Minutes

UHM Faculty Senate
Meeting of April 16, 2003
Richardson School of Law, Classroom 2

Faculty Senate Members Present:

Excused
Joel Cohn, Tony Guerrero, Michael Salzman, Lesley Wright

Absent:
G.D. Bryant-Greenwood, Jim Caron, Katalin Csiszar, Eric DeCarlo, H. Gert DeCouet, Patricia Fryer, Robert Grace, Amelia Jenkins, Kenton Kramer, Stacey Marlow, Marian Melish, John Melish, Neal Milner, Brian Popp, Irwin Schatz, Elizabeth Tam,

Others in Attendance:
Amarjit Singh, Sandy Davis, Tom Bopp, Bruce Liebert, Margy Ledward, John Morton, Stuart Lau, Barry John Baker, Paul Costello, Jon Okamura, Carol Anne Dickson

Chair Michael Forman called the meeting to order at approximately 3:10

AGENDA

1. Michael Forman introduced Paul Costello, VP External Affairs & University Relations. Because VP Costello needed to get to a BOR meeting, he would make his presentation prior to the usual approval of the minutes and the Chair’s report.

Costello noted discussions about changing the names of the Community Colleges began nearly two years ago.

A deeper discussion on the community college campuses began last spring when the Brand Strategy Group held meetings on the 8 campuses. Costello argued that there was a “consensus” that the name "community" was outdated and perhaps limiting to recruitment of students. Many former community colleges on the mainland have, over
the past 5 years, dropped community, ie. Santa Monica Community College is now known as Santa Monica College.

Costello noted that as UH moves to a more seamless system, there is a growing consensus that the term community hampers the branding and marketing of the institutions. Many of the units in the community colleges feel that the term carries some negative connotations especially when recruiting international students for programs such as the culinary arts program at KCC.

Throughout the past month, all of the community college campuses have hosted meetings for a discussion of the name change. A majority would like to see community dropped in favor of simply Maui College, Kapiolani College, Honolulu College, etc. A minority voice believe the change is meaningless or that the sense of community will be lost.

Most of the campuses just want to get the issue resolved and move on since the issue has been lingering for several years.

Note: One proposal was to call all of the system's ten campuses, The University of Hawaii at... This proposal was rejected since it failed to distinguish Manoa and Hilo as four year institutions.

The BOR will need to approve the name change along with the WASC Substantive Change Committee. Costello expects after the consultation is completed to bring the recommendation to the BOR at their May meeting.

Ron Bontekoe noted that “the particular truth in advertising” that is now being proposed is less troubling than the previous proposal, e.g. the University of Hawaii at Honolulu. Still, many will assume that college means a four-year institution like Swarthmore College or Oberlin College. This is a clear fudge of what these institutions really are. This is somewhat shoddy.

Amarjit Singh asked how much it will cost. John Morton said the answer is that the only costs will be a rolling replacement of stationery.

Singh followed that there will be a need to make an estimate.

Costello said that the cost would be minimal. The signs would not change overnight.

Frank Sansone doesn’t mind the name change; he does feel that there clearly are costs.

Costello noted that the Community Colleges haven’t brought up the cost issues in their discussion of these matters.

Sansone responded that it is clearly disingenuous to say there is no cost.
Charlie Weems asked about a seamless system; shouldn’t we also have a seamless tuition?

Costello said that would be a matter that would have to be taken up by others in the administration.

Linda Duckworth thought that the change to college could be misleading to foreign students.

Joan Peters questioned the “no cost” aspect of the proposal, noting that costs for these initiatives often surface later. Meanwhile, faculty raises are “top” priority of the administration, but are unlikely to be funded. Now we have this plan that supposedly doesn’t cost anything, just as we earlier have had reorganizations that supposedly cost nothing. Eventually, they all cost a considerable amount.

Matt McGranaghan noted that he felt that the name changes are misleading. He felt that the name change is an indication of “mission creep.” Faculty still don’t have any indication from central administration as to what a seamless system really means. These proposed name changes really put the cart before the horse.

John Engle had a follow up question. He hopes that this is not part of a movement where the community colleges become a four-year college.

Costello said that there is some talk of MCC becoming four year, but at this point there is no plan.

Robert Bley-Vroman noted that CAPP looked at this; about one third of all community colleges have names that are simply “college” which suggests that name changes of the sort being proposed are not necessarily inappropriate.

Costello said that he would go back to the community colleges about the cost issues.

Singh came back to the issue of costs. It could be the $100,000. He asked that there be an estimate.

Rhonda Black asked that if Maui Community College becomes a four year college, will it have to change its name again?

Costello said Vice President Neubauer would have to answer that question.

Charlie Weems asked again about seamless tuition.

Costello said that the BOR will be looking at the issue of tuition.

Ron Bonteko asked about West Oahu’s name.
Costello said that it would become the University of Hawaii at West Oahu.

Chair Forman returned to the original agenda.

**Adoption of the Minutes**

The minutes of the March 19, 2003 meeting were approved as amended by voice vote. The amendments: Senator Chang noted that she was present, and Halina Zaleski noted her name was misspelled on the last page of the minutes.

