

## Minutes

Mānoa Faculty Senate  
Meeting of 8 May 2002  
Architecture Auditorium

There were fifty Senators who signed in: Paul Adams, Denise Antolini, Roger Babcock, Cristina Bacchilega, Elaine Bailey, Rhonda Black, Douglas Bomberger, Ronald Bontekoe, Kent Bridges, Glenn Cannon, Catherine Cavaletto, Paul Chandler, Rosita Chang, Craig Chaudron, Meda Chesney-Lind, Joanne Cooper, Thomas Craven, James Dator, Sandy Davis, Eric DeCarlo, Gert DeCouet, Nancy Dowling, Ernestine Enomoto, Carl Evensen, David Flynn, Michael Forman, Patsy Fujimoto, Pamela Fujita-Starck, Donna Fukuda, Jon Goss, Amelia Jenkins, Susan Johnson, Christine Kirk-Kuwaye, Karen Lee, Spencer Leineweber, Peter Manicas, Stacey Marlow, Jeanne Oka, Marvin Ortel, Robert Paull, Frank Sansone, Richard Schmidt, Gwen Sinclair, Brent Sipes, Wayne Smith, David Stegenga, Mary Tiles, Lynne Wilkens, Sylvia Yuen, and Halina Zaleski.

Six Senators were excused: Martha Crosby, Linda Duckworth, Merle Kataoka-Yahiro, Roberta Lamb, Jean Toyama, and Charles Weems.

Thirty-five Senators did not sign in and are considered to have been absent: Harriet Abe, Cathy Bell, Robert Bley-Vroman, G D Bryant-Greenwood, Lonny Carlile, Hong-Mei Chen, Katalin Csiszar, Charles Fletcher, Patricia Fryer, Michael Garcia, Robert Grace, Tony Guerrero, John Hardman, Emily Hawkins, Matt McGranaghan, John Melish, Marian Melish, Neal Milner, Roy Nishimoto, Jeffrey Okamoto, Joan Peters, Brian Popp, Damon Sakai, Michael Salzman, David Sanders, Irwin Schatz, Jane Schoonmaker, Dan Spears, John Stimson, Elizabeth Tam, Robert Valliant, Frank Walton, Kelley Withy, Lesley Wright, and Kate Zhou.

It should be noted that there were ninety Senators in all for this meeting; the newly-elected Senators attended along with the out-going Senators.

In addition, thirty-four others attended: President Evan Dobbelle, Interim Chancellor Deane Neubauer, Interim VCAA Karl Kim, and Bee Kooker, Lois Magnussen, Robert Anders, Emanuel Drechsel, Karen Jolly, Elaine Schultz, Sharon Ouchi, C Allday, Nancy Sack, Thomas Hilgers, David Ross, Tom Bopp, Kathy Ferguson, Paul Wessel, Agnes Fok, Ralph Moberly, Tom Ramsey, Ruth Horie, Sophia McMillen, Eric Guentner, Ron Brown, DeeDee Acosta, Martha Chantiny, William Sharkey, Hye-Ryeon Lee, Steve Martel, Ken Tokuno, Denise Konan, William Lampe, Kelly Aune, and David Sherrill.

1. The Senate was called to order by Chairm'am Cooper directly after the meeting of the Congress. It was a few minutes before 4pm.
2. The minutes of April 17 were approved by voice vote, with no nays, and with two abstentions.

3. Chair Cooper presented her Chair's Report:

3.1. Much has been accomplished this year. She spoke about the developments in the Chancellor's search, noting that two candidates would appear and speak on campus in two days. She said that the two were excellent candidates, and had been accepted unanimously by the search committee.

She then thanked the members: Allen Doane, Karen Jolly, Kathy Ferguson, Lori Ideta, Kris Kaupalolo, Mamo Kim, Edward Kuba, Joy Lewis-Kobashigawa, Noreen Mokuau, Walter Neimczura, Jane Schoonmaker, John Stimson, Martin Rayner and Chuck Hayes.

