Minutes

UHM Faculty Senate
Meeting of November 20, 2002
Wm S Richardson School of Law, Classroom 2

Present:

Excused
James Cowen, Tony Guerrero, Stacey Marlow, Jane Schoonmaker,

Absent:
Douglas Bomberger, Katalin Csiszar, Patricia Fryer, Susan Johnson, John Melish, Neal Milner, Jeffrey Okamoto, David Sanders, Irwin Schatz, Richard Schmidt, Elizabeth Tam

Others in Attendance:
Roseann Harrigan, Bev Creamer, Jim Manke, Richard Guillary, Sandy Davis, Ron Cambra, Denise Konan, Bill Lampe, Sarita Rai, Paul Costello, Joanne Clarke, Barry John Baker, Emanuel Drechsel, Karl Kim, Stephen Martin, Haunani Martin

Chair Mike Forman called the meeting to order at approximately 3:05

AGENDA

1. Minutes:
The minutes of October 16, 2002 were approved as corrected by voice vote with one abstention.
2. Chair's Report
Mike Forman reported that he continues to be very busy. He attends the University Community Partnership. He attends the MMT, the Deans and Directors Meeting, the All Campus Council of Chairs, and others too numerous to mention. He also talks to the press on various issues. He also attended a meeting on branding. Since those topics will be discussed in substance during the meeting, specific questions can be addressed directly to him at his email forman@hawaii.edu

3. Resolutions

CPM - Academic Freedom

Chair Lynne Wilkens asked that the audience look to the resolution on academic freedom at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. What the committee found was that the UHM Faculty Senate has never passed a specific policy on academic freedom. For those covered by the UHPA contract, there are strong protections and a mechanism for resolving problems. The Strategic Plan mentions academic freedom, but there is no specific mechanism for resolving problems should they arise.

The resolution was read by Chair Wilkens.

Discussion:

Ron Bontekoe asked if Lynne Wilkens could briefly relate the details of the case that created the need for this resolution.

Lynne Wilkens: The Conklin case caused this to occur. Initially, a course taught by Dr. Conklin was cancelled because of threats, but subsequently, the course was run. It is not clear if not for credit classes are covered in this resolution, but this policy does attempt to address the issue in the last statement. The committee concluded that there should be a specific administrative procedure to address problems of academic freedom. Currently, there is no procedure for handling such matters as arose in the Conklin situation. The resolution defines academic freedom, attaches both rights and responsibilities to the faculty member, and then suggests the administration develop a procedure to handle academic freedom violations.

Meda Chesney-Lind noted that the Workplace Violence Policy should also have been triggered in this instance and that also failed to occur.

Mike Forman added that the issues have been separated. He stated further that the SEC felt that there may have been a breakdown in that area as well since the threats described appeared to be terroristic threatening.

Paul Chandler asked where this leaves Graduate Teaching Assistants?
Lynne Wilkens replied that they tried to leave open the issue of who was a “faculty member.” If someone who has responsibility for a course, then they are covered. However, there are certain folks like a course facilitator who is an APT would not be covered by this policy.

Luciano Minerbi said that the statement is good, but there are some courses where there is joint decision making.

Lynne Wilkens noted that she thought that the law recognizes academic freedom for those who run their own classes, including graduate students, since they are functioning as faculty.

Joan Peters said that graduate students should be covered by the policy, but she wondered about other sorts of anomalous positions.

Lynne Wilkens responded that if they are teachers in training they may not be covered by this policy since they are being supervised by another faculty member.

Joe Cohn asked if the policy covers both faculty as perpetrators and victims academic freedom violations.

Lynne Wilkens answered that yes, both instances should be covered.

Rhonda Black asked for clarification about the specific administration action required by the resolution.

Lynne Wilkens discussed the need for the administration to develop and implement a plan for handling all perceived violations involving all faculty on the campus.

Matt McGranaghan asked about situations that the statement doesn’t cover like a seminar series or visiting scholars.

Lynne Wilkens said that academic freedom is attached to the faculty member.

Matt McGranaghan said his discomfort is that this seems hedged and not particularly idealistic.

Lynne Wilkens responded that all policies attach responsibility to rights. What would you change?

Matt McGranaghan commented that he does not know what “undo restrictions” means.

David Flynn noted that the library ratified a statement on intellectual freedom. Shouldn’t this include librarians?
Lynne Wilkens said that it does since librarians are faculty. She accepted a friendly amendment to re-word the last sentence to specifically include specialists.

Kathy Cavaletto asked about extension agents.

Lynne Wilkens suggested a re-wording that would use the phrase “all faculty” in the last sentence would help clarify both these situations.

