

Faculty Senate
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: November 8, 2010

Attendance:

Susan Hippensteele (Chair)	X	Chancellor Hinshaw	Greg Takayama	Others:
Lilikala		Martin Rayner	X	
		VCGRE Ostrander	X	
Shirley Daniel	X	Halina Zaleski	X	
Rosanne Harrigan		David Duffy	X	
		VCAA Dasenbrock		
		VCSA Hernandez		

Subject	Discussion	Action/Strategy
Call to order	The meeting began at 3 p.m. in HH 208.	
Chairs Report	MET will meet tomorrow, nothing to report today.	
Meeting with VC Ostrander	<p>The VCGRE joined the meeting. The following issues were discussed.</p> <p>1. Undergraduate Research Initiative</p> <p>The VC indicated that he is awaiting the committee's report on who to hire to aid the undergraduate research initiative (i.e. student, PHD, APT). The UH Honors program received 24K as a first step to jump start the undergraduate research initiative. Reid and Francisco also have 200K-250K that must be afforded to students. The Chancellor has also committed 90K to the initiative, but the VC indicated that the Chancellor may be inclined to contribute more money. The VC indicated that he wants to avoid committing to recurring funds since doing so would make the funds generally unavailable to alternative programs.</p> <p>Hippensteele noted that undergraduate students are largely unaware of research opportunities, and that a popular research area of interest amongst students is sustainable research.</p> <p>The VC indicated that a new employee in his office has been working on affording sustainable research opportunities to undergraduates. The VC concluded that flexible spending enables them to stay responsive to a wide range of research areas, but that most undergraduates become involved with research as a result of their connections with faculty.</p>	A

Subject	Discussion	Action/Strategy
	<p data-bbox="401 131 1014 159">2. PBRC: VCRGE/SEC/ Committee Communication</p> <p data-bbox="401 191 1356 280">The VC began by expressing his overall concern with the procedural functionality of the Senate and Chancellor's office, and the need to work more productively together.</p> <p data-bbox="401 313 1371 768">The VC expressed his frustration with the Senate's reports regarding the abolishment of PBRC. While the VC said that he did not entirely agree with the CAB report and that he had follow up questions to address, he believes that the report was furnished through a fair process since he was afforded an opportunity to present his position. The VC expressed his frustration about not being invited to present his position to CPM even though PBRC was invited to comment, and noted that the report has clear factual errors, including the representation that the vote was unanimous when there was only a marginal quorum. In addition, the VC said that he believed that CoR's statement that he declined to meet with them was not accurate, and that he definitely wanted to meet with them but that his schedule did not allow on that day, although there had been two months on which a meeting could have been held. The VC also noted that it he had requested additional names of prospective candidates to fill the Interim Dean position, since the three suggested individuals were either found to be unacceptable or declined the VC's invitations for discussion, but that he had never received a response.</p> <p data-bbox="401 800 1367 979">Hippensteele noted that the Senate was also concerned because the final reorganization proposal came with a due date in the off-duty period. CAB was the only committee that achieved quorum during the summer, although the SEC felt that there were other committees that we wanted to review the issue. Whether or not the Proposal would go to the BOR over summer was not clear until after CAB had finished its review.</p> <p data-bbox="401 1011 1339 1133">The VC agreed that confusion over whether the Proposal would go before the BOR had complicated matters over the summer, and suggested that we move forward towards future improvement to the procedural functionality of the Senate and VC's office.</p> <p data-bbox="401 1166 1360 1409">Daniel also noted that there are questions about the underlying rationale for the abolition of PBRC since this is not clearly stated in the VC's proposal. There were also concerns about whether the reorganization of PBRC was the beginning of a referendum on ORUs in general. There were questions about whether the measures used to evaluate PBRC are appropriate and whether these criteria are being used to evaluate other similar units/ORU. Daniel suggested a fairly applied productivity standard and a faculty driven progress review process to ensure fairness.</p> <p data-bbox="401 1442 1297 1468">The VC pointed out that the reorganization suggested matters that should be</p>	