3.2. Much too had been accomplished by the Senate. GenEd had required a lot of hard work -- there would be more on this later in committee reports.

3.3. In the areas of governance and development of the strategic plan, again more accomplished. She noted Karl Kim who was passing out copies of the strategic plan draft. She thanked Karl and Denise Konan. She said that there had been "a million committees" staffed and participating, and she cited the fourteen hundred who participated in the Defining Our Destiny activity as "only symbolic of all the interest and involvement in the process."

3.4. She felt that hiring a new chancellor would be a great accomplishment.

3.5. She acknowledged the work of the various standing committees of the Senate, thanking them and noting that year-end reports would be given later in the meeting.

3.6. She thanked all Senators, outgoing and in-coming, and welcomed the new Senators.

3.7. She thanked Vice Chair Jim Dator for his support, especially in taking over work on the strategic plan -- Presenting him with a lei, she said it had been especially good to have a futurist in this task while she focused her efforts on the search committee. She acknowledged and thanked out-going SEC members (The three members ending their two-year stint of service on the SEC are Jim Dator, Sandy Davis, and Joanne Cooper). She reminded Senators that May 10 would be the deadline for voting on the new SEC members to replace those ending that service.

Chairm'am Cooper always opened SEC meetings with a joke. We SEC members thought she was about to tell another one. What she said was that she had been reminded of loggers in Coos Bay, working in splash dams where felled logs are contained and then released and floated down-river. The work required loggers at the mouth of the river who kept the logs from going on out to sea. They walked on the logs in their clogged boots, hooking the logs and tying them together. This might require twenty-four or even seventy-two hours of work. It was exhausting and dangerous. The logs just kept on coming down the river, and these loggers had to keep up their work steadily, throughout the night when necessary, to keep the logs from disappearing into the ocean. They carried flashlights to enable them to see what they were doing in the dark. As it happened, two men were working together one night. One fell into the river and found himself trapped underneath the log-raft which was made of the multitude of logs fastened together. He kept bumping along underneath this log raft, with nowhere to surface. He thought for sure he would die. Suddenly, he felt a strong hand grab his neck and haul him to the surface. It was his partner. "How the heck did you find me?", the grateful man asked. "You never let go of the damn flashlight," he replied. Well, said Chair Cooper, she didn't know what had tightened her grip on the flashlight, but she sure wanted to thank the team that had kept pulling her out all year long.

4. Professor Kathy Ferguson was introduced. Professor Ferguson wanted to present a new program proposal. Actually, she said, it was a revival of a program that had existed a few years

ago. The Faculty Ambassador Program had been created about four years ago, when Alex Malahoff was Chair of the Senate and Professor Ferguson was a member of the SEC with Alex. Forty-two faculty members had made faculty ambassador visits to seventy-two high schools (nearly all the schools in the state, less a few who had declared that they did not want visitors). There had been no assessment, other than word-of-mouth and anecdotal assessment, of the program. Many of the faculty participants were building on relationships which they had established earlier with these schools. These faculty ambassadors are not to be mistaken for recruiting officers. They don't know everything, and they are not expected to do recruiting. Instead they are "selling higher education."

Professor Ferguson said that there were a variety of ways of going about this: teaching a guest class was the way she selected. She modeled having the high school students in a college class. She selected a reading from Machiavelli, as something which made the students feel they might be in a college class. The trick was to select a reading which would be challenging, which would feel like college, but which would not be too difficult. Other ambassadors chose other ways of doing the work: some shared research projects, some assisted teachers with curricular matters, some served as mentors, some assisted counselors, etc. A serious effort was made to match particular faculty strengths and interests with school needs.

The program does require resources. The previous version died when that support was not forthcoming. When Professor Ferguson went on sabbatical, Mary Tiles and Martha Staff took it up for a year. Once the administration (Mortimer's) started saying no to student assistants, and the like, and when UHPA declared it not the sort of thing they did either, those involved gave it up.