Ron Bontekoe said that speakers aren’t covered.

Lynne Wilkens said that the policy would need to be re-worked to extend this right to non-faculty.

Mary Tiles said that it might be difficult to include them since we have very little control over them.

Ron Bontekoe said that what if there is a protest about some speaker?

Mary Tiles said that there are two policies for that reason. If a group protesting a speaker committed a criminal act, then the workplace violence policy would cover that circumstance.

Bill Lampe argued that the issue has been addressed since speakers invited by faculty are in a sense connected of the inviter. In that instance, academic freedom is attached.

Luciano Minerbi is concerned that the focus on research that might limit the applicability to the arts.

Lynne Wilkens said that the policy is intended to cover art. The “meaningful pursuit of knowledge” includes the arts.

Question was called

For: 41
Against: 1
Abstain: 1

Vote on the amended resolution.

F: 48
Against: 0
Abstain: 2
CAPP - JABSOM reorganization

Gert DeCouet presented the resolution on the reorganization of the medical school. He noted that CAPP had addressed specific concerns about the need for continued support for teaching undergraduate teaching. No extra resources are needed beyond those that have already been given to the Dean of the Medical School when he was hired. Finally, the current proposal has the support of the Dean of Natural Sciences.

Discussion:

Luciano Minerbi asked to clarify the six departments that are going to be amalgamated. Sam Shomaker listed the departments that would be amalgamated. None of these would impact degrees nor undergraduate course offerings according to Shomaker.

Charlie Weems asked about two items in the resolution (5 and 12) which appear to be in conflict. The first says no additional resources would be required and the second mentions the increased resources given to JABSOM. Appear to be in conflict.

Sam Shomaker said that we lost 30 positions in the basic sciences. Unfortunately, even though he was a good negotiator, the Dean was not able to get replacements for all of those. “We are probably getting 15 positions back, so each new department will have about 10 positions.” The clinical departments that are being proposed will have only a few G funded positions; the rest will be soft-money.

Charlie Weems asked about the rationale of combining pharmacology and tropical medicine.

Shomaker said that they were trying to make all the departments about the same size. Further, it was the choice of the faculty involved.

Charlie said that the fit is odd.

Shomaker thought that both the departments were in good positions to get extramural funds given the current state of political affairs.

Charlie Weems asked about other amalgamations.

Sam Shomaker said that they considered a host of different options, but this fits with the current recruiting strategy.

Roger Babcock says that item 12 contains a proviso to continue present undergraduate offerings, but it doesn’t appear that the guarantee is binding. It’s a conditional endorsement.

Shomaker said that conversations with Dean Hayes have an agreement to negotiate a mutually acceptable resolution to any future course reductions.
Paul Chandler said that the committee was concerned about the impact of the move on student access to undergraduate enrollment.

Richard Guillary asked if CAPP had considered the impact to graduate programs? You are going to lose three graduate programs.

Gert DeCouet said that a new inter-disciplinary graduate program has been formed. “We are aware of the situation.” With one exception, the faculty were supportive of the new structure. Some faculty were in favor of only one department.

Richard Guillory expressed concern about the graduate programs that will disappear.

Shomaker said that the physiology program is still operating. Biochemistry and Pharmacology were stopped out some years ago.

Guillory said that the proposal did not include any impact on graduate programs.

Shomaker responded that the document is a reaction to the status quo.

Guillory reiterated his concern about the impact.

Rebecca Cann said that the medical school faculty faced the reality that the old labels have ceased to have significance. We hope to offer the graduate students meaningful training.

Bill Lampe asked if there was anything barring the hosting of a particular graduate program.

Shomaker says this does not impact any existing academic program.

Roger Babcock suggested a rewording of item twelve to add in since to replace provide; friendly amendment accepted and included in approved version.

For: 45
Against: 2
Abstain:3

CAB – Classified Research

Robert Bley-Vroman presented Classified Research Resolution

CAB suggests that proviso that classified research not be conducted on campus.
Eric DeCarlo from Oceanography asked why classified research should not be on campus.

Robert Bley-Vroman replied that previous senates prohibited classified research on campus. Could also be referred to CPM.

Mike Saltzman asked what issues created the problem.

Robert Bley-Vroman said the issue was producing research that would NEVER be public.

Frank Sansone mentioned the history on these issues. He noted that “obviously this is a bit of a political issue.” Most universities resolve this by having two separate facilities. The issue, now, is the Maui Super Computer. One way out of this is to allow classified research, but not on campus. He continued that he believes that a majority of campuses allow classified research on off campus sites.

Ron Bontekoe asked about the BOR policy.

Robert Bley-Vroman said the policy addresses three kinds of research: classified, proprietary and publication restricted research.

