Minutes

UHM Faculty Senate
Meeting of September 18, 2002
Wm S Richardson School of Law, Classroom 2

Present:

Excused
Patricia Fryer, Tony Guerrero, Susan Johnson, Roberta Lamb, Stacey Marlow, Irwin Schatz, Mary Tiles,

Absent:
H. Gert DeCouet, Robert Grace, John Melish, Neal Milner, Jeffrey Okamoto, Dan Spears

Others in Attendance:
David Duffy, Sandy Davis, Tom Bopp, Emily Hawkins, Peter Manicas, Jim Tiles, Denise Konan, Helene Sokugawa, Alison Conner, Hye-ryeon Lee, Wendy Pearson, Joe O’Mealy, Ken Kipnis, Larry Foster, Joanne Cooper, Emanuel Drechsel, Sarita Rai, Jim Manke, Jean Imada.

1. The Senate was called to order by Senate Chair Michael Forman who introduced the members of the current SEC (Denise Antolini, Meda Chesney-Lind, Martha Crosby,
David Flynn, Mary Tiles, and Frank Sansone). He further announced that the Vice-Chair of the Senate is Mary Tiles; the Secretary of the SEC is Frank Sansone, that Denise Antolini is the parliamentarian, and that Meda Chesney-Lind is the Secretary of the Senate.

2. The minutes of May 8, 2002 were approved by a unanimous vote.

3. Peter Englert, Chancellor, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa then addressed the group. Initially, he noted that the Academic Senate had been instrumental in re-establishing the Chancellor’s Office after a fifteen-year hiatus.

He then took the opportunity to go into a couple of issues with the faculty senate: the need for a student focus, the role of UHM as a research university, his proposal to expand the consultative process, and the importance of a research / teaching interface.

STUDENT FOCUS. Chancellor Englert felt that it is essential to retain our focus on students. “They are the reason we are here.” He felt strongly that it is the responsibility of faculty to provide positive support for students. “Faculty should be recognized as the first knowledgeable point of contact for our students.” Chancellor Englert felt that there was a need to engage students in the educational process “in the first two years,” and mentioned that currently, students widely perceive that they will only meet senior faculty in their last two years.

RESEARCH: Chancellor Englert noted that UHM is “a world class institution.” Many of the faculty have outstanding reputations. Chancellor Englert disputes the Newsweek ranking. Specifically, he noted that the research enterprise is growing. We saw a 70% gain in the last year in research funds (with these increasing from $135 million to $252 million. Grants $168 million come in as “pure” research income. Research income, though, is concentrated in certain parts of the campus (and not in others). Because of this, growing the research enterprise will require strategic investment decisions and “we need to make these decisions as a campus.”

RESEARCH AND TEACHING: Chancellor Englert felt that our way of teaching must reflect our special identity as a research campus. “Our students need to experience the excitement of research” We need to make sure it happens. How does this come about?

CONSULTATIVE PROCESS
Chancellor Englert observed that, in order to be successful, we must be consultative, and that process must be transparent and outcome oriented. Here, he contends, there is “room for improvement on the management side.” He noted that he meets regularly
with SEC, and that his senior administrators will also meet with other relevant groups. He also noted that the Faculty Senate chair meets with his Senior Management Team. Finally, he is preparing a paper that will revise the composition of that group to include some deans and directors. Chancellor Englert noted that he aimed to be “personally accessible as well.”

STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS:
Chancellor Englert noted that this process was “about to come to an end.” A product of many conversations, the BOR will likely approve the plan at its November meeting. He further noted that we will use the new consultative processes to implement the plan. “What distinguishes successful and unsuccessful plans is implementation of strategic goals.” Many of the goals will take time and the implementation process will be a process that “everybody buys into.”

SCHOLARSHIP
Chancellor Englert then discussed research and scholarship. He noted that it is necessary for the campus to have had many conversations about what research and scholarship actually means. “It would be valuable to have a debate about the types of scholarship that we have in our various disciplines.” “My thought is that this may bring about a clearer notion of what excellence constitutes across disciplines” to ensure “equity.”

GENERAL REMARKS:
Finally, Chancellor Englert wanted to explain why he found “this position [Chancellor of UHM] so attractive.” It was very attractive because we the faculty wanted this position and we were intimately involved in the selection process. Chancellor Englert felt personally that the faculty wanted him to join this campus. Other factors included President Dobelle’s leadership. He also noted that the Strategic Plan suggests a willingness to change. Finally, he noted that he is “still touched by the strength and dignity of the welcome the first day.”

