

## Minutes

Mānoa Faculty Senate  
Meeting of 17 April 2002  
Law Classroom 2

There were thirty Senators who signed in: Denise Antolini, Roger Babcock, Elaine Bailey, Douglas Bomberger, Lonny Carlile, Catherine Cavaletto, Paul Chandler, Craig Chaudron, Joanne Cooper, Thomas Craven, James Dator, Sandy Davis, Eric DeCarlo, Ernestine Enomoto, David Flynn, Michael Forman, Patricia Fryer, Donna Fukuda, Michael Garcia, Merle Kataoka-Yahiro, Spencer Leineweber, Stacey Marlow, Roy Nishimoto, Robert Paull, Frank Sansone, Jane Schoonmaker, Gwen Sinclair, Wayne Smith, Mary Tiles, and Jean Toyama.

There were seven Senators excused: Paul Adams, Cristina Bacchilega, Meda Chesney-Lind, Emily Hawkins, Jeanne Oka, Charles Weems, and Lynne Wilkens.

Thirty-three Senators did not sign in and are considered to have been absent: Rhonda Black, Robert Bley-Vroman, Kent Bridges, G D Bryant-Greenwood, Glenn Cannon, Hong-Mei Chen, Katalin Csiszar, H Gert DeCouet, Nancy Dowling, Carl Evensen, Charles Fletcher, Richard Frankel, Pamela Fujita-Starck, Jon Goss, Robert Grace, Tony Guerrero, John Hardman, Amelia Jenkins, Peter Manicas, John Melish, Neal Milner, Thomas Morelli, Damon Sakai, David Sanders, Irwin Schatz, Richard Schmidt, Brent Sipes, Dan Spears, John Stimson, Elizabeth Tam, Frank Walton, Kelley Withy, and Sylvia Yuen.

Seventeen administrators, guests, a speaker, and others signed in: Deane Neubauer, Karl Kim, Denise Konan, David Chandler, Karen Cross, Emanuel Drechsel, Ann R Sloat, Robert Anders, Michael Jones, Martha Crosby, Alan Teramura, Chuck Hayes, B Keever [?--illegible signature; my guess--MLF], Dawn Nishida, John Morton, and Tom Bopp. Bart Abbott from Ka Leo introduced himself to Charlotte Mitsutani, but did not sign in.

0. Chairm'am Cooper called the meeting to order at 3:05.

1. There being no corrections offered, the minutes of the meeting of 20 March 2002 were approved.

2. Chair Cooper gave her Chair's Report:

2.1. SEC Nominations are up-coming; vote by 5/3/02.

2.2. Articulation issues are being addressed by GEC. Sen. Cooper added background on this, reminding senators of a point made at the last Senate meeting by Ken Tokuno: that out-of-state transfers, transfers from outside the UH system, and transfers from other units within the UH system make up .5 of the student body enrolling in any Fall semester. We need to be aware of this, and of its impact on questions and practices in areas like articulation.

2.3. The Chancellor search proceeds apace, is "going well", and the plan of having the finalists appearing on campus during the period 9-11 May is still what we may expect.

2.4. Faculty participation in governance -- With our new President and new Chancellor, this has been an extraordinary year, and there has been a much larger demand for faculty service on committees than was normal in the past. Additional committees are being formed, concerned with ethics and conflict of interest, and with on-line grading.

2.5. Web of Science. Current files of the Web of Science will be available soon through the Library's list of databases. This web-based product includes Arts & Humanities Citation Index, Science Citation Index, and Social Sciences Citation Index. The Library is currently negotiating with the vendor for additional access to back files. Trial access is available through May 10 (<http://wos.isitrial.com/>).

2.6. On-Line Grades: Ron Cambra is to report on developments here. Dean Cambra is also looking for a faculty member to serve on a committee for this concern. One target is that by F2002 grades would no longer be sent through the mails; by S2003 information about academic activities would be on-line.

