

MĀNOA FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

January 19, 2011

Art Auditorium; 3:00 – 5:00 pm

MEETING AGENDA

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of December 20, 2011 minutes**
- III. Chair's report:** [Act 179](#), [Faculty Budget Workshop](#), Senate/Admin Retreat, Gmail, [Sp 2011 Committee Charges](#)
- IV. Presentations**
 - 1. David Hafner, *Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Services* (3:10 pm – 3:25 pm): Custodial Issues [PPT](#)
 - 2. Jim Donovan, *Director of Athletics* (3:30 pm– 3:50 pm): Financial Plan for Athletics & [Knights Report PPT](#)
- V. New Business**
 - 1. **MAC:** [Resolution on Student Learning Outcomes](#)
Passed: 32 in favor, 8 opposed, and 7 abstentions
 - 2. **CFS:** [Proposed Amendment to Congress and Senate Bylaws - Senate turn over](#)
Passed: 43 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions
[Proposed Amendment to Congress and Senate Rules of Order - Voting methods](#)
Passed: 43 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions
 - 3. **COA:** [Motion to Invite Athletic Director to Address the Senate Annually](#)
Passed 43 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention
 - 4. **CAPP:** [Report on Repeated Course Grading Options](#)
No vote due to lack of quorum
 - 5. **CPM:** [Report on Faculty Fellowship Policy](#)
Not discussed due to lack of quorum
 - 6. **CAB:** [Proposed Amendment to Congress and Senate Bylaws \(Absenteeism\)](#)
Not discussed due to lack of quorum
[Results of Absence Survey](#)
[2010 - 2011 Senate Attendance Record](#) (Senators are unnamed)
- VI. Adjournment**

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT: 59

Chizuko Allen, Edoardo Biagioni, Ronald Bontekoe, Paul Brandon, Marguerite Butler, James Caron, James Cartwright, John Casken, Richard Chadwick, Williamson Chang, Beei-Huan Chao, William Chapman, Meda Chesney-Lind, Donna Ching, Robert Cooney, Robert Cowie, Shirley Daniel, Patricia Donegan, Ernestine Enomoto, David Ericson, Elizabeth Fisher, Sheri Fong, Brien Hallett, Cynthia Hew, Susan Hippensteele, Ellen Hoffman, Carol Kellett, Kenneth Kipnis, Anne Leake, Chin Lee, Mark Levin, Dongmei Li, Barry Lienert, Bonnyjean Manini, Jennifer Matsuda, Crystal Mills, Richard Nettell, Thanh Truc Nguyen, Torben Nielsen, Lawrence Nitz, Ian Pagano, Julia Patriarche, Vaughan Phillips, Hamid Pourjalali, Weilin Qu, Sarita Rai, Martin Rayner, Robert Richmond, Stacey Roberts, Todd Sammons, Lilia Santiago, Magi Sarvimaki, Bruce Shiramizu, Janice Shoultz, Nicolaos Synodinos, Douglas Vincent, Hsing Wen, Kelley Withy, Halina Zaleski

ABSENT:

EXCUSED:

Jonathan Deenik, Michael Demattos, David Duffy, Timothy Halliday, Rosanne Harrigan, Lilikala Kameeleihiwa, John Mahoney, Jonathan Matsuda, Katrina-Ann Oliveira, Kaimi Sinclair, Cynthia Ward

UNEXCUSED:

Garrett Apuzen-Ito, Michael Cooney, Stewart Curry, Ariana Eichelberger, Guliz Erdem, Thomas Gallacher, David Garmire, Jay Hartwell, Kim Holland, Joseph Jarrett, Daniel Jenkins, Chad Koyanagi, John Madey, Raul Rudoy, David Sanders, Victor Stenger, Charles Weems, James Yates, Pavel Zinin

GUESTS:

David Ross, Robert Brewer, Krystyne Aune, Virginia Hinshaw, Reed Dasenbrock

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m. upon achievement of quorum.

II. CHAIR'S REPORT

1. **Act 179**

Chair Hippensteele reviewed a new act that would impact and limit retired personnel/faculty hires for instructional or other work.

2. **Faculty Budget Workshop**

Chair Hippensteele noted that the workshop was a success, and encouraged the senators to review the workshop materials on the website.

