



## FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

March 24, 2021

Online via Zoom

3:00 PM - 5:00 PM

### *Present:*

AGRUSA, Jerry; BANNA, Jinan; BEAULE, Christine; BERGSTROM, Kelly; BIAGIONI, Edoardo; BOVARD, Penny-Bee; BUSCH, Gerald; BUSINGER, Steven; CHANDRA, Nandini; CHEN, Roger; CLAPP, Justin; CONWAY, Thomas; COONEY, Michael; DE SILVA, Kahikina; EICHELBERGER, Ariana; FARRAH, Duncan; GAL, Roy; GUENTNER, Erik; HARRIS, Chessa; HIGA, Jason Kenji; HOFFMANN, Kathryn; IRVIN, Vanessa; JOHANSEN, Morgen; JULIEN-CHINN, Francie; KAME'ELEIHIWA, Lilikala; KAO, Peiling; KIRS, Marek; LAWSON, Kenneth; LENTZ, Rachel; LENZ, Cory; MAYNARD, Ashley; MCKIMMY, Paul; MEDINA, Richard; MESSINGER, Thane; MIYAMOTO, Camaron; MOORE, Colin; NGUYEN, Trúc; NÍ DHONACHA, Siobhán; O'BRIEN, Maureen; PAULL, Robert; PETTIT, Jonathan; POTEMRA, James; RAY, Stacy; RUTTENBERG, Kathleen; SAKAGUCHI, Ann; SALZER, Ku'uilei; SAND, Shannon; SANDERS, David; SINCLAIR, Gwen; SIPES, Brent; SORENSEN IRVINE, Christine; SPEETJENS, Maile; STEPHENSON, Carolyn; STIRR, Anna; THOULAG, Jean; USPAL, William; UYEHARA, Lisa; VARGO, Stephen; VON DOETINCHEM, Sandra; WANG, George; WITHY, Kelley; YOSHIOKA-MAXWELL, Amanda; YAGI, Seanyelle; and YUAN, Sarah.

### *Excused:*

BATENI, Sayed; BINSTED, Kim; DAVIS, Katherine; GILLILAND, Betsy; JHA, Rajesh; NUTE, Kevin; STOKES, Alexander; TALLQUIST, Michelle; WERTHEIMER, Andrew; and WONG, Vanessa.

### *Absent:*

None

### *Guests:*

COFFMAN, Makena; HIGGINBOTHAM, Derrick; LEONG, Jaret; LYONS, Laura; NISHIDA, Dawn; PEARSON, Wendy; ROSS, David; TANOUYE, Allyson; and TEVES, Lani.

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

- Chair McKimmy called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.



## 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- [Non-significant MFS Charter, Bylaws, & Rules of Order Amendments](#)
  - [Procedural Guide for Amendment Voting](#)
- Chair McKimmy reminded Senators to use the hand raise function from the participants pane.
- Chair McKimmy reviewed the consent agenda and the process associated with it.
  - Senator Yuan requested row 47 be moved off the consent agenda, article 3 section 2 of bylaws.
  - Senator Beaule requested row 88 be moved off the consent agenda, article 6 section 3 of bylaws.
  - Senator Eichelberger requested row 68 be moved off the consent agenda, article 4 section 1 of bylaws.
  - Chair McKimmy called for additional requests for removal of items from the consent agenda. No additional requests were raised.
- Chair McKimmy asked if there were any objections from any Senators to approving the consent agenda. No objections were raised.
- Chair McKimmy declared the consent agenda with removed items approved by acclamation.

## 3. MINUTES - [February 17, 2021 Senate \(DRAFT\) Minutes](#)

- MFS Secretary Nguyen shared that edits were received and appear in red line in the draft. She noted that one suggestion was to add a business item, which was not on the agenda of February 17. Chair McKimmy advised keeping the agenda the same and placing discussion under that business item. Chair McKimmy asked if there were any objections to keeping the original business items as listed.
- Senator Maynard requested a correction to her statement about resolving issues. The edit was made.
- Chair McKimmy asked for additional corrections to the minutes. No additional corrections were requested.
- Chair McKimmy asked if there were any objections to the corrected minutes. No objections were raised. Chair McKimmy declared the minutes accepted by acclamation.

## 4. CHAIR'S REPORT

- Chair McKimmy welcomed everyone and expressed appreciation for the time and commitment of the Senators to their Senate work.
- Election results have been distributed to the respective constituencies.



- The call for committee preferences will open on April 8 as well as the call for SEC candidacy nominations. Informal information sessions will be offered to new and continuing senators about the committees to share information and answer questions.
- The President's Office has a General Education Summer Institute under discussion. [Self nominations are open](#) for faculty to serve on the committee. More information is available at the link that was shared in the agenda.
- Congress meeting was moved to May 12, 2021.