Frank Sansone mentioned that there is an oversight body for classified research; President Mortimer changed the composition of this committee to remove all academic leaders. This composition has been changed as a result of faculty senate resolutions to include an academic leader.

Luciano Minerbi noted that it is difficult to vote on this issue without seeing the BOR policies in front of us. The concern should also address UH form 5 which is intimidating.

Bob Paull said that he isn’t concerned with faculty doing classified research, but he is concerned about graduate students who have less choice. This may restrict their ability to complete their degree.

Robert Bley-Vroman said that the box is the problem of the inconsistency of existing policy. In principle, existing policy would give you the choice.

Minerbi noted the box is coercive.

Eric DeCarlo noted that graduate students would not be harmed since the thesis is not considered true publications.

Robert Paull said they can still be cited.
Paul Adams said that we are being asked to approve a policy that we don’t have in front of us.

Roger Babcock noted that the committee process requires trust that the subcommittees are doing their job.

Ron Bontekoe noted that in this situation, the matter is complicated, since the senate is both approving a policy and amending it. Yet the faculty can’t see the policy being discussed.

Amelia Jenkins asked about the proposed BOR status? Where does it stand?

Frank Sansone said the Vice President for Research has developed it. It is at the senate.

Question:
For: 48
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion to postpone:
For: 44
Against: 1
Abstain: 3

Resolution on Re-Organization

Robert Bley-Vroman introduced the draft resolution that CAB has submitted regarding the proposed re-organization of the President’s Office. The resolution expresses the strong sentiment that such proposals must be presented to the Senate for review. This was not done in the case of the proposed re-organization. Hence, the resolution to censure the system administration.

Robert Bley-Vroman said that over the past couple of weeks the CAB has been working intensively to avoid a rift between the administration and the faculty.

This morning CAB and SEC met with the President and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs to review the Senate’s concerns. As a result of that meeting, it appears that the administration is willing to admit that they are wrong and that they are willing to consult. They have agreed to specific wording changes in the proposed reorganization, and they have also agreed to actively consult with the Faculty Senate as the new reorganization is implemented.

As a result of these developments, Robert Bley-Vroman will present the censure motion, with a request from CAB that we “put aside” that motion.
Robert Bley-Vroman then discussed the revised resolution and read the new paragraphs including the requirement.

Charlie Weems moved to table the censure motion. The motion was seconded.

For: 47
Against: 1
Abstain:

Motion to table passed.

To introduce a new resolution not currently on the agenda takes a vote of two thirds of those present. That count was taken.
N=51 (needs 34 to discuss)

Favor of considering new motion
For: 45
Against: 2
Abstain: 2

Robert Bley-Vroman read the new resolution, “Consultation on the Proposed UH System Reorganization.”

Discussion:

Ron Bontekoe asked what happened to the second aspect of the proposal. Specifically, why are we not asking that the proposal be delayed.

Robert Bley-Vroman agreed that this resolution does not request that we review the administration’s proposal.

Frank Sansone clarified that we have proposed changes in the positions are described had some very serious problems with words like “direct and manage.” Frank noted that this is being presented to the BOR with our modifications tomorrow.

He continued that the bigger issue now is that they establish a consultation procedure. We got what we need to protect UHM autonomy. We also got apologies and changes in procedures.

Bill Lampe regards it as a serious problem that they did not withdraw this for consideration. The President’s Office needs to be kept minimal if the Chancellor is to be viable. He felt that the document merits a full review because of the lessons of past history with reference to the Chancellor position.

Robert Paull noted that it was this body that pushed that the Chancellor be created. We are now only one voice, we are one part of the whole system. Problem of how you set
up the consultation process. “I don’t care too much how he rearranges the chairs” in his office.

Charlie Weems noted that we suggested that the President withdraw the proposal. President Dobelle didn’t want to do that.

Joan Peters is concerned that this leaves him accountable to no one. We do have the right to say we don’t like the way this happened.

Robert Bley-Vroman noted that there were two goals this morning. 1. As it stands, the re-organization sets up a very skeletal system. We imagine that it will take shape during the next couple of years. First thing is that we be continually be consulted. We will insist on consultation on search procedures and hiring. The second point is that we believe that currently there are no adequate consultative systems to handle the new structures at the level of the President.

Joan Peters notes that there are new positions and that these have budget implications.

Frank Sansone said that the meeting was a very poignant one. Frank said that the SEC really wanted to have a thorough review. In order to go to the legislature, the President needs a new plan in place. President Dobelle feels this is his last chance. “He’s put the gun to our head.” It’s a really sad situation.