3. **Senate/Admin Retreat**

The SEC and Senate committee chairs met with the administration. One item agreed upon at the meeting was that the administrators would have standing invitations to attend their appropriate senate committee meetings (CAPP, CAB, CSA, COR). This will improve communication and expedite senate processes and decisions.

4. **Gmail**

The VPIS has proposed a move to Gmail, but has not provided a full report on the proposed change. The Senate has asked for this information, and UHM is not going to change until further information is available. VPIS is scheduled to attend the February Senate meeting.

5. **Spring 2011 Committee Charges**

Spring 2011 Committee charges have been conveyed to all of the committees through the committee chairs. One senator noted that the issues are already addressed in their committee minutes. Hippensteele noted that the deadlines noted were target dates for items to be addressed by the full senate. While not all items will be brought to the full senate, committees need to communicate items to the SEC for consideration and conclusion.

III. PRESENTATIONS

1. **David Hafner**, *Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Services*: Custodial Issues

Hippensteele introduced David Hafner, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Services, to discuss custodial issues. He provided a PowerPoint presentation which he expanded on through his remarks.

Hafner noted that a systematic review of the facilities maintenance requirements and staffing was recently undertaken. He remarked that it is surprising that such a review had not been previously done. The data on staffing levels versus the industry norms and guidelines indicate a severe shortage of facilities personnel to maintain the space we have. There are over 100 positions understaffed. Not only is there a shortage of cleaning staff, there has been an even greater neglect of preventive maintenance, which is analogous to driving a car without changing the oil. Part of the shortage is due to the hiring freeze imposed by Gov. Lingle, but retirements also play a key role. There is also a lack of funded positions due to budget cuts. He noted that State law bars the University from outsourcing.

Some of the proposed responses he discussed were outsourcing via capitalization of labor in the A&E/CM budget. He noted that some of the new buildings would have more sophisticated cooling systems, etc., and that they might need to outsource the maintenance of these systems.

He is also proposing new cleaning approaches. They have divided the campus into building zones with building zone managers, and are using industry standards and an automated custodial management system to help measure productivity. They are also in the process re-engineering over a 12 month plan. This will include a shift to evening hours for some cleaning, and a change to building cleaning teams rather than each janitor handling a set number of rooms. They are also investing in new cleaning methods and systems.

Hafner illustrated the issues of the aging facilities workforce with demographic information on the staff. He noted that many of our facilities staff were hired from the tourism/resort industry.

Hafner illustrated how they determine cleaning standards and perform time and motion studies for our facilities and staff. He provided a bar graph illustrating industry levels of cleanliness and the number of hours that would be required for higher levels of cleanliness. We simply do not have the staffing hours to attain a higher level of service.

Hafner explained some proposed changes to classroom cleaning routines. One faculty noted that people with allergies might be negatively impacted by the less frequent cleaning of some items. Another faculty recommended removing pencil sharpeners from the classrooms, as few students use them. Hafner thanked the faculty for their suggestions as this is the type of input they need to refine the new duties.

Hafner concluded with a request for more acceptance of the reduction in staffing, as he cannot help it. He also asked that there be no eating and drinking in the classrooms, no animals in the buildings, and no bicycles in the buildings. He provided contact information to report janitor problems. He opened the floor for questions.

One faculty noted that there needs to be more covered parking for biking. Particularly there is little covered parking for bikes in the parking structure. Hafner noted that there is a group working on a bike friendly campus and a similar suggestion is being considered by them. He will also refer this suggestion to the parking office.

Another faculty noted that if some cleaning supplies such as brooms were available to faculty they might clean up after themselves. Hafner noted that he will try to work on this suggestion, although there were concerns about loss of such items if they were unsecured.

One faculty noted that the number of cleaning administrators was increased, while the staff was down. Hippensteele noted that part of this was due to civil service hiring freeze. Hafner noted he could still hire APTs. Some fiscal and other support staff was not being performed and he is trying to remedy that.

Hippensteele encouraged faculty to email Hafner with additional questions and provided his email address as hafner@hawaii.edu.

2. **Jim Donovan**, *Director of Athletics*: Financial Plan for Athletics & Knights Report

Hippensteele introduced Jim Donovan, Director of Athletics, to address the Financial Plan for Athletics. He provided a PowerPoint presentation.

Donovan began by defining the distinction between internal and external funding and providing a pie chart to illustrate the generated revenue, allocated revenue and deficit. He detailed a list of efforts to generate additional revenues. He provided some information about the student fee proposal which was recently approved. He also provided a comparison of student fees among the WAC schools.