Subject	Discussion	Action/Strategy
	considered, but that these were not necessarily always required, which created a grey area. The VC agreed that a review of marine stations by CAB would be useful.	
Parking at Senate meeting	<p>We were able to obtain two Zone 3/green stall parking pass; one will be shared by JABSOM and CRCH faculty and one will be given to Rosanne Harrigan.</p> <p>The other parking pass will be kept at the security desk at the Med School who will monitor access to it.</p> <p>MET meets tomorrow.</p>	
SEC minutes	Minutes from the last meeting were approved as revised on the laulima website.	
Senate Nov 17 meeting	<p>The SEC discussed the agenda for the Nov 17 meeting.</p> <p>Duffy noted that CAB is working on a change in bylaws or rules to waive the reading of resolutions into the minutes if they have been posted on the website.</p> <p>Hippensteele asked whether there is a need to hand out paper resolutions. The SEC decided this was not necessary, but we would continue to show the resolution on the screen at the meetings.</p> <p>Specific agenda items were then discussed, including</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Budget Task Force report. This report should be ready for presentation at the Nov 17 meeting. It should be a good complement to the current strategic planning process as it advocates integrating financial planning into the strategic plan. 2. The CFS Committee on faculty service would also like to present a report on the voting mechanisms for senators to simplify elections. <p>There is also an issue that we will have too few carryover senators and too many new senators in fall 2011 and they want to present this to the Senate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Hafner is schedule to come at 3:20. Given the number of items we have will we have time to adequately discuss his presentation? 4. The SEC discussed the various issues that CAPP has proposed to bring up for the meeting. 5. Hiring activities, including the number of faculty that have been hired, and perhaps proposed retirements. 	The senate will continue to finalize the agenda and will work with the committees to get agenda items posted.

Subject	Discussion	Action/Strategy
International Programs organizational process	<p>A memo was circulated this week from the liaison of CAPP concerning the current organization of international programs. The SEC has discussed the issue of international programs a few times with the VCAA and we agreed to postpone organizational changes until after the UHM strategic plan was finished and until the matter has been fully considered by Ned Shultz.</p> <p>The SEC also noted that any reorganization proposals coming from any unit should try to work through the procedures in A3.101.</p>	<p>Liaisons for CAB and CAPP will relay to them that we will take their concerns into consideration, but that we would like to postpone any resolutions or reorganization proposals until the strategic plan is finished.</p>
January retreat with the administration	<p>We are planning a half day meeting in early January with the administration. It was agreed that we would invite the SEC and all senate committee chairs, as well as all the VCs</p>	<p>S Daniel to sent out invitation with Doodle schedule to the appropriate invitees.</p>
Resolutions vs. Motions	<p>There are a number of issues that the Senate deals with that could be motions rather than resolutions. Unless the issue needs to go to the BOR, then a motion will suffice.</p>	
Committee reports	<p>CFS – The CFS Committee on faculty service will present a report on the voting mechanisms at the next Senate meeting. They are also addressing the issue that we will have too few carryover senators and too many new senators in fall 2011 and they want to present this to the Senate.</p> <p>CoA will meet next week CoR will meet this week</p> <p>CAB met today. They discussed clickers and whether such a change would require a change in bylaws. They discussed a review of centers. They had earlier met with the VCAA about the classroom policy and are awaiting more information from him. They need to check with CAPP about its progress on this.</p> <p>CPM will bring the handbook Wiki issue as a motion.</p> <p>MAC the faculty assessment issue will be brought to the Nov 17 meeting as a resolution. There was also some correspondence this week about commitments that have been made by the Chancellor regarding assessment processes that have not been vetted through the faculty senate. The SEC discussed some of the prior issues relating to assessment and the organization and funding for assessment and historical staffing. Hippensteele noted that the MOU that was approved last year required a faculty director for the assessment office, however, it isn't clear that there are resources to do this, and whether this would accomplish a faculty led assessment process. For example having funds to hire a GA or buy out teaching time might be a better use of funds to move assessment forward. Also, combining the Assessment office with OFDAS and perhaps GenEd might need to be revisited.</p>	<p>Liaisons are encouraged to remind their committees to keep following up on their charges and if they are taking the lead on an issue that is being address by several committees they should coordinate and keep the issue moving along.</p> <p>The issue will be discussed in more detail with the VCAA, and perhaps with MAC after that.</p>

Subject	Discussion	Action/Strategy
Native Hawaiian underrepresentation at UHM	This item was deferred to the next meeting.	
SEC roles revisited	This item was deferred to the next meeting.	
Strategic Planning	The SEC briefly discussed the progress of the writing groups for the strategic planning progress.	
	The SEC was pleased to see the improved organization of HH 208 Senate room and look forward to working with Herrick as she begins her work with us. The meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.	