## 5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- **RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN QUEER STUDIES**

*Name changed from February agenda (undergraduate certificate in sexuality studies)*

*Recommendation from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP)*

*Presenters: Carolyn Stephenson, Chair*

*Supporting document:*

[Queer Studies Certificate proposal](#)

- CAPP Chair Stephenson (SOCSCI) shared that CAPP had on the agenda at the previous Senate meeting a resolution supporting the proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in Sexuality Studies. CAPP was informed that the proposers wished to change the title to Undergraduate Certificate in Queer Studies; they did not wish to change the content of the proposal other than the title. CAPP revised the resolution to reflect the change in title, and supports the resolution. Senator Stephenson thanked the subcommittee that reviewed the proposal as well as the Women's Studies Department for their proposal.
  - Senator Maynard asked for clarification on the new title and how the proposers saw the difference between sexuality studies and queer studies.
    - Senator Stephenson responded that the proposers were present and requested that they be given a chance to answer.
    - Guest Lani Teves (Women's Studies) and Derrick Higginbotham (English) were present to address questions. Dr. Teves explained that the proposing committee decided to shift the name, in part because the Department of Women's Studies is changing its name to Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies. She also explained that they surveyed their students, and the majority of students surveyed said they wanted Queer Studies. Dr. Teves



further clarified that given the intellectual shifts within the field of LGBTQ studies and Sexuality Studies, the proposing committee decided upon Queer Studies because it reflected more accurately the approach to the certificate and the trends in the field. Queer Studies captures a theoretical intellectual and political orientation of the certificate that is not just about sexuality. Queer Studies seemed to reflect the student need and as well as the field intellectually.

- Chair McKimmy thanked Dr. Teves.
- Chair McKimmy invited other questions and additional discussion. None were raised.
- Chair McKimmy called for the vote. Senator Potemra (SOEST) asked if a motion to approve was needed. Chair McKimmy clarified that a committee bringing an item to the floor is considered to have moved and seconded it.
- RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN QUEER STUDIES
  - 42 (95.45%) in support; 2 (4.55%) opposed; 6 abstentions
  - Motion carries.

## 6. BUSINESS

- **RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN SUSTAINABILITY**

*Recommendation from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP)*

*Presenter: Carolyn Stephenson, Chair*

*Supporting document:*

*(ISR) UG Certificate Proposal in Sustainability*

- CAPP Chair Stephenson (SOCSCI) offered an apology for taking time on a day the Senate agenda is so crowded and noted that both CAPP and the proposer had agreed that April was fine, but the SEC decided to put it in March. The proposal is unanimously and enthusiastically supported by the CAPP subcommittee and the full CAPP. CAPP had been working with the proposers of this for several years and had made a number of requests for changes. The new proposal this semester was found to be excellent. Senator Stephenson acknowledged and thanked Makena Coffman, Director of the Institute for Sustainability and Resilience, for her work. Dr. Coffman was also present at the meeting to answer questions. The questions that CAPP had at this stage were not about the certificate itself, but things surrounding the certificate. Questions were raised such as how Sustainability Courses are designated. The designations were originally



made by the Provost's Office. But there was faculty buy in, in the sense that each faculty member consented to having their courses cross listed; all Sustainability courses in the certificate are cross listed with other courses at this time. The other thing that CAPP requested of proposers several years ago was whether they would consider also working on a BA in Sustainability, and they went ahead and did that. They did not bring the BA through the curricular oversight of CAPP, but directly to Interdisciplinary Studies. So, CAPP's question became how the BA in Sustainability will fit with or relate to the Certificate in Sustainability, because the content is very different.

- Vice Chair of CAPP Senator Cooney (SOEST) expressed strong support of the resolution. He offered great credit and high marks to Makena Coffman for her two years of work and following the procedures and process, and said this is the kind of excellent product we get when we work through this system.
- Chair McKimmy invited other questions and additional discussion. None were raised. Chair McKimmy called for the vote.
- RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN SUSTAINABILITY
  - MFS Secretary Nguyen (ED) reminded those present that votes should only be cast by Senators and she needed to verify results.
  - 54 (98.18%) in support; 1 (1.82%) opposed; 0 abstentions
  - Motion carried.

● **RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PHASE I AND II REORGANIZATION OF THE MANOA MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE**

*Recommendation from the Committee on Administration and Budget (CAB)*

*Presenter: Justin Clapp, Chair*

*Supporting document:*

[Reorganization Proposal Consultation and Review Checklist](#)

- CAB Chair Clapp (AA) shared that CAB has been considering this topic since late November and have had multiple and significant conversations regarding this topic in response to an initial analysis by CAB. CAB met with and consulted with Provost Bruno in the early stages of this year. And then after that point, CAB actually went through another review and editing process of this document in response to those meetings. Generally speaking, CAB has five main concerns regarding Phase II.