Donovan detailed a list of efforts to reduce expenses. He provided a graph illustrating a significant decrease in ticket revenue from 2007-2008. He showed the annual deficit for the past 10 years in a bar chart. He noted that the downturn in the state economy was one factor causing the deficit. The Sugar Bowl generated significant revenues. The accumulated deficit to date is over 10 million dollars.

He provided some bullet points to illustrate how athletics contributes to UH Revenues.

He provided 2 bar charts comparing the support and ticket revenues for the WAC schools. He noted that we were first in the WAC in revenue generation. Compared to the Mountain West, we are second behind New Mexico, and ahead of others.

Our team expenses are the highest in the conference due to the necessity of air fare for Hawai'i teams. We also are the highest in guarantee expense to other teams who travel to Hawai'i. We are the highest in student athlete expense. He also provided comparative data on coaching and staff salaries. Much of the staff/administrative salaries are union employees, and athletics pays the benefits for most of them as revolving fund employees.

He provided comparative data for NCAA Division I-A financial data. He also provided a comparison of salaries and grants-in-aid compared to NCAA.

Q. You mentioned that grants-in-aid went up due to tuition increases. Were tuition waivers monetized?

A. Yes, back in 2004-5.

Regarding the switch to the Mountain West, Donovan explained that schools were vying for additional television revenue. Schools moved out of WAC, which made the number of teams too low to sustain the conference. He noted that the WAC may have only a 50% chance of survival now. He noted that there is a misconception that if we stayed in the WAC, it wouldn't have cost us anything, but this isn't true. This is because the television revenue was going down due to the loss of schools. Also we would lose PayPerView revenue due to more UH games being televised. In addition, we would have to travel to Texas to play which would be costly. In contrast, the move to the Mountain West produced a net of only \$400k. We'll save travel by playing in California. We will lose some payperview, but we will save on travel subsidies paid. He noted that we paid \$500k in 1979, which compares well with our current costs of \$1.1m. He believes that the fan base is very happy with the move, because of the teams we will play and the UH familiarity with the locations we'll play. If we hadn't made the move, then other teams would have taken the slots and if the WAC dissolved we wouldn't be able to maintain as a Division I athletics.

So why does UH need Division I athletics? Gov Burns wanted to address Hawai'i's "inferiority" complex through competing in athletics.

Regarding the Knight Commission report, Donovan noted that he has read it and that he agrees with most of it. He proposes more transparency, more focus on athletics, and a concern that we not become a minor league for pro athletics. He is concerned with the report's wording about the growth of athletic spending vs. academics. He also is concerned about the extension of seasons for student athletics. He totally agrees we must cut down on these extra seasons. He doesn't agree with shortening the regular season.

Q. What is the cost per athlete for our programs?

A. He can get that.

Q. Given we are the only big time game in town, is there a way to leverage that with the general population.

A. He noted that the economic downturn has been a problem. But they have made progress on parking revenue. They also had a price elasticity problem because ticket prices were raised and sales went down. To address this issue, he has lowered the price and tried to increase demand.

Hippensteele thanked Donovan for his remarks.

IV. Approval of December 20, 2011 minutes

A motion to approve the senate minutes was made and seconded. The motion passed.

V. New Business

1. MAC: Resolution on Student Learning Outcomes

Paul Brandon, chair of MAC, introduced the Resolution on Student Learning Outcomes which had been introduced in a prior senate meeting. The resolution was read verbatim for the record. The motion was made and seconded.

One senator noted that while he had no problem with student learning *objectives*, student learning *outcomes* are not under the control of the faculty. The outcomes are contingent on student efforts and other factors not under the control of the faculty.

A motion to amend the wording from outcomes to objectives was made and seconded. This issue was discussed. Cons against the amendment included the need for accountability from faculty, and the need to stay with the accreditation type language. Pros for the amendment included that there is little difference in objectives and outcomes, particularly on the syllabus.

The amended wording passed: 33 for, 10 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

The amended motion was called to a vote.

The motion passed: 32 in favor, 8 opposed, and 7 abstentions.