2.7. There was a handout on the "fast-track initiative" from the Strategic Planning efforts. A query from the floor brought the explanation that a check meant that this was a task already completed -- and, well, you can guess what a non-check means, then.

2.8. The next Senate meeting is to be held on Wednesday, 8 May. This will also be a meeting of the Congress. President Dobbelle will address the Congress. The meeting will be held in the Architecture Auditorium beginning at 3pm.

3. It was 3:11 when Chair Cooper concluded her Chair's Report. She explained that guest John Morton could not be present until 3:30, so we would move item 3 of the agenda to that time when he arrives and proceed with the CAB and CAPP resolutions.

#### 4. Committee Reports:

4.1. Senator Cavaletto presented for CAPP the resolution regarding the Lyon Arboretum, a copy of which was contained in the meeting packet. The resolution is entitled: "Resolution relating to the TRANSFER OF LYON ARBORETUM TO THE COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES. Senator Cavaletto noted that both Dean Hayes and Director Alan Teramura of the Lyon Arboretum were present to answer questions. Senator Cavaletto presented a brief overview of the history of Lyon Arboretum: founded in 1918 by the Hawaii Sugar Planters' Association, given to UH in 1953, administered by what is now CTAHR. In 1965 an independent research unit, under organized research, it then reported to the position then known as Office of the Vice-President for Research, currently reporting to the Office of the Chancellor.

The Lyon Arboretum does not offer classes, but does serve as a resource for faculty, students, and staff, sometimes supporting classroom teaching. Currently employed there are seven permanent, and three temporary staff. The Arboretum is, at present, "a little of an orphan," said Senator Cavaletto. This resolution is an attempt to bring it into the family. She read the resolution aloud. There being no discussion, a vote was taken. The vote was twenty-five for the resolution, none opposed, two abstaining. The time was 3:18.

4.2. Chair Cooper then invited Denise Konan, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to make a comment on the progress of Strategic Planning for the campus, which she did. Prof. Konan said that there is to be a 1 May event celebrating involvement of the campus community in the planning effort. The event, to be held on Bachman lawn, about 11:30am, would provide an opportunity to have a look at the plan in progress.

4.3. Next Senator Roger Babcock presented for CAPP the RESOLUTION RELATING TO APPROVAL OF A GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION. Professor David Chandler and Education Specialist Karen Cross were introduced as being present to respond to questions. Sen. Babcock said that the program in Conflict Resolution is well-known, having some fifteen years of history on campus and serving the community. Then he read the resolution aloud; when he finished he asked: "Is there any conflict with this?"

There was no discussion. The vote which followed next was twenty-seven in favor, none opposed, one abstaining.

4.4. Senator Mary Tiles presented the resolution for CAB. Before she got to the resolution, she offered as information a number of remarks regarding related matters

which CAB has been discussing. She noted that the lead committee member on these issues was not able to be present, so she was substituting.

She began by noting that there are larger issues involved which the committee was not here and now addressing. She said that at present the Board of Regents' policy statements are "not in line with current practice." She noted that [CAPP?CAB] last year had been involved with some of these questions.

One concern is the question of conditions under which an investigator has the freedom to publish results of research, particularly so when this right is made a matter of conditions for accepting funding support. She showed on the screen an overhead reproduction of the ORS form 5, calling attention to a section with boxes to be checked. The statements accompanying these boxes seemed to run at least slightly counter to general faculty assumptions about freedom to publish research results, or so she thought. A proposed modification being developed in committee did not go to the BOR.

Currently still under discussion is the wider issue of academic freedom and the right to publish research results. There is a need, she said, to separate out the various reasons presented for constraining this right. Included among these reasons are needs of defense, commercial and proprietary needs, and other kinds such as those involving research for the State of Hawai'i utilizing various forms of privileged information.

One recommendation is that in the next academic year, the Senate remain involved in the over-all discussion. On these larger issues CAB had no resolution to bring forward.