Questions:
Ken Kipnis mentioned the importance of student focus, and specifically suggested that the absence of single administrative office responsible for undergraduate education was one possible cause. Chancellor Englert commented that he “has been thinking about this.” He was aware that there had been some discussion of a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, but that he “would like to have a Vice Chancellor” to bring him issues of undergraduate education. In conclusion, he felt that the topic was “too important” to not warrant a Vice-Chancellor.

Katalin Csiszar asked about the RTRF process. Chancellor Englert replied that he has
been “engaged in a process of consultation on this issue.” Discussion will begin with Deans and Directors, and then he will consult with the Principal Investigators, as well as graduate and undergraduate student groups. The goal: to make more funds available in support of research efforts. Issue here is complex, but the goal is to bring research monies to enhance the entire research enterprise.

Luciano Minerbi asked a question about the various types of scholarship. Chancellor Englert “is still struggling” with the concepts as defined by Boyer. He felt there is a need to discuss these various types on the campus.

Ron Bontekoe asked about the recruitment of mainland and foreign students. Chancellor Englert noted that there were several aspects of issue, many revolving around the issue of “diversity.” He noted that UHM is possessed of a “unique” cultural diversity and has a great deal to offer students because of this strength. However, he felt that “we don’t have the infrastructure” right now that we need to support students.

Robert Paull asked about Chancellor Englert’s thoughts on specific definitions of scholarship. He was particularly concerned about a campus-wide definition, since “we’ve spent a lot of time discussing this in our college.” Chancellor Englert responded that he has not yet decided how this would interface with departments’ definitions. He did observe that they have already had the debate, which is good and would likely make Paull’s college a model for the rest of the campus.

Someone asked about the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Chancellor Englert said that the new consultation process will interface with the implementation of the strategic plan and is critical to its success. He stressed that there will be “more opportunities for input than simply through chair and dean.” He specifically noted the “danger of unattended issues.”

Joanne Cooper said that she was hearing that there may be several chancellors for community colleges and she wondered about his reaction to that possibility. Chancellor Englert said that he could “not comment on this directly” but acknowledged that UH senior administration is discussing system administrative structure. However, he was confident that by virtue of the “strength” of UHM, “it will be well represented” in whatever structure emerges.

3. Chair’s Report
Mike Forman noted that Joanne Cooper is an ex-officio member of the Senate as a former Chair. He also introduced himself, and corrected the error in the published agenda. Chair Forman noted that the SEC had been extremely busy this summer. We continued to monitor the change-over in administration. We were sorry to lose Jane Schoonmaker
from the GEC; happy to report that Jeanne Oka has agreed to be the Chair. Jean Toyama was replaced by David Flynn as a member of the SEC. He further noted that the work of the senate is done in sub-committees that meet during the regular school year, but that very infrequently, the SEC may act in the Senate’s stead. Specifically, the SEC acted for the Senate in approval of the College of Education Re-organization over the summer. There were a number of questions that CAPP had with the original proposal at the end of the school year. These were addressed by the College of Education, and the revised proposal was approved by the SEC (after discussion with the Dean and his staff) since we were persuaded that time was of the essence. Other re-organization proposals (from JABSOM) were held until CAPP could review them.

4. Resolutions
Committee on Academic Programs and Planning

Resolution Relating to Concurrent Degrees
Jeanne Oka presented the resolution.

Matt McGranaghan asked why we have a policy that says a student cannot do this. Oka responded that we have a policy that permits this in only certain sectors of the campus (notably Arts and Sciences and the College of Business Administration).

Jim Skouge asked about the “down side.” Jeanne Oka noted that there were only a few students doing this, and that she and the committee were aware of “no other downside.” Karen Lee noted that “excellent students are drawn to this.”

Tom Bopp asked about grade point average required. Jeanne Oka noted that it's up to the college and clarified that grade point average is an entrance, not exit, requirement.

In favor: 51
Opposed: 0
abstain: 0
Motion Passed.

Resolution Relating to LL.M for Foreign Law Professionals
Jeanne Oka read the resolution.
Discussion followed:
Alison Conner and Larry Foster, Law said that they were available for questions. Douglas Bomberger questioned the notion that the new degree entailed “no new costs.” Alison Conner said that the program entailed “a new course,” but that there is no cost because “we don't have to hire faculty.” The program “will be taught by members of the existing faculty.”
Chancellor Englert raised a question to Dean Foster re: retention of revenue for the new program in the law school. He was specifically interested in how the law school had persuaded the previous administration. Foster replied that “there continues to be a discussion about this situation.”