<p>RESOLUTION TO INCLUDE STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES ON ALL NEW AND AMENDED SYLLABI</p> <p>Whereas student learning objectives (SLOs) specify observable knowledge, skills, or attitudes that students should be able to demonstrate when they have successfully completed a course; and</p> <p>Whereas the majority of programs on the Manoa campus are now producing student learning objectives for a majority of their courses; and</p> <p>Whereas the Faculty Senate passed a Resolution in September 2000 supporting “an assessment process for all departments and programs, in order to revitalize the spirit and practice in higher education of paying substantial attention to the learning achievement of its students;” and</p> <p>Whereas the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Handbook of Accreditation (2008) states that:</p> <p>2.3 The institution’s student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated at the course, program and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and expectations are reflected in academic programs and policies; curriculum; advisement; library and information resources; and the wider learning environment; and</p> <p>Whereas, the Mānoa Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Mānoa Assessment Office are available to provide assistance to faculty in formulation and assessment of SLOs for courses and programs;</p> <p>Therefore, be it resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Student Learning Objectives or equivalent statements that specify what observable knowledge, skills, or attitudes students should be able to demonstrate when they have successfully completed a course are an essential component of syllabi;2. Syllabi for all new and amended courses being submitted for approval on Forms UHM-1 and UHM-2 will clearly state Student Learning Objectives in order to be approved by the appropriate program faculty committee(s); and3. UHM-1 and UHM-2 forms will include a check box to indicate that the proposed or amended courses have Student Learning Objectives that are consistent with the learning objectives of each program under which the courses are listed.
--

2. CFS: Proposed amendment to Congress and Senate Bylaws – Senate turnover

Ian Pagano, chair of CFS, provided a proposed change to the Congress and Senate bylaws to account for senate turnover.

The motion passed: 43 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

<p style="text-align: center;">CFS PROPOSAL TO RESTORE BYLAWS FACULTY CONGRESS AND SENATE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MĀNOA</p> <p>ARTICLE VI. ELECTIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND TERMS</p> <p>Section 2. Elections.</p> <p>b. Election of Senators.</p> <p>(2) Approximately one-half of the senators are to be elected each year. (page 13 of 17)</p> <p>Two-thirds of senators’ terms will end in 2011. In order to meet the “one-half” requirement, we propose that a quarter of them extend for an additional year.</p> <p>To be eligible, a senator must be from a constituency with lopsided turnover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">College of Arts and HumanitiesCollege of EducationCollege of EngineeringCollege of Tropical Agriculture and Human ResourcesLibrary ServicesOrganized Research UnitsSchool of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology <p>If necessary, attendance will determine selection.</p>
--

Pagano introduced the proposed amendment to Congress and Senate Rules of order on voting methods. Pagano explained that the amendment would change vote counting.

The motion passed: 43 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

ARTICLE II. ELECTIONS CODE.

Section 4. Elections for the Senate.

b. Final Elections for the Senate. (page 4 of 6)

Revise Paragraph 8

Original:

Candidates will be elected senators by counting the preferential votes using the Meek method of counting in the Single Transferable Vote (SVT) system. Alternates for each constituency shall be determined by repeating the vote count with a larger number of elected positions for that constituency, the exact number of alternate positions to be determined by the Committee on Faculty Service based on the number of elected senators in the constituency and the number of candidates in the constituency.

Revised:

Candidates will be elected senators by counting the preferential votes using the Instant Runoff method of counting in the Single Transferable Vote (STV) system. Alternates for each constituency shall be determined by the Instant Runoff rankings, the exact number of alternate positions to be determined by the Committee on Faculty Service based on the number of elected senators in the constituency and the number of candidates in the constituency.

These motions will go before to the faculty congress next months.

3. COA: Motion to Invite the Athletic Director to Address the Senate Annually

Kelley Withy, Chair of COA, introduced a motion to invite the Athletic Director to address the Senate annually.

The motion passed: 43 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Motion from UHM Committee on Athletics: The UHM Athletic Director be invited to speak with the UH Manoa faculty senate annually (first meeting of the spring term is recommended). Topics of discussion can include 1) information on the athletic department budget and 2) the academic success of student athletes. The faculty senate may provide other specific questions one month prior to the meeting.

4. CAPP:

Sairta Rai, Chair of CAPP, introduced a report on repeated course grading options that was previously discussed. She noted that the CAPP gathered data from 17 universities. This data is provided in their report.