- First, are critiques related to the process of how this was implemented, including the consultation period leading up to the release of the Phase II proposal, and then the absence of an opportunity to provide feedback, particularly from individuals departments and units, post release a Phase II. Consultation with mandatory consultative bodies does not replace consultation with individual units, as constituted bodies are generally limited to providing global feedback.
- Second, the reorganization seems to, for the majority, simply rename offices, and this doesn't fully address challenges or opportunities for UH Manoa going forward. While the strategic plan was released after Phase II was released, it seems improper to move forward with Phase II, without evaluating it in relation to institutional goals.
- Third, the Phase II solidifies the faculty's hesitations regarding Phase I, the concentration of authority within a single individual, and decline and autonomy for UH Mānoa. A key part of this was in the Mānoa Office of Budget and Finance Reporting to the Mānoa CEO rather than the Provost. A committee was originally proposed to further investigate this topic for Phase II. Yet once Phase I was approved, the plans for a committee were diffused.
- Fourth, and this was identified as a significant concern by Senator Clapp, the Phase II does not provide an itemized list of budget savings including eliminated or created positions, leaving faculty unable to review proposed savings for a reorganization that was put forth with an emphasis on budget savings. The absence of any verifiable data is significant.
- Fifth, concerns remain regarding how specific units are represented within Phase II, including but not limited to first-year programs, Graduate Division, Global Engagement, advising, and Mānoa's research and scholarship office. Lastly, there are concerns regarding the lack of criteria to evaluate the potential implementation of Phase II in the short or long term. CAB acknowledges that consultation regarding Phase II appears to be ongoing, and it is perhaps an unfinished product that CAB and the MFS have been given to review. CAB evaluated the proposal, and not a hypothetical proposal that may not be given additional time for faculty review in the future. There are more significant details and nuances within the proposal.
- Senator Potemra (SOEST) asked about the title of the resolution and why it said Phase I when it was already discussed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the BOR almost two years ago. Senator Potemra shared that he was considering asking to remove it from the title.





- Senator Clapp (AA) explained that in the previous resolution, the MFS was reserving judgment on Phase I until Phase II was available. This resolution, therefore, was giving a concrete opinion regarding Phase I as the MFS had asked to see it in its complete body of work. Senator Clapp felt it was appropriate to mention since Phase I and Phase II are intertwined.
- Senator Paull (CTAHR) pointed out that Phase I was not actually approved as Senator Clapp had pointed out. MFS had strong reservations about it at the time and had asked the administration to provide the entire proposal because MFS did not want it in piecemeal. The issue was raised in the Phase I motion and one reason MFS did not support it was because CAB had not been given the full proposal to evaluate. Senator Paull indicated that what the MFS is seeing now are situations where Phase I is actually impacting what is proposed in Phase II. So CAB brought to the floor both Phase I and Phase II, with this being the Senate final resolution.
- Senator Potemra (SOEST) thanked Senators Clapp and Paull for the explanation. He expressed that this may lead to unnecessary confusion at the BOR when something comes up before if that they have already decided on, with the possibility of the BOR disregarding the whole thing because of that. Senator Potemra thought the point would be made in the whereas statement as opposed to having Phase I in the title.
- Senator Potemra (SOEST) also asked about the insufficient time for review, with the proposal around for about three years. He did not agree that there was not time at the unit level to discuss the reorganization and recalled at least three campus forums where individual faculty would attend and participate. If comments did not make it into Phase II, that is a separate issue. Senator Potemra offered that there was a long time for consultation, but perhaps people are disappointed in the result.
- Senator Paull explained that the document was received in November of last year, and he did not recall a 300-page document received prior to that. As Senator Clapp had already identified, offices were renamed and duties and responsibilities changed, but the document still has the core issues which were raised in the motion.
- Vice Chair Sorensen Irvine (ED) agreed with Senator Potemra and found the language odd about the lack of time for feedback, because the reorganization has been discussed for multiple years. She described a survey where feedback was received campus wide from individual faculty over the summer and into the early fall, and the design team had met with a lot of different groups that are directly impacted. Senator Sorensen Irvine said that those entities have continued to send in feedback, even up until this week.
  - Senator Clapp responded collectively to the ideas forwarded by Senators Potemra and Sorensen Irvine. Open forums occurred previously, but post release, there were no



organized or formal avenues for people to provide feedback. When the proposal for Phase II was first sent out, Senator Clapp pointed out that it did not invite feedback or directions on where to send comments whether via email or through unit heads. Senator Clapp acknowledged that it might be difficult to go unit to unit for the entire university to assess how this proposal may fall in favor or disfavor. Senator Clapp further acknowledged that some units or departments may have been more proactive than others in raising concerns regarding this proposal. However, Senator Clapp also offered that it is not out of the question to believe that not providing, soliciting, or directing feedback to a specific avenue may have quieted some people from raising concerns as well.