The resolution which CAB is bringing forth is a much narrower proposal, Senator Tiles explained. It is related to BOR action which took place last summer, involving a managerial group which is required for certain federal funding. The BOR action changed the nature of the membership in this managerial group. Sen. Tiles said that she understood from conversations with VP Sathre that the reason for the change was that the associated job titles had changed. The CAB resolution spoke to the "spirit of composition" of the group prior to that BOR action, and advocated its restoration. Senator Tiles read the proposal, a copy of which was in the meeting packet, aloud (Resolution on the composition of the Classified Research Managerial Group). Sen. Tiles commented on the phrase at the second-to-last line: "Mānoa Vice Chancellor responsible for Research"; Sen. Tiles explained that CAB was not presenting any exact title here because it did not want to be tied up in changes that might have been necessitated had they used any one certain title, only to find the title changed in new re-organization. The intent is to assign the position to whichever office gets assigned the responsibility.

The floor was opened for discussion, and considerable discussion ensued.

The first question came from Mr. Bart Abbott, who identified himself as a Ka Leo reporter. He asked if the BOR change last year might have made it easier to get approvals, given no faculty member involved.

Sen. Tiles said she saw it as neither easier nor harder.

Sen. Garcia asked: Should there be a faculty representative?

Sen. Tiles said that the committee (CAB) had thought about this, but felt that it might be hard to find a faculty member willing to serve who could also obtain security clearance. (laughter) She hastened to add (in response to the laughter, I surmise) that she was not saying that no faculty member could get security clearance. The decision in committee in the end, she explained, was that people with day-to-day cognizance should be the ones involved in the committee.

Senator Sansone said that he had been examining a large Department of Defense document recently and had run across "well-defined characteristics of who can be granted security clearance." He did not think that obtaining security clearance was a problem. The biggest change, he said, had been the additions of the Secretary of the Board of Regents and the VP for Legal Affairs, replacing the former Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate Division (a position which has been more clearly faculty-linked). Sen. Sansone expressed the hope that the BOR would change the membership of the managerial group back in that direction.

"Why not VP for Administration?"

Sen. Tiles said that the committee had not considered asking for a group with a larger membership.

Sen. Sansone pointed out that there was no VP for Administration.

Mr. Abbott asked further on the matter of the ORS Form 5: Were people signing away rights?

Sen. Tiles explained that one merely checked yes or no, but she said that there was an inclination on the part of the researcher seeking funding to think: "Well, maybe I'd better check yes". The big incentive was to get the funds.

Mr. Abbott commented: "It seems it does restrict academic freedom."

Sen. Tiles said that this University is not heavily into classified research at this time. Classification and what it means needs more examination. Frank Perkins has pointed out that there is a distinction between "classified research" and "research which has a classified aspect." As of 6 May 2001, Mary Tiles said, there were only 6 DOD contracts active with UH.

Chair Cooper commented that we might well anticipate larger involvement now that UH was running the Maui SuperComputer. She observed that a member from IfA might be a good addition.

Sen. Chaudron asked for clarification on "the politics of this memo." What was the genesis of the previous BOR change, and was it thought that the Faculty Senate would have the force, the political clout, to effect any change?

Sen. Tiles answered that all we can do is recommend and request; it is a BOR decision. She said that she had had conversations with some who had tried to influence change, and had gathered the impression that our efforts “wouldn’t be wholly unwelcome.”

Chair Cooper then noted that there had been a change in administration in the meantime.

Sen. Chaudron said he had learned what he wanted to know.

Sen. Sansone reiterated his point that there were at present “a lot of inconsistencies, a lot that needs to be updated.” This, he said, is simply the most obvious, the most egregious. Former President Mortimer had claimed that there was “no substantial change” but the faculty who had examined this did not agree that that was the case.

A vote supported the resolution, with thirty-one in favor, none opposed, no one abstaining.