Professor Ferguson felt there were two things crucial to institutionalize the program: one was to have it housed in the Senate (I believe "homed" was the word she used) and then a small budget.

SEC suggested that the Committee on Student Affairs would be a proper locus, and she had adopted that suggestion. She had approached CFO Wick Sloane and he had agreed to provide \$10,000. That, said Professor Ferguson, had been a lot easier than it had been before. She suggested that for a new beginning, this be operated on a year-to-year basis. Keep it going unless "No" got in the way.

One question from the floor was with regard to coordination with counselors and recruiters. Mary Tiles expressed the hope that that would be so. She asked about conversations with that part of the university. Professor Ferguson answered that she had not talked with them about reviving the program. She agreed that there was a need to work with them, and to refer people to them, not to attempt to do their jobs in any way but to support them. Joanne Cooper reiterated the SEC view that CSA was the right location. Mary Tiles agreed that it was a good place to try the institutionalization.

VOTE: Yes: 39; No: 1; Abstain: 0.

5. Committee Reports followed from the Senate's standing committees:

5.1. CAPP. Senator Jeanne Oka presented the first resolution: Resolution Relating to the Approval of a Pilot "FAST TRACK" BS Nursing Curriculum Option for Second Degree Candidates. People

were present from Nursing to answer questions. Senator Oka introduced Lois Magnussen, Bee Kooker, and Dean Robert Anders. A copy of the resolution was provided in the the meeting packet, and Senator Oka read it aloud and showed it on an overhead. She noted the “pilot” nature of the proposed program.

The first question concerned the cost. Why was \$18,700 needed per student? Bob Anders replied that the proposal did go to the Mānoa Faculty Senate. He said that the idea had been developed in response to President Dobbelle’s desire for a University response to the events of 9/11. He also mentioned discussions with Dr. (Karl) Kim and in the Mānoa Budget Committee.

The questioner asked: Why do we need this program? Is it justified, given the cost per student? Anders answered that currently a one-to-ten ratio of supervising teacher to students is a requirement for safety, hence the expense. Clinical classes were like that, they required additional faculty.

A second question: How long is this program to run? The answer: twelve to fifteen months.

Another question was with regard to the 1:10 ratio. Anders answered that the program could handle 10. Admitting 10 would lead to an increase of production, giving another 10.

The next question concerned the word “accelerated”. Anders explained that it refers to program content and time of delivery. What was normally delivered in fifteen weeks would now be delivered in ten weeks. The students would be full-time. The nursing shortage is part of what urges this on us. Many nurses are being hired from the mainland at present.

What percent of students trained here stay to serve in Hawai’i? Dr. Magnussen answered that 80% stay. She said there is competition for admission, that 90% of the student applicants are Hawai’i residents.

Senator Oka pointed out that CAPP had made a minor change in the fifth WHEREAS, for clarification.

VOTE: Yes: 32; No: 2; Abstain: 11.

5.2. Grading Policy Allowing Plus (+) and Minus (-). This was presented by Senator Craig Chaudron. The committee had given this a lot of thought, Senator Chaudron reported. Mike Garcia spearheaded the effort to assess campus opinion. A petition was circulated last Fall. An attempt was made to poll student opinion. An open-microphone forum was held at Campus Center (but was marred by poor attendance). There was a good exchange between proponents and opponents published in Ka Leo. There was a questionnaire-survey follow-up which sampled opinion further. The committee voted to support this resolution, not unanimously, but by majority.

It was noted that there was no F+ option provided. Senator Dowling noted that Hilo does not have D+ or D-, but that otherwise with this proposal we conform.

The first question, as discussion was called for, concerned the A+. What was the rationale for not rewarding the A+ numerically, i.e., with more than 4.0? Senator Chaudron said that other programs do not give numbers higher than 4.0. Senator Chandler added that the A+ would show on a transcript, and that was thought reward enough. Chaudron noted that many medical schools do not admit any student with grades below 4.0.