- Senator Gal (ORU) added that in addition to the consultation issue, as Senator Clapp pointed out and even Senator Sorensen Irvine said, it was only last summer and into the fall, which is not three years and only six months ago that the MFS saw this proposal. There was no discussion with the units about this large proposal, and it's not clear how any of that feedback or input made it into the proposal. Afterwards there was no avenue for input. It is only one of the points CAB has raised regarding the actual content. It's not just a process; out of the five points, four deal with the content of the reorganization. The majority of those hundreds of pages is reorganizing or renaming without any clear rationale in terms of student success, cost savings, and efficiency. Senator Gal further pointed out that looking at the strategic plan, he can't see how this reorganization actually dovetails with the strategic plan. It does not make sense to him to reorganize, without doing it in concert with or in line with the strategic plan.
  - Chair McKimmy recognized Guest Laura Lyons, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. iAVCAA Lyons addressed comments made by Senator Gal. She thought there is a lot of overlap between the strategic plan and the reorganization Phase II. And regarding renaming of offices, most of the offices are not quite the same. For example, elevating Enrollment Management to its own office separate from Student Affairs is a significant change. The change indicates the value that is placed on the need to have ongoing recruitment and retention efforts for our university. Also, renaming Student Affairs to Students Success and the movement of academic advising to the same unit is meant to create a greater synergy between and among different offices under student success; student success is understood as both academic and developmental, social, and more in a more holistic way. There are other changes that iAVCAA Lyons thinks are also in line with the strategic plan. In that regard, iAVCAA Lyons expressed that it's not quite accurate to say that the Phase II reorganization isn't and hasn't been informed by the strategic plan. Many of the people who ran the discussions of the





strategic plans such as the Provost and others in the Office of the Provost were also intimately involved in Phase II.

- Chair McKimmy called for additional comments or discussion. None were raised. Chair McKimmy called for the vote.
- RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PHASE I AND II REORGANIZATION OF THE MANOA MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE
  - 32 (72.73%) in support; 12 (27.28%) opposed; 9 abstentions

- **CAB PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE MFS CHARTER (Second Reading)**

*Recommendation from the Committee on Administration and Budget (CAB)*

*Presenter: Ann Sakaguchi, CAB member*

*Supporting documents:*

- [Procedural Guide for Amendment Voting](#)
- [Redline Charter \(PDF\)](#)
- [Amendments list, Charter](#)
- CAB Member Senator Sakaguchi (SOCSCI) stated that the Charter, Bylaws, and Rules of Order would be discussed in that order. The Charter has one proposed amendment only, i.e., Article I, Section 2, paragraph 1, line #4, which is to add “prior to the relevant BOR meeting”. She noted that Senators spend considerable time and effort formulating a resolution or motion. However, if these are not sent in a timely manner before the relevant BOR meeting, it diminishes the ability of the Senate actions to make an impact on the decisions. Chair McKimmy passed the gavel to Vice Chair Sorensen Irvine to participate in the discussion at 3:58 pm.
- Senator McKimmy (ED) shared that the Chair and Secretary of the Senate are the ones responsible for relating MFS business items to the Board of Regents, the President, and the Provost. Senator McKimmy pointed out it is very common for business in the Senate to be concluded at approximately 5pm on a Wednesday, and the Board of Regents meeting is the next morning. Getting the Chair and the Secretary’s signatures assembled is rather difficult after the meeting. If the MFS does get transmissions to the BOR, it means that it's under late testimony, which isn't necessarily a problem but it is a complication. Senator McKimmy also shared that in his experience this year submitting testimony, he had testimony rejected if a corresponding business item on the BOR agenda did not exist. The language in the amendment presupposes that there is a relevant BOR meeting for that particular action item, which is not necessarily a given.



- Senator Sakaguchi responded that the amendment is not a personal attack on the SEC, but is seen as good practice because the MFS meets on the third Wednesday of the month, and the BOR meeting is usually right after that. CAB thought of proposing that the meetings be held a week before or maybe the second week of the month. In any case, even if a meeting ended at 5pm the day prior, the SEC needs to sign and send it if that is the relevant BOR meeting with respect to the action. The fact is if it doesn't get transmitted for whatever reason, then all the work of the Senators will be wasted.
- Senator Maynard (SOCSCI) added that the BOR does accept input from people, whether it's relevant to a meeting or not. And so, Senate resolutions, even if they're not relevant to an agenda item can be sent to the BOR Secretary with a request to forward to the entire Board.
- Senator Higa (JABSOM) inquired who sets the calendar for the Faculty Senate meetings? If the BOR sets meetings and they are rejecting MFS materials, what can MFS do? If MFS is not transmitting in a timely manner, doesn't it make sense to space out agenda items? And furthermore, what is the usual timeline that the BOR would accept this sort of business? Does the BOR have a minimum timeline, for example, at least a week before?
  - Vice Chair Sorensen Irvine responded that participant testimony is required 24 hours before the meeting, and believes the third Wednesdays for MFS meetings is set in our bylaws.
  - Senator Higa reiterated that something needs to change about MFS meetings and whether that gap is insurmountable if the meeting dates are set in the MFS bylaws.
- MFS Secretary Nguyen (ED) stated her support for the amendment and that timely transmission was important. She asked about clarification for the word “prompt,” and if it meant within 3 days or urgently and immediately that evening. She also commented that even with prompt transmissions the same night, whether or not the MFS gets on the BOR agenda is up to the BOR and not the MFS.
  - Senator Sakaguchi responded that “prior to the relevant BOR meeting” is the new language. And, she understands how the MFS needs to work around these things. She supported Senator Higa’s statement and said the MFS should probably find a way so that the Senate meetings are not so close to the board meetings.
- Senator Maynard wanted to clarify what may have been a misstatement. The BOR does accept late testimony; the testimony will eventually be on the website. Senator Maynard shared that the CAB subcommittee discussed moving the Senate meetings, but it becomes very complicated