Item 3. ( which had been postponed to await the arrival of our guest speaker)  
At 3:42 John Morton (Provost, Kapi’olani Community College, currently on assignment as Project Director for The University of Hawai’i Student Information System Project) was introduced and invited to tell us about the forthcoming changes in the UH Student Information System. He spoke on this for about forty minutes.

Provost Morton began by saying that the student information system had been a problem for some time now. It affected the various campuses differently, but had consequences for students which were too often negative. He said that in early Fall of 2001, a group had been pulled together by Deane Neubauer to work on this. They solicited proposals, and by November had eleven responses in hand. These were evaluated in terms of a set of criteria: was the program extant now? was it in operation? what was its primary enabling feature? was it open? was it reasonably affordable?

They were working with a \$20million budget, looking at programs in the 25-30 million dollar ballpark, for hardware, software, data base and university expenses.

The program selected is from SCT (the same company which produced the ISIS program in current use). The software is called “Banner.” It will be used for all student functions, including recruitment, registration, records, and advising and for financial aid processing. Additional products will include products for data warehousing. Web-for-executives will allow updates and tracking of key benchmarks for managerial decision-making. UH also licensed a work-flow type product which

will permit moving information around the entire university system. Included will be a capacity for imaging and the transmission and movement of documents, etc. Reports will be electronically distributed.

Provost Morton mentioned that a serious contender for the UH selection was something called Sallie Mae Solutions. In mid course, as things developed, SCT bought Sallie Mae. As a result a complete suite of products is what we bought.

The SIS will have a single data base, working from a single, central computer system. Any person will be a single instance within the computer's system. An individual might well have multiple roles within the UH system, but would be organized within this information system as a single person. It will be system-based, not campus based. Financial relationships, for example, will be handled across the entire system. The system will operate as a bursar system. Charges, payments, all will be handled as a single account -- no more separate checks for this (housing) and separate checks for that (meal ticket, or bookstore), etc. The academic relationship is that of student to multiple institutions. Students will be able to register in a single on-line session. The system will maintain institutional integrity and will make things easier.

One of the effects will be to encourage us all to re-examine what we have to offer. A concern will be to insure that courses are truly same or truly different and that the labeling of courses, with and without alpha numbers, communicates this clearly. This is a service issue. The developers will try to identify other such areas.

We should be mindful that the community colleges are an open-admissions institutional arrangement. Once the computer system establishes that an applicant is a resident and is eighteen years of age or older, the applicant is in. Are there other restrictions? The system is designed to enforce them strictly. There will be consequences. One such of immediate import is the matter of pre-requisites on course enrollment. If these are really not wanted (if we really do not want strict enforcement of a stated pre-requisite), then now is the time to have them removed, before this system is up and running.

The enrolling cohort for Fall 2003 is the target focus for these developments. Provost Morton used the phrase "normal business practice" in this context. (Note that we are hearing this phrase with greater frequency in recent days). Things like grades from summer courses given in Summer 2003 will not yet appear within this system as it is developing. Those summer 2003 grades will still be located (for a while) in the current ISIS system.

Morton talked about building schedules. He also talked about calendar information, and "migrating it" into various things and places -- he mentioned the possibility of various "subscriptions" and the migrating of information into one's personal calendar. He even mentioned volleyball schedules in this context.

He said there would be various ways to get into the system to draw out information. He said access would be secured with PIN numbers.

Currently on task, he said, are about 25 to 35 UH employees, engaged in various parts of this project at any one time. He mentioned fifteen SCT full-time, and said that the project is moving ahead rapidly. The time lines, he said, are tight, but are being maintained as such.

Provost Morton invited questions. The first question was from Professor Martha Crosby (Information & Computer Science): Will the system have capacity to "look" across several courses at a time? She explained that she was thinking about instructional needs involving sequences of courses. Morton replied by talking first about forms of articulation: one-to-one, one-to-many, many-to-one, many-to-many. He said this system is articulated "many-to-many". He said there were unresolved decisions here, and mentioned a "degree audit system."