Ron Bontekoe had a question about the revenue/workload. Would the School be introducing other courses? Alison Conner said it was possible depending on the interests of the student. “Many have practical and commercial interests.” The program will be small.

Matt McGranaghan asked how many people participating. Conner replied that the goal was 10-15 per year. McGranaghan was still trying to “clarify revenue cost.” How will the courses be taught? Are faculty getting overload? Conner replied that the Director will receive a one course reduction and there will be a new APT hired.

Spencer Leineweber asked about ABA requirements? Larry Foster responded that ABA accredits the JD degree. They typically “acquiesce” to an LLM simply reviewing the program to be assured it does not “negatively impact” the JD degree. Monday the school will have that ABA site visit.

Luciano Minerbi asked what the admission requirements are since it is only a one-year program. Conner noted that the program is designed “solely for foreign law professionals.” Two kinds of LLM programs (specialized kind); generic law degree for American law. Currently, we are too small for a specialized LLM.

Robert Bley-Vroman asked about revenue returned to unit. Larry Foster said that it is his understanding that Executive MBA program got this revenue return as well. Somebody asked whether the law school anticipated other LLM programs? Larry Foster said long range that there are possible areas of LLM speciality (such as environmental law).

Helena Zaleski asked “what do the students who take this get”? What do they use it for? Alison Conner said it has cultural as well as practical significance. Legal practice has become internationalized, and frequently US Law is often the standard in international areas.

Charlie Weems suggested that the revenue return set “a dangerous precedent.” He was specifically concerned about the precedent of returning the monies to the graduate program.
Charlie Weems moved to amend by deleting the section in support of revenue return from the resolution. Robert Paull seconded the motion.

Peter Englert supported the amendment. Larry Foster suggested he was “very comfortable with the language being removed from the resolution.”

Vote on the amendment:
Favor: 47
Opposed: 3
Abstain: 3

The Question was then called:
In favor of calling the question:
For: 35
Opposed: 6
Abstain: 6

Vote on the main resolution with the amendment
For: 48
Opposed: 1
Abstain: 3

Resolution passed with the deletion.

Committee on Administration and Budget

Resolution in Support of the Draft Mānoa Strategic Plan

Robert Bley-Vroman introduced resolution.

Discussion:

Denise Konan introduced herself and said that she was happy to discuss the Strategic Plan and the process. She noted that the administration had tried to respond to suggestions of UHMFS (the revised Strategic Plan was circulated to the Senate in the meeting). Konan called specific attention to the changes on page 4 where graduate education was added, to pg 7, concern about high caliber student body where they dropped the mention of enrollment management system. Finally, on page 11, which had said we would “establish a film school,” the administration concurs that this proposal needs to go through the formal approval process. The plan now reads that we will
“evaluate a film school.” While this could be read to suggest that the evaluation process could be eight years in length (which seems foolish), all in the administration agree but it is a fair point that new initiatives need to be fully reviewed.

Bley-Vroman commended the very quick response of the UHM.

Paul Adams commented that since the UHM administration already addressed the CAB concerns, he suggested a friendly amendment to delete all UHMFS reservations about the previous draft.

Robert Paull suggested that if we added a date to the resolution based on the date of the Strategic Plan draft, that that would be sufficient.

Martha Crosby noted that it may be important to keep a record of the initial concerns of the Senate “for the record.”

Joan Peters noted that she has had a problem with a plan is specific in only certain areas (e.g. film school and honors college), and vague in others. Liz Tam thanked Karl Kim and Denise Konan for their hard work. Liz Tam noted the deletion of safety and health matters from the Strategic Plan.

Mike Forman noted that the discussion was beginning to move away from speaking to amendment.

Frank Sansone moved that we insert the date that CAB met to discuss the draft Strategic Plan.

Joan Peters seconded.

David Sanders from Astronomy asked for Peter Englert ‘s reactions?.

Chancellor Englert wanted to have a series of discussions on the Strategic Plan. He plans to discuss the plan with the Steering Committee. He feels it is important to have lots of checks and balances.

David Sanders had pushed for the inclusion of graduate education. Peter Englert noted that the process of consultation is very important.

Paul Adams withdrew his amendment
Frank Sansone suggested addition of 9/11 , insert "dated September 11” after 2010. in the existing resolution.
Matt McGranaghan noted that we are saying that we endorse the Strategic Plan.

Jeanne Oka was wondering if you put in the date then it doesn't recognize the work the administration has done to address these concerns.

Helina Zalinsiki noted a concern that page 3 doesn't mention graduate education.

Frank Sansone withdrew his amendment.