because the BOR can change its meetings. Senator Maynard expressed that if there's something on the BOR agenda the next day, that our SEC needs to get the resolution there.

- Senator McKimmy noted that prompt transmission is already required and the definition of what is relevant may not be shared by the BOR. Senator McKimmy stated that he did not think the amendment was necessary.
- Senator Paull noted that his definition of “prompt” depends on the faculty member to whom he is referring something. “Prompt” for Senator Paull would be one or two days, and but for other faculty members it might be a week. It really depends on the group you're dealing with. Senator Paull further noted that “prompt” is already there and the statement added is “prior to the relevant BOR meeting” which means, in some cases, the MFS might have a month. And in other cases the MFS might have a day. The point of the amendment is to get the transmission to the BOR “before the relevant BOR meeting”.
- Vice Chair Sorensen Irvine invited additional discussion. None were raised. Vice Chair Sorensen Irvine passed the gavel back to Chair McKimmy at 4:08pm. Chair McKimmy called for the vote.
- Charter amendment - "prior to the relevant BOR meeting"
  - 41 (82.00%) in support; 9 (18.00%) opposed; 6 abstentions

- **CAB PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO MFS BYLAWS (Second Reading)**

*Recommendation from the Committee on Administration and Budget (CAB)*

*Presenter: Ann Sakaguchi, CAB member*

*Supporting document:*

[Redline Bylaws \(PDF\)](#)

[Amendments list, Bylaws](#)

- Senator Sakaguchi began with the presentations of amendments discussed but not included.
  - CAB received requests for bylaws amendments but not all requests were included. Senator Sakaguchi added that the Amendments section in the bylaws is designed to present all of the proposed materials in the first reading, and then at the next MFS meeting, the second reading takes place. This ensures transparency first and foremost, and CAB followed this process very closely.
  - CAB had a request to amend Article IV, Section 1. K., which it received from the Committee on Faculty Service (CFS). The amendment was as follows: “*CFS may also nominate one-year alternate appointments for non-senator positions to committees with their own governing documents.*” CAB reviewed and discussed the request at length, and



felt that while the amendment is a very good amendment, it was too granular and specific for bylaws. CAB felt that it belonged in the committee's standing rules.

- The second amendment that CFS requested was concerning individuals who hold faculty positions and are also graduate students. CAB found that there are a lot of senators in the past who were pursuing advanced degrees or other professional degrees; some of them were also on the SEC. They have served the Senate very well, so CAB did not see an issue, conflict, or problem. In fact, the current SEC has a faculty member who is a graduate student, and another SEC member who had recently graduated.
- The third amendment that CFS requested was to disallow senators in the second year of their final term to stand for election to the SEC. This is partially closed because CAB did include amendment language precluding senators in the second year of the second consecutive term from standing for election to the SEC.
- Senator Sakaguchi then proceeded to present the proposed amendments starting with Article III, Sec. 2 that adds "tenured" to the requirements to serve on the SEC.
  - Senator Sakaguchi first presented the pros, which was that tenured faculty have the biggest stake in the long-term survival of the university and its functions. Non-tenured probationary faculty may feel vulnerable in addressing difficult situations with senior administrators. Furthermore, CAB felt that the voice of the SEC must be strong, and believes that the strongest voices tend to come from tenured faculty. Non-tenured track (NTT) and pre-tenure faculty can certainly serve in the Senate and serve as officers of committees. Senator Sakaguchi presented the cons next, which was that there are a lot of qualified NTT and pre-tenure faculty who may be left out should this amendment go through. Chair McKimmy opened up the floor for discussion.
  - Senator Yuan (CTAHR) opposed the addition of a requirement of only tenured faculty to serve on the SEC. The Committee on Faculty Service (CFS), of which she is a member, discussed this at length. One reason is because the CFS does not have access to a person's tenure status for elections, and if a person is under consideration, what that tenure decision will be. The CFS also felt that the essence of the SEC election is for volunteers to assess their own availability and ability to run for election. So CFS thought it is a decision of the Mānoa Faculty Senators as a body to decide who should serve, and who is not qualified to serve. Having an arbitrary qualification would hinder, potentially, a suitable strong candidate to serve in the SEC.
  - Chair McKimmy reminded Senators that the appropriate action for Senators after discussion is heard is to make a motion to strike, either the amendment or portions of the amendment, or a motion to amend the amendment. Those are the options, but it would be helpful to hear opinions first.