He continued that the joint committees also pressed Deane Neubauer on large number of high number of positions with very high salaries. “They realize that we are serious about this. They do need to change their behavior. They have basically ignored us. We hope we’ve impressed him with the seriousness of the matter.”

Mike Forman has had subsequent conversations with the President and he is now willing to talk to us. He is now available to meet with the SEC where he previously refused to do so.

Bob Paull noted that the motion needs to be amended.

Lynne Wilkens noted that the wording is awkward in the current draft.

Ron Bontekoe asked for clarification of the definition of the senates including the other UHM senates. Forman responded that the SEC was well aware of the other senates, and that their situation was discussed in the meeting with the President.

Mary Tiles suggested changing regularly to frequently; there was another change she proposed.

Marian Melish was concerned about the wording.

Frank Sansone opposed with the changes proposed.
Voting on the motion as written
For: 39
Against: 3
Abstain: 3

4. Reports

Search / positions of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education -- Joanne Clark

Speaking for Peter Englert, Joanne Clark gave an overview of the search process. First, she said that the Chancellor would appreciate comments on the two position descriptions. There will be continuous recruitment for these positions, but there will be a first screening date, after which there will be a list drawn up.

Chancellor wants the screening (search?) committee to be comprised of 50% (8 faculty). The Committee on Faculty Service, through the SEC, will provide names. He wants 11 names from which he would chose 8; he will interview them. He will meet with the SEC after making his decisions to discuss recommendations. The Committee will collect the impressions once the three top candidates appear on campus. The Chancellor will make final decision with BOR approval.

Brian Popp asked “Why only two searches?”

Clark responded that the Chancellor is trying to start 2 a month just so that the logistics won’t be overwhelming.

Marian Melish asked about the advisory nature of the committee. What if he doesn’t want candidates that are recommended?

Clark stressed that he is very committed to taking the committee’s choices seriously.

Marian Melish noted that she is concerned that the committee is advisory and that their choices are unranked.

Clark responded that she will take this concern to Chancellor Englert. She does not have the answer regarding that issue. She did note that the final candidates would all be brought to the campus.

Branding update -- Paul Costello

Paul Costello stressed that they are doing system work on marketing. He noted that we are being outspent dramatically. The competition’s spending patterns were discussed.
Hawaii Pacific is spending $1.2 million; University of Phoenix is spending $301,000. Initially his budget was zero. Currently, we are spending $500,000 on marketing.

Costello noted that the brand is fractured. We have 150 logos. No singular message or look.

There is a campus e-mail list. There are messages to key leaders. They also have information on the brand strategy.

“We are bringing together those who are responsible for branding, communication. Communicators throughout the system never met.”

We have a UH radio program and a television program (UH Today, UH This Week). He got these by asking those who broadcast our sports programs to also give us some air time. “They have our sports program; got some marketing vehicles.” In addition, University Report airs on 9 radio stations.

Costello expressed his view that Malamalama doesn’t have a strong point of view. It is outdated. They are considering starting advertising and they are exploring outsourcing.

Improving the website is also a goal, specifically improving navigation.

Advertising is a big element in the future. He then showed a new ad on video.

He’s also done ads in Sunday papers, and he’s compiled a book of UH experts.

Their office has been working with various groups to improve the brand. How do they connect to the product or institution? Key questions. He reported on the work of various consultants. The results of this will be put on the web and we will have a chance to comment. Hopefully, we will have a brand by Spring.

Frank Sansone criticized the website as poorly organized.

Costello acknowledged the problems. “The architecture is not consumer friendly.”

Matt McGranaghan asked about the budget.

Paul Costello said that he’s got $500,000 to do this project.

**Manoa Strategic Plan/Manoa Budget -- Karl Kim**

Karl Kim reviewed the Strategic Planning Process through a power point. He then turned to the proposed UH budget. We are asking for faculty salary increases first. Then second priority is research infrastructure. Beyond that the medical school and improvements in undergraduate education are important. Finally, expanding high demand programs and securing funds for new initiatives are priorities in the new budget. Kim noted that the
new initiatives (e.g. film school, honors college, and public policy institute) must being run through the formal review process. Can UHM really use 25 million a year? His answer was yes. UHM salary benchmark data were presented.

Bill Lampe asked about implications of increased overhead. It could mean 28 million on the increased overhead. Its free money.

Mary Tiles asked about the salary figure?

Karl Kim said that the salary issue is complicated. One argument is that this is part of collective bargaining. The other position from the UHM system is different. Our faculty are more poorly paid, while that is not necessarily the case for the rest of the system.

7. Other Business--none

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Forman at 6:05

Respectfully Submitted,
Meda Chesney-Lind, Secretary