**Chair’s report**

Chair Mike Forman noted that the SEC has been very busy for the past month. We have been heavily engaged in filling committees, and the requests keep coming. The SEC election is coming up. The SEC is very concerned about articulation; there is a need to have faculty involved in a group that works toward a new E5-209. Forman feels that these meeting have been effective in reducing tensions that have been there previously. Principal effort is to get faculty involvement, across the system.

There are on-going searches. VP for Academic Affairs is on-going; the list is being narrowed, and it will be narrowed further. Currently, there are about 10 names in consideration.

The VC for Academic Affairs is also ongoing; there are over 60 applications. Forman is the chair of that committee. The VC for Research is about a week or so behind. The Committee on Faculty Service has faculty on both committees.

Forman also announced that Herman Frazier - Athletics Director, was not able to attend; he had to go to the BOR meeting.

Forman has heard several discussions about the sanction imposed by WAC. One of the things that is worth saying is that faculty are being criticized for grade reporting. As an example, there is an allegation that at least some faculty members turn in all incompletes for their classes and later changing those grades. The business of faculty turning in grades in problematic ways has been raised. We need to remove any excuses at all to prevent finger pointing to the faculty.

**Banner system**

Stuart Lau (representing Jan Heu) and John Morton discussed the Banner system.

John Morton opened the discussion and noted that Stuart Lau is the new UHM registrar.
Morton asked to discuss, briefly, the name issue. He noted that there is a range of opinion on the naming of campuses as either colleges or community colleges. Kapiolani Community College is deeply committed to avoiding mission creep. They want to remain a community college, compound noun. To extent that the programs become four-year programs; the community colleges will want to work collaboratively with either UHWO or UHM. Morton also wasn’t trying to be flip about the cost of renaming. “I have no intention to spend money on this shift.” Morton noted. “The sign is just going to stay there. This is not the priority area of spending. Some others may have other plans, be he currently expects the shift to incur only minimal costs.

The Banner is also an attempt to allow students to move more smoothly between campuses. There have been five teams working on this issue, across the campuses, across all the components of student record keeping and accounting. UH has a fairly unique approach to higher education. “We wanted the system to maintain both 10 separate systems, while appearing seamless to students.” Registration has started in the community colleges and there is a problem with pre-requisite checking. The database blew up when the system began to check. UHM registration is still a week or so off, so we have some time to fix the problem.

Now students can register just about anywhere; they don’t have to do lots of extra work to enroll. The system will check UHM admission status; other campuses have open enrollment. Students can also enroll at two campuses at once. The home institution controls the financial aid. The project has involved massive amounts of data convergence. We now have a single database. There have been problems with duplicate entries. Approximately 690,000 students files have been created. UHM data are available, and students can correct their files. Fall registration is the cut over period. Faculty will be able to get in as well. For fall, we will be able to see our class lists. You do need a Hawaii.edu to sign on. The system will not use social security numbers. There will be bumps going forward.

Stuart Lau then spoke. UHM will be going on line April 28th. Students will be able to pick up course schedules on Monday, April 21. It’s Lau’s first day on the job. Asked about questions.

Bruce Liebert asked about pre-reqs not being enforced at UHM.

Lau said they will not be enforced for this semester.

Tom Bopp heard that the training programs for advisors have been filled up.

Morton said yes, the first set is well booked. They are doing just in time training, and there will be other sessions as we go forward.

Charlie Weems asked about a student that is taking 8 credits at two different campuses; how will their tuition be determined?
Morton said that they student would be counted by both institutions; the financial arrangements are those that are currently in place at each campus will govern their cost.

Weems was concerned that they would be paying community college tuition for all classes, including those taken on the UHM campus.

Jeannie Oka asked about grades, credits, for Outreach that have been going into the UHM grade point. Will this continue now that they are an open campus.

Morton said that they have always been open; grade policies have not changed.

Oka said that if the student has been suspended, would they be able to enroll in UHM. They hadn’t been able to in the past

Morton said that the student would not be able to enroll at Outreach and get credits at UHM.

Halina Zaleski asked about co-requisites being monitored.

Morton said that every time you touch the system, it does a re-check. If the student changed major, as an example, or dropped a co-requisite, this would be flagged.

Ron Bontekoe is concerned about co-requisites being dropped once a student had enrolled.

Morton said to talk to Stuart Lau about that.

Luciano Minerbi raised a concern about distance learning students to be enrolled without a TB test.

Morton said UHM has to weigh the TB clearance. He personally as a Provost wishes to get out of the TB clearance business.

Bruce Liebert asked if the system will check for grades.

Morton said yes.

Zaleski asked about permission of instructor. Can the instructor over-ride?

Morton noted that banner can handle that; UHM can get its faculty that right if they so chose.

Morton concluded that there is a problem of subject code; hopefully that will be resolved very quickly. Right now, courses that have the same name and number will not necessarily be duplicates. In the future, he hopes that all courses in the system that have the same subject code and number will be the same course.
Ron Bontekoe noted that this becomes a problem with graduate courses; different faculty can teach these and sometimes the courses are very, very different. Repeatability is important at the graduate level.