- Senator Maynard shared, regarding tenure, that CAB was aware that it would leave some people out, but CAB believed that the tenured faculty have the biggest long-term stake in the health of the faculty in our institution. CAB believes that tenured faculty have the strongest voice. Senator Maynard also wanted to make an amendment to the amendment coming from CAB. UHMFS Staff member John Kinder added the amendment on screen for Senators to see.
  - Amendment to the amendment: Add "duly elected as outlined in Article VI, Section 2" to Article III, Sec. 2
    - Chair McKimmy asked if there was any discussion. Having none, Chair McKimmy asked if there was any Senator opposed to the amendment to the amendment. Given that there was no opposition, Chair McKimmy declared the amendment to the amendment was accepted by acclamation.
- Senator Withy (JABSOM) shared that she is a non-tenured faculty member and that almost all the clinical faculty who are not department chairs at the School of Medicine are non-tenure track faculty. Senator Withy stated that she has served on the SEC without problems, having been a non-tenured faculty member for 25 years. She expressed that it would be very unfair to faculty if the MFS requires the SEC members to be tenured. She further expressed that Mānoa might see more non-tenure track faculty hired, that seems more well-liked by leadership, because NTT faculty are more vulnerable. Senator Withy emphasized that NTT faculty should continue to be valued even if vulnerable. She stated that the MFS may end up with a two-class system, if MFS says Senators have to be tenured to be on the SEC. As long as a Senator understands what they are up against, and are willing to do that, then they should be empowered to be in that position.
- Senator Sorensen Irvine expressed strong opposition to adding the word “tenured” into the article. She stated that there are many talented non-tenured tenure track faculty, working in the university. She described the Center on Disability Studies in the College of Education that has two (2) faculty who are tenure-track or tenured out of almost 200 people. There are faculty in the university who have been here for decades who are not on a tenure track. Senator Sorensen Irvine thought it should be an individual choice. Faculty know our own strengths and weaknesses and should be able to make that choice for themselves as to whether they would like to run for the SEC.
- Senator Beaule (CALL) stated that the CFS, which is responsible for running the elections, cannot implement this particular requirement. CFS does not have access to information on tenure status, which becomes more difficult for those faculty who are undergoing the process of applying for tenure and do not learn of decisions until the summer, which is after SEC elections. CFS unanimously and very strongly opposes this amendment.





- Senator Sorensen Irvine moved to strike the word “tenure” from the amendment. Seconded by Senator Withy.
  - Amendment to the amendment: Strike word “tenure” from amendment to Article III, Sec. 2.
    - 48 (84.21%) in support; 9 (15.79%) opposed; 2 abstentions. Motion carries.
- Chair McKimmy called for additional discussion on the amendment to the amendment, displayed on screen as “duly elected as outlined in Article VI, Section 2. No additional issues were raised. Chair McKimmy asked if anyone opposed the revised amendment.
  - Chair McKimmy declared the amendment is approved by acclamation.
- Chair McKimmy introduced the next amendment to Article III, Sec. 2. It proposes that no more than two members from a single constituency may serve on the SEC, except possibly during the summer overlap period. Chair McKimmy invited discussion.
  - Senator Yuan (CTAHR) stated that she wanted to recommend striking this part of the amendment, as it artificially limits how the voting will go. If the MFS has that cap, she described that the MFS might have people elected who have lower overall votes than others. To place this kind of limitation to such a small committee of seven members is problematic because it addresses a problem that does not exist. In the last 10 years [[data available here](#)], the MFS has very frequently had two members from the same constituency serve in the SEC; only two years out of the 10 years had more than two members of the same constituency served in SEC. It is a really rare occurrence. If it is not a problem, the MFS should not add rules to affect voting in this way. All Senate members have one vote. Adding this would affect how the voting results will turn out.
  - Senator Guentner (NATSCI) spoke in favor of the amendment. The amendment is related to proportionality of representation. Right now, the Senate has a proportional representation where the MFS has X Senators from College A and Y Senators from College B, etc. This is a very natural extension of that idea. Furthermore, Senator Guentner stated that he is not very receptive to an argument that takes the form of if it doesn't come up, why should the MFS do it. If the idea of proportional representation is a good one, why not put it in the bylaws?
  - Senator Beaule shared that the CFS discussed this amendment at length and unanimously and strongly opposes this requirement. CFS researched [the last 10 years of SEC elections](#), and including the elected alternatives, 9 out of 10 groups of elected SEC members included more than two from the same constituency. CFS thinks that the decision to run in the SEC election is a personal one. It is an extremely heavy workload and time commitment. Every year, there are





relatively few senators who run for election for the SEC. All senators get one vote. And if the Senate as a body decides to elect several individuals from the same constituency, CFS doesn't think that the process should go around the will of the elected Senate. There is no problem that has been brought up that would be solved by this. All SEC members have faithfully executed their duty in representing the faculty as a whole. And so CFS unanimously and very strongly opposes this amendment as well.