Denise Antolini suggested that we do want to have a vote on the new draft.

Chancellor Englert stressed again the importance of the senate vote on the Strategic Plan.

Joan Peters said that there are more concerns than the three mentioned. She suggested we should approve the document as a whole, and then get specific concerns passed on to the administration since they have been responsive in the past to specific suggestions.

Ron Bontekoe is looking for clarification on what the benchmarks mean.

Denise Konan said that the benchmarks are giving us a measurable indicator of success. Not goals, but indicators.

Charlie Weems called the question:

For: 38
Against: 3
Abstain: 0

The vote then proceeded on the original resolution vote offered by CAB
For: 41
Against: 1
Abstain: 0

5. Other Business:
Glenn Cannon noted that the film school process will be dealt with as required. He noted there is a great deal of talk about this matter, and it will continue.

Charlie Weems suggested that the revenue issue in the current MBA graduate program also needs to be addressed. Mike Forman said that that CAB and CAPP would follow
up on that matter.

Charlie Weems moved to adjourn. Motion passed on a voice vote, and the meeting adjourned at 5:10pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Meda Chesney-Lind
Secretary of the Mānoa Faculty Senate
Resolution Relating to the Approval of an LL.M. (Legum Magister—Master in Law) for Foreign Law Professionals at the William S. Richardson School of Law

Whereas, an LL.M. (Legum Magister—second degree in law at the master’s level) for foreign law professionals can enhance the international reputation of the UHM School of Law, and can provide an opportunity for faculty, staff and students to interact with foreign-trained law professionals; and

Whereas, it is anticipated that the majority of the students interested in enrolling in this proposed program will be law professionals from the Asia-Pacific area, a focus that conforms to the UHM Strategic Plan; and

Whereas, the proposed LL.M. degree will be a general introduction to American law with an individualized curriculum totaling 24 credits within a nine-month period; and

Whereas, LL.M. students will enroll in regular courses already offered by the Law School, so that no additional faculty costs are anticipated; and

Whereas, the proposed LL.M. degree will be comparable to similar programs offered at other US law schools and will include a required 2-3 week pre-program introducing the US legal system; and

Whereas, the LL.M. Program will be administered by an existing full-time law school faculty member who will serve as director of the program, as required by the American Bar Association (ABA), and a new assistant director (APT position); and

Whereas, all applicants will have a first degree in law or sufficient knowledge of law (e.g. through licensing in their home countries), and will be required to demonstrate competency in English; and

Whereas, the proposed LL.M. Program conforms to the ABA Standard 307 in that the additional program does not detract from the existing JD program and teaching resources are not to be diverted from the JD program; and

Whereas, assessment procedures for the LL.M. Program will include the number of graduates, grade point averages, and exit surveys; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Mānoa Faculty Senate recommends that the proposal to offer an LL.M. for foreign law professionals at the William S. Richardson School of Law be approved.
Resolution Relating to UH Mānoa Policy on
Concurrent Undergraduate Degrees

Whereas, current policy states that students cannot seek concurrent undergraduate
degrees in two different schools/colleges unless one of the colleges is the College of Arts
and Sciences or Business Administration; and

Whereas, the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at UH Mānoa sees no reason
to restrict students from seeking concurrent undergraduate degrees; and

Whereas, the Academic Procedures Committee (a joint committee of representatives of
academic affairs from each college and Student Affairs) has reviewed the current policy
and finds no compelling reason to restrict students from this pursuit; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Mānoa Faculty Senate recommends that the current policy be
changed to permit students at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa to seek concurrent
undergraduate degrees in any two different schools/colleges subject to admission
approval by both schools/colleges.
Resolution in Support of Draft Mānoa Strategic Plan

Whereas the document entitled "University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Strategic Plan 2002-2010" has been the subject of considerable consultation and has received input from many sources, through an extended process of review, and

Whereas this document is of value as a synthesis of the results of that process, as a statement of our shared concept of the University, and as a guide to Mānoa’s future,

Therefore be it resolved:

That the Mānoa Faculty Senate endorses the document entitled "Strategic Plan 2002-2010" with the following recommendations:

1. That there be a clearer indication of a commitment to recruiting and admitting high quality undergraduate students.

2. That graduate education be given greater prominence in the document, for instance by using the phrase "research and graduate education" rather than "research" in cases where this is appropriate, such as in the heading of the relevant “core commitment.”

3. That the document explicitly acknowledge the fact that proposals which have academic programmatic consequences are subject to established review procedures. In particular, the establishment of a film school, listed as a strategic priority under Culture, Society, and the Arts, will be subject to such review procedures.