Morton noted that he’s talking about issues across the campuses, not within one campus.

Committee Reports

Robert Bley-Vroman updated the senate on the activities of CAB.

1. CAB received a copy of a memorandum from Paul Costello, Vice President for External Affairs and University Relations, dealing with campus consultations for the proposed name changes for community colleges. CAB contacted Paul Costello and urged him to come to the Senate to discuss the proposal. Vice President's Costello's presentation at the present meeting of the Senate was the result of CAB's invitation.

2. The administration, in consultation with CAB, is drafting a revision of the BOR policy dealing with classified research, to make sure that this policy is in harmony with the Senate resolution on classified research, passed at the Senate meeting of December 11, 2002. The Senate resolution states that BOR policy must include the proviso that classified research not be conducted on campus.

3. In consultation with CAB, the administration is drafting a memorandum clarifying and amplifying the Manoa policy for the distribution of overhead return from external grants and contracts (RTRF). While the final wording is still being worked on, CAB reports that the main features of the policy are the following:

   - Allocation: Of that portion of the RTRF which is allocated to the Manoa campus, two-thirds will be returned to the generating units. One third is retained for campus-wide purposes, including faculty travel, seed money grants, and the like. This allocation scheme will hold through the current fiscal year, and for fiscal years 2004 and 2005.

   - Unit-level distribution policy. Each unit receiving RTRF is required to have a faculty-approved distribution policy for its own portion of the funds. This policy must include a statement of the fraction of the allocation which is returned to the PIs. The faculty approved policy must be submitted to the VCR by July 1.

   - Carryover. Units are permitted to carry over RTRF funds to the extent that they are encumbered or committed. Examples of the latter include proposal cost-matching, faculty startup funds, and salary or other infrastructure commitments. Funds which are neither encumbered nor committed ("discretionary funds") may also be carried over. However, units are required to justify the carry-over of discretionary funds exceeding $250,000.

CAB urges Senators to work actively in their own constituencies to ensure that faculty-approved unit-level distribution policies are in fact developed, as required by the policy.
Bruce Leibert asked about the President’s Office getting any RTRF funds.

Bley-Vroman said that about a quarter is taken off the top to handle research administration and other costs.

Singh asked about the resolution on classified research; is it going to be enforceable?

Bley-Vroman noted that we had a resolution that the policy should be that Classified Research not be conducted on campus. The administration then wrote the policy along those lines. Whether the policy is easily enforced is clearly a separate matter.

Joan Peters asked about the state auditor’s reports noting that these funds are being misused. Shouldn’t we make this difficult to do?

Bley-Vroman noted that the desire is to have a stated policy to more systematically address the issue. The hope is that with a clear policy that some of those auditing problems are less likely to occur in the future.

Peters noted that the administration’s cut was a major problem.

Bley-Vroman noted that some expenditures were also criticized that occurred at lower levels.

Frank Sansone noted that there is better accountability in the proposed system.

Peters expressed concern about the President’s and Chancellor’s trip to New Zealand.

Sansone noted that the new policy is a significant advance; we have to get involved in the faculty approval process, which has to be monitored.

Roberta Lamb asked when the accumulation of funds actually starts.

Bley-Vroman noted that it starts now.

Sansone noted that all special funds can be carried over; there was a March 13 memo from the Chancellor on this topic.

Lamb noted that fiscal officers need to be aware of this.

Sansone suggested that we post the memo on the Faculty Senate discussion board.

Bley-Vroman noted that we need to think about how to shore up communication strategies with an administration that is open to faculty input.
Forman added that the Chancellor has said that he will not approve Dean’s proposals about how to spend RTRF that doesn’t have clear faculty input.

Forman noted that with respect to the Congress, the Chancellor regards his presentation to that body as a major address. Forman also noted that he has gone to three different meetings on violence in the workplace. He has also heard two strong presentations on campus crisis management with suggestions that there needs to be more understanding of whom should be called and informed in a crisis. He also heard the Chancellor telling the deans that this is an important issue. “It could affect their continuance in the job.” Deans are responsible to have these policies enforced.

Forman then asked new Senators to introduce themselves. Margie Ledward, Outreach college, Amarjit Singh, College of Engineering, Tom Bopp, Natural Sciences, Bruce Liebert, College of Engineering, and Barry Baker, College of Architecture, introduced themselves.

Carol Ann Dixon said that the faculty mentoring program is trying to address the workplace violence issues indirectly through conflict resolution and “healing” in departments.

Incoming Senator Singh wanted to say a few words about EIF funds saying “there appears to be no ongoing commitment to the faculty on this matter.” Seed money is also a cause for concern. Before, $400K were allocated; in 2001, we are only seeing $200K. The last two years saw them vanish. Faculty development funds have also disappeared. Shortage of general purpose classrooms; upkeep of these classrooms has been problematic. He was also critical of the legacy path initiative.

Luciano Minerbi wanted to comment on the issues that were raised. He really feels that these funds should be allocated to the departments. Campus-wide committees are unwieldy and inefficient for these purposes, in his view.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40.