- Senator Sakaguchi expressed support for the amendment. As Senator Yuan said, there are only seven senators on the SEC, and if three, four or five of them are from the same college, the views are not representative of the wider campus. Administrators have also remarked on the SEC composition and the issue of representativeness. This affects the credibility of the Senate. It is not a criticism of the folks that are on the SEC, but about perception. Senator Sakaguchi feels strongly that wider representation is really important moving forward.
- Senator Cooney inquired what is done when MFS finds that only members from one or two schools even apply to run for the SEC? How would this resolution affect that? If it's required, but the MFS doesn't get enough people running? What does the MFS do then?
  - Chair McKimmy invited Senator Sakaguchi to respond. Senator Sakaguchi stated that for a variety of reasons, and this is just not the SEC, a lot of people are not running for the Senate. She acknowledged the dilemma of CFS. Senator Sakaguchi suggested that maybe the MFS should conduct another election. Senator Sakaguchi also suggested that the MFS should let people know that if you are on the SEC, you receive a stipend; a lot of people don't know this. If they knew, they might run for the SEC. Senator Sakaguchi suggested that it needs to be made more transparent. With a stipend, you're actually getting some of your time bought out. For the regular SEC member, it's a quarter-time; for the SEC chair it is half-time; stipends may therefore be an incentive. Senator Sakaguchi stated that she thinks the SEC needs wider representation. She expressed that if there are four or five SEC members from the College of Social Sciences, where she is from, this composition would be seen as a skewed perspective and that it would not be representative of the whole campus, and not fair to the rest of the Senators.
  - Chair McKimmy provided a point of clarification that what was mentioned as a stipend is not a stipend, but a relief fund. For the SEC Chair, he said it is about \$11,000. For anyone who is not Chair, it is slightly less at about \$5,000. The stipend is not related to FTE. Relief funds have been provided for specific purposes that relate to assistance with teaching, research, etc.



- Senator Maynard agreed with Senator Sakaguchi. CAB unanimously voted for this change after a lot of discussion and consideration. Senator Maynard further stated that the MFS may need to work on changing the culture of the Senate to get more people interested in running. If people are hesitant, the MFS may need to find out why. And, if there are low numbers in slates, the MFS can work to increase those numbers. Senator Maynard expressed that it would be great to have seven different constituencies, but this language means that the SEC would have at least four constituencies represented, and the SEC would have variety. Senator Maynard's concern with variety in thinking is that groups, especially groups that meet for several hours weekly, or a whole year or more, can be vulnerable to groupthink, of which the MFS needs to be wary. Senator Maynard is for greater representativeness of the SEC, a principle that the Senate should support.
- Senator Sorenson Irvine agreed that that diversity in the SEC is important and agreed that Senators should encourage people to run. However, Senator Sorenson Irvine expressed opposition to this particular change, because it's going to be difficult to implement. It also might result in the Senate as a whole not being able to express their voice the way they want. Senator Sorenson Irvine suggested that the solution is about encouraging Senate colleagues to run for the SEC, which Senator Sorenson Irvine pointed out she was accused of doing. She did not think that this particular change is necessary in order to increase the diversity that's on the SEC.
- Senator Potemra asked if Senator Cooney's question was answered, what would happen if the MFS doesn't get diversity of people running for the SEC. Senator Potemra also pointed out that the justification for not including students in the Senate--that it hasn't never been a problem--is the same justification given here to make this change--yet it has also not been a problem. Because it hasn't been a problem in the past, is not a valid justification for doing it now. But that's the exact justification that CAB gave for including graduate students on the faculty senate. Senator Potemra expressed concern that some Senators may think that faculty are doing SEC service because of a stipend and found the comment insulting.
- Senator Higa expressed support for the diversity initiative in the amendment. He stated that despite the possibility of someone being elected over someone with more votes, it also gives senators coming from a potentially small constituency more of a chance of being elected versus senators coming from larger constituencies. Senator Higa conveyed that he wondered about the future, if it's possible for a big coalition from a very big constituency to elect their own and stack the whole SEC with their college. If it's possible, he wants to protect against that. Senator Higa stated that one thing he liked about the committees Senators serve in is that the MFS tries to have



representation from different colleges and schools, the diversity of which he finds refreshing, enlightening, and great for the overall functioning of the committee.