Senator Chandler noted that the system sounds powerful. He asked then if it would be able to assist units like his own (LLEA) in matters such as placement requirements for courses in Spanish or Portuguese. Provost Morton said he appreciated the question, that a current task of those working on developing the system was "looking at the workflow", and he wondered about furthering the discussion via e-mail.

Senator Chaudron asked about the licensing period of the current contract. What protection if any had been built in to insure that it would work for, say, more than two years? It was here that Morton identified Oracle as the proprietor with whom UH was dealing. He said that the contract provided us with "access to sources codes"; he said it was "full source", complete, with perpetual license. The contract included a maintenance contract, and we are paying for continual improvement to the system. There are extensive warranties, and it is guaranteed that the system will run for 50,000 students.

The next question from the floor was a query concerning other schools who currently use this system. Morton mentioned Georgia, Oregon, Montana, Illinois, and Virginia Tech. He said that there were college systems (multi-campus) using this system. It is a development from the company that built ISIS, which "walked away from the University" in the previous experience -- but that "they've come a long way." They

now have 900 customers. There is a trade-off there: It is “not as easy to move the monolith” with so many other customers. Morton remains “reasonably comfortable” though.

The next question concerned capacity for “migrating current information into the system”. Morton answered Yes. Community college information now, and, he suspects, it will be the same for other campuses. Conversion routines are a part of the contract. When one considers data from the perspective of history, we are dealing with, he supposed, 335,000 people for the community colleges, and 75,000 of these involve some duplications.

Would the system be able to track things like the WI requirement/designation? Morton mentioned the Focus requirements being developed for the new curriculum. He said it was not only WI but the other three sets of requirements as well that needed to be handled. The problem at the moment is that something like WI may not be “an attribute of the course” but of particular sections of the course. That is something which will need to be tracked and moved as a matter of articulation. They are working to make it possible to do that, at the section level.

Would the system be useful for assessment? Morton asked first for clarification. Was the question about “student outcomes assessment”? He said it would be much easier in the future to generate reports, there would be much more information available, and this would be far more useful.

How soon would the system be available for this purpose? Beginning in Fall 2003, and, Provost Morton hazarded a guess, “within several months” of then. He said more than about the difference between “migrating snap-shot data” and capturing, storing, and moving data of a more dynamic sort.

The next question concerned a task force on on-line grading. Provost Morton said that UH would continue to mail out grades up to a certain point, and then intended to stop doing that. Deane Neubauer, he said, is asking why not move to that position sooner, or immediately, if the capacity is available now. Since this is already possible through PA'E and ISIS, the system might move that way in the short run. UH-Hilo has not mailed out grades for the past five years.

Question: Are you telling us that there really is “Heaven on Earth”? Well, replied Morton, there certainly still is Purgatory -- my everyday life. There are lots of little problems to be solved. A student's advisor has to be able to access records. There must be control over who can change these records. There is a great deal that goes into how we set it up, so that the right people can get the right information but not

violate the terms and conditions rightfully set. A bottom-line goal is that students will clearly be students of UH (belong to the entire system).

Question: Has Larry Ellison really given you this program without holding on to billing on a "per cpu basis"? Morton said that computer units were already coming, from SUN. There was a provision for higher cost if we were to need to develop the system beyond the contracted 50,000 student capacity.

Martha Crosby asked about security. Morton asked if she were asking about user security? network security? He gave an answer which was a bit too swiftly delivered for your secretary's computer-challenged understanding to follow -- but it was about what parts were "behind the firewall". He talked about user security, UH Unix, individuals and READ-access vs. WRITE-access. He said that PIN control would be used for web access.

Prof. Crosby asked if there would be any encryption option. Morton said that the system would make use of a common ID which would not be a person's social security number. He said that more information would be out soon on the web, and he invited communication through his e-mail, giving his address <jmorton@hawaii.edu>

Provost Morton was thanked with a spirited round of applause.

There being no further business at that point, the Senate adjourned. It was 4:20pm.