Senator Zaleski talked about need being driven by grade inflation. She was concerned about loss of distinction. Senator Chaudron acknowledged that there is grade inflation. He referred to data made available by Colleen Sathre. Senator Chandler said he thought this change would have the effect of lowering grades somewhat, that grade point averages would go down.

A question from the floor requested evidence. Senator Chaudron said there was none, but he cited information from Ken Tokuno to the effect that a decimal system did not bring averages down; it in fact contributed to their rise.

Karl Kim asked if this was to apply to both graduate and undergraduate grades. Chaudron said Yes. Chaudron indicated that "the graduate director was highly in favor" of this change, and that his Department of Second Language Studies had been using such grades internally for a long time.

Ken Tokuno said that at Ball State, A- increased over A in frequency of grades given.

Senator Paul Adams asked about the impact of grading systems on student learning. Chaudron said that the committee could not address that. It would have required year-long research; much of what the committee says has to be impressionistic.

Senator Dowling said she wanted to emphasize that what was being presented was an option. Anyone who so desired could still give A or B or C or D or F without plus or minus. She felt that this was desirable for graduate student grading.

Senator Chaudron urged faculty to withstand any pressure from colleagues, or from students saying that you should do what others do. He said that Department Chairs and Deans should support faculty decisions.

An observation (Adams again? Zaleski?) was that the existence of both options would make it difficult to assess the effect of the change. We could never know for sure.

Chaudron agreed, saying that unfortunately we could not do experiments on this. The proposal, he reiterated, allows faculty to choose, without imposing any requirements. He noted that we would also be busy assessing General Education.

A comment was offered to the effect that this was a step toward numerical scores. Chaudron said that we might think of ourselves as "on a little path in history."

Senator Adams said that this was his first meeting and his first year on the faculty, but that his last position offered him some perspective on the question at hand. He said that student organizations

at his last post had opposed the plus/minus option. The medical school there used no grading at all. The law school graded only because top law firms demanded information on rank order in graduating classes. Adams argued against the proposal, saying that students did less well when graded, that grading devalued the intrinsic worth of the task. Students would select easier tasks in quest of higher grades. Adams felt that a certain "spurious objectivity" was presented about grading. He advocated the portfolio system, or, short of that fewer options were better. Perhaps just A or I. This, he said, was a move in exactly the wrong direction.

Senator Bontekoe identified himself as "one of the originators." The motivation, he said, was not to fight grade inflation but to do justice by student performance. He felt the proposal comes closer to doing so. Our grades, he said, cover such a wide range of performance now.

Senator Goss reported that the majority approving was "a very small majority." He said that 57% of those surveyed approved; 53% of the undergraduates were opposed. He wanted "majority" to be treated with caution. He said he was not sure that we had done enough research on this. He would like to know more about impact. From the point of view of administration and records, it was possible that this proposal was still premature. He said he felt the proposal needs several more months of work.

Senator Chaudron accepted what he called "points well taken." The word "majority" was being used vaguely. Approximately fifty faculty members had been surveyed, and a bit under 60% of these were in favor. Several hundreds of undergraduates had expressed opposition, or a "tendency to be against."

Senator Bacchilega asked if someone could summarize the students' objections. Senator Chaudron said that they had not really been studied. He thought most were saying something like: What's so bad about the present?

Senator Sansone said we were running out of time; he asked if we could vote on the question.

VOTE: Yes: 27; No: 14; Abstain: 4.

Senator Chaudron announced that the third CAPP resolution would not be brought forth at this time, as the committee felt it was not ready.

CAPP's year-end report was available to be read, in the meeting packet, said Chaudron.

CAB -- Senator Mary Tiles said that there was a short report in the packet. She offered to take questions, but there were none.