- Senator Sakaguchi clarified her comments to Senator Potemra's statements. Regarding graduate students, the proposed context of CFS's amendments was related to conflict of interest. CAB did not see a conflict of interest when a faculty member is also a graduate student. In regards to the Senator feeling insulted by the implication that faculty are doing SEC service for a stipend, Senator Sakaguchi explained that she was trying to convey that a lot of people have heard that working on the SEC is a lot of work and that they're not ready to spend that much time on it. Senator Sakaguchi wanted to share that there is a stipend or relief funds. The relief funds paid are equivalent to three Lecturer C credits; for an SEC member, it's about \$5,600- \$5,700 and \$11,500 for the SEC Chair. This is provided to, for example, buy out your time, hire graduate students for your research, or the funds can be used for conference travel. For the amount of time an SEC member works, it is certainly not enough, but it helps to address the fact that some feel that being on the SEC is too much of a time commitment. Senator Sakaguchi apologized that she did not explain that better.
- Chair McKimmy reminded Senators to address comments to the Chair and about the merits of the motion.
- Senator Guentner stated that the goal of this particular amendment is obvious--to ensure a diversity of representation on the SEC. Listening to the conversation here, he had not heard a single person say that the goal of increasing diversity in the SEC is a bad one. The comments against this amendment are about difficulty of implementation, or not enough people running, etc. The fundamental point of the amendment, which is the increasing diversity of representation on the SEC, is a worthy goal that seems to be undisputed.
- Senator Kame'eleihiwa (SHK) wanted to address this amendment because she serves on CAB and had served on the SEC twice. Having spent a lot of time in SEC meetings and dealing with administration, it's really important the SEC has diversity. Usually the SEC does, but the times where it doesn't, there is discomfort. The MFS may not have had a problem with seating people in the past, but CAB felt it important to address this for the first time. The amendment prevents having too many people from one school and that's a good thing, because Senators all have different ideas. And it's good for Senators to share those ideas across different schools. And, that's not to say that there's not different ideas within the same school, but that's the reason CAB looked at this. A number of Senators on CAB have been on the SEC a number of times. Senator Kame'eleihiwa stated that the amendment is a good one and she was supportive of it.



- Senator Maynard shared that in addition to Senator Higa's and Senator Kame'eleihiwa's comments about the views of people being diverse when from different schools or constituencies on the campus are important, the diversity of their networks is important too. Some people have networks across the campus, but others have more of a strong network with just their constituency within their college.. It's not just views, it's also networks of the people they think of as leaders, and as people who would be good for various committees. Senator Maynard also agreed with a previous Senator who spoke about the process, that the MFS can adjust the voting. She agreed with Senator Guentner that the MFS does not have language yet to address cases with too few candidates. If the MFS builds on the idea that the MFS expects diverse views on the SEC and that the MFS wants this broad representation, Senator Maynard hopes to shift the culture a bit toward greater participation in the Senate more generally. The MFS just had a Senate election, and when she tried to get faculty members to run, she received feedback that people didn't want to spend their time this way. Senator Maynard wants to help with shifting the culture and views and sees diverse representation in the SEC as a really important step.
- Senator Stephenson strongly supported the amendment. She referred back to the 10 years of data that were brought up earlier as not showing any problem, with only two years having had substantial majorities from one college was problematic. Senator Stephenson pointed out that two years ago it was three people from one college and this last year it was four people out of seven. Four members out of seven really enables a group to control the leadership choices and to control basically all of the decisions of the SEC. The fact that this has been happening more frequently in the most recent two years is a reason to make sure that it doesn't happen again. The issue of diversity is absolutely important. It's important for the credibility of our Senate. As one person said earlier, administrators have spoken to us about this concentration of power and that it really reduces our credibility. But the most important thing is that the Senate be democratic. Senator Stephenson expressed strong support for the amendment that there not be more than two members from any constituency.
- Senator Biagioni (NATSCI) moved to end the debate. Senator Maynard seconded the motion.
  - 42 (84.00%) in support; 8 (16.00%) opposed; 3 abstentions
  - Motion to close debate carries.
- Chair McKimmy called for a vote on the amendment on Article III, Sec. 2 that adds that no more than two members from a single constituency may serve on the SEC, except possibly during the summer overlap period.
  - 39 (76.47%) in support; 12 (23.53%) opposed; 1 abstentions
  - Motion carries and the amendment is approved by the Senate.



## ADJOURNMENT

- Chair McKimmy recognized that it was past 5:00 PM and stated that business would be carried forward to the April meeting.
- Chair McKimmy declared the meeting adjourned at 5:02 PM.

---

Respectfully submitted by Truc Nguyen, MFS Secretary  
Approved on April 21, 2021