which had appeared that morning, to acknowledge the nature of the concern. She said there had to be a high degree of confidentiality at early stages. Early on, the firm would do a lot of screening, to insure best fit between candidates and job. Strong candidates would be very tentative through this stage, and the process must remain quite confidential. Early on, she would describe the process as exploratory, for both sides. There had to be an opportunity for each to learn about the other. Leaks at this stage could damage either candidate or institution, and leaks could frighten other candidates away.

It is the final stages where the process can and will be open. She said that she understands there is a strong commitment from President Dobelle and the SEC that people will get an opportunity to see and meet the candidates, and that the candidates will be given an opportunity to learn about the campus. This schedule has not been laid out yet.

Chair Cooper offered the information that it was intended that this open point would be reached by mid-May, so that the Senate and other faculty could be fully involved.

Mrs. Van Gilder said we would want to show off the campus in its best light. At that, Senator Chesney-Lind asked her how she would be presenting UHM to potential candidates. Mrs. Van Gilder said that there is a great story to be told about this campus. She mentioned that UH has seized on its geographical advantage to develop into a strong competitor both nationally and internationally in certain areas. At the same time, she said, it was obvious that the university was uneven in quality. There are parts that need to be strengthened, parts that are already strong. A candidate could be attracted both to the strengths and to the opportunity to create new strengths. She noted the international and the Asian dimensions of what this university is. She noted the advantage of the new leadership. She touched on both strengths and weaknesses, such as noting the large number of administrators in interim positions. She said there was some negative there, but that it could also be seen as a plus. She said she felt the job was "sellable" as a great challenge. She mentioned budget as a major area of challenge, noting that we are not a Texas or a California or a Florida. She talked about the international ties and the diversity of the student body and faculty as opportunities which a good candidate would rise to meet.

Senator Antolini asked if we would be competitive. Mrs. Van Gilder said yes, we will be. She mentioned something being done about housing. She talked about

negatives being perceptions more than reality. She said that she herself found, having recently moved from Washington DC to Kailua, that Hawai'i is not as "out of touch" ("reach"?) as people think. The salary, she said, would be OK.

Senator Weems asked about the political situation -- Would she apprise candidates of that reality? Mrs. Van Gilder said that she would, of course. She pointed out that any serious candidate would be accessing our newspapers on the web. She said she would give them other sources. "They'll find out," she said. We will want to have candidates who are excited about the opportunity. Anyone who is afraid of politics, she said, "would not be the right pick."

Chair Cooper thanked Mrs. Van Gilder.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned. It was 4:12pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael L Forman
Secretary of the Senate