She noted there may be issues with the implementation, which she read aloud to the Senate. One advisor asked whether banner would be able to prevent students from repeating courses beyond the number allowed. He also asked about the integration of the change in the Star system.

One suggestion was to try it for a year. Others noted that changing the systems for only 1 year would be too costly.

The committee for student advisors has asked that the item be deferred until they have a chance to address this.

**Recommendation, CAPP to SEC Re: Repeated Course Grading Options
Repeated Course Grading Options**

CAPP made the following motion by unanimous vote at its 12 January 2011 meeting and requests that SEC present this motion to the full Senate for its approval and transmittal to UHM Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to be implemented as University policy.

CAPP recommends that UHM's current policy on repeating courses should be replaced with a new policy called "Grade Replacement Opportunity." The policy would read as follows:

Students may repeat up to three courses taken only at UH Mānoa under the Grade Replacement Opportunity.

While UHM transcripts will include all grades for each attempt, only the highest grade will be calculated in the student's grade point average. Students may repeat courses beyond the three allowed by the Grade Replacement Opportunity only with approval of the chair of the department offering the specific course(s), and all attempts will be calculated in the GPA.

Rationale:

Current policy in the catalog concerning Repeat Course Grading Options is unclear and unnecessarily burdensome. The policy (from UHM Catalog 2010-2011, p. 16) states as follows:

Repeating Passed Courses

Students may only repeat a course in which they received a grade of C-, D+, D, D-, F, or an NC. Degree credit for a course is given only once. The grade assigned for each repeated course is permanently recorded on the transcript. Grades for all repeated courses will be included in the GPA.

Repeating Failed Courses

Students may repeat, for a letter grade only, any course in which an F was received. If this is done at UH Mānoa, credit hours and grade points for each attempt are included in the GPA. Students may repeat (but not for a letter grade) CR/NC courses in which they received a grade of NC.

Under “Repeating Passed Courses,” the catalog addresses repeating courses for which students received failing grades as well as low passing grades. As such, the catalog fails to clarify how the policy differs for passed courses and failed courses. In addition, the policy does not allow students to replace a lower course grade with a higher grade in calculating the GPA; the grades for all attempts are included.

CAPP finds this policy to be unfriendly to students, to discourage students’ making further attempts to improve performance and hence gain knowledge, and to discourage some beginning students who do not perform well in their first year to drop out. Allowing a student to repeat a course in which s/he earned a grade below the student’s satisfaction can encourage the student to attempt the course again if there is an added incentive to improve her/his GPA. For students who have difficulty in Gen Ed courses or during their first two years, we should expedite their learning especially by allowing them to repeat courses in which they have done poorly, and thereby encouraging them to remain in school, rather than dropping out.

Although some may fear that this policy would destroy the academic validity of the GPA, in reality for seniors, this opportunity does not alter the GPA very much. With the opportunity of repeating three courses throughout a student’s undergraduate life the overall GPA of a senior student will be only slightly impacted. Repeating a course to change a C grade to a B has much more influence on the GPA of freshmen and sophomores than on the GPA of juniors and seniors. Placing a limit on the number of opportunities, as this new recommended policy does, encourages students to use this opportunity discreetly.

CAPP also found that our current policy runs counter to the policy of many peer institutions that allow some form of grade replacement.

CAPP members surveyed eighteen peer or land grant universities (see summary below) of which we found information from seventeen. All seventeen allow courses to be repeated. Some allow unlimited number of repeats while others establish limits in some way or another to the number of times a student could repeat a course to improve the grade earned. Of the seventeen, five universities, Penn State, Louisiana State, Missouri, North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Virginia, calculate the grades earned using all times registered for a course. Five others, Arizona, Iowa State, California at Davis, Kentucky, and Tennessee at Knoxville, specify that with a limited number of repeats only the higher grade earned will be used in calculating the GPA. Three, New Mexico State, Washington State, and Michigan State, allow only classes in which the grade earned was below a C to be repeated; they record only the higher grade in GPA calculation. Oregon State University allows only one repeat with the final grade only used in the calculation of the GPA. Utah State allows up to twelve repeats with only the last grade recorded being used in the calculation of the GPA. Georgia and Utah apparently allow unlimited repeats with only the final grade earned used in GPA calculation.

VI. Adjournment

At 5 p.m., the Senate lost quorum and no further official business was possible. The meeting was adjourned.

Chair Hippensteele encouraged all senators to attend next month’s meeting.