There was no report from the Committee on Student Affairs. The committee had not been active. Senator Tom Craven reported for the Committee on Professional Matters. He presented a written report, but wanted to add that the last meeting's minutes revealed a problem of concern to CPM: attendance at Senate meetings. Absenteeism was a problem which called for further discussion. He added, especially for the benefit of new Senators, that one should call or e-mail Charlotte Mitsutani at the Senate Office ( 67725, fax 69813 or <mitsutan@hawaii.edu> ) to be excused when unable to attend.

Committee on Athletics -- Senator Carl Evensen said that a one-page summary was available. He spoke of "successes on the field" and said that there had been lots of changes, much soul-searching. The primary responsibility remained to the integrating of athletics and academics. Two major things he wanted to bring up:

(1) an on-going self-study report for NCAA was on-going. The Senate committee members had been drafted to serve on four subcommittees for this report: governance and rules; fiscal integrity and academic integrity; equity, welfare, and sportsmanship. Also within the area of this self-study, there had been no corrections necessary, with thirteen recommendations for action -- the finding was that appropriate actions had been taken during the past five years; appropriate control was being exercised over all revenue sources; in the area of gender and minority equity issues, action had been taken and there was a new five-year gender equity plan; apparently we were making good progress in matters including equity, funding, facilities; coaches' salaries, winning seasons; academic supports and advising showed fairly positive trends.

(2) Knight Foundation Commission Report, "Academics First", concerned with commercialization of college athletics, made a call for a serious examination at this as a possible problem. Southern Methodist University had sent a request to the Senate (reported at the December meeting of the Senate). The Committee on Athletics feels that our program is in relatively good condition and the committee did not want to be discouraging in any way. The program is nearly self-supporting, utilizing less than 10% for G-funds, and this mostly in the area of custodians and grounds; the graduation rate of athletes is very good, superior to that of the general student body; and with respect to grade-point averages, athletes have improved to 2.5 or higher overall.

A motion was presented, to the effect that the Senate accept the report, endorse it, and recommend sending a letter explaining our position to SMU.

VOTE: Yes: 30; No: 0; Abstain: 1.

Senator Rhonda Black reported for the Committee on Faculty Service. This has been an extraordinarily busy committee this year. The CFS has found committee members from the faculty for six standing committees, eighteen new committees, five major search committees, twelve other standing committees, and one other which is hard to group with those above: a special committee identifying excellence in buildings and grounds. Moreover Senator Black inherited this committee in mid-year (due to the serious illness of Senator Emily Hawkins' husband). She said that the bottom line was that there had been a great increase in service load and a great increase in faculty involvement. Applause followed.

Another opportunity for faculty service arose immediately:

There was an announcement that on 16 May there would be meetings on "branding", that focus groups would meet in Bachman 113 to discuss 'What's in a name?', and Senators who could were invited to join these discussion groups. Karl Kim said he would like to have ten to twelve in each group, and that one could call Karl's office, or Phil Kennicutt (?) to sign up.

Other volunteers are needed for yet more committees. The Deans-Search structure is another area where there are opportunities to serve.

Senator Brent Sipes received applause as he was introduced to give the GEC report. He noted that the Senate had, in December 1999, gotten the GEC work started. In February 2001, the Senate had heard a major report on progress to date. Many new options have been created toward making graduation possible in a reasonable amount of time. From once 220 to now 1873, the number of options has grown dramatically.

Issues remaining include problems of articulation, assessment, mentoring and information about integration of the new possibilities with the requirements of majors. These are matters the Committee has just taken up, or will get to soon.

Senator Sipes also offered his thanks to all who served. He mentioned those who served on the GEC and also all those who served on the separate boards. He said he wanted to “apologize for all the problems the committee had given the SEC.” He was applauded for his efforts.

There being no other business, the Senate adjourned at 5:10pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael L Forman  
Secretary of the Mānoa Faculty Senate