

wMANOA FACULTY SENATE
Committee on Professional Matters (CPM)
Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: December 6, 2012

Location: Sakamaki D-302 (Phil. Conf. Room)

Attendance: [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]; V = Vacancy

Members		Members		Members		Guests	Time
Llilikala Kameeleihiwa	V	Henry Lew	V	Victoria Szymczak (For M. Levin)	P		
Kenneth Kipnis	P	Gabor Mocz (Taking notes)	P	Halina Zaleski	E		
Scott Lozanoff (Teleconferencing)	P	Thanh Truc Nguyen	P	David Ericson (SEC Liaison)	P		
David Leake	P	Janice Shoultz	P				
Mark Levin (Sabbatical)	E	Gwen Sinclair	E				

Subject	Discussion/ Information	Action/Strategy/Responsible Person/s
CALL TO ORDER	The meeting was called to order by Ken Kipnis at 2:12 p.m.	Quorum established
MINUTES	Minutes of October 4, 2012 meeting sent by Vicky Szymczak Minutes of November 1, 2012 meeting sent by Thanh Truc Nguyen	Minutes approved, 6 votes in favor and 0 against
OLD BUSINESS	CPM Fall Report 2012-2013	Truc and Ken created/revised the Fall Semester Report for CPM (version 1, 2, & 3) based on outcomes of previous CPM meetings. CPM will review the report by 3 p.m. Dec 7 and make suggestions for additional changes if needed. Report (amended version 3) will be submitted to SEC by 4 p.m. Dec 7.
	#36.12: Evaluation of Administration / Administrators - DISCUSSION We would like to know/determine whether there is a problem with administration conducting its	

Subject	Discussion/ Information	Action/Strategy/Responsible Person/s
	<p>own evaluation before recommending anything to SEC. Our hands are full and we do not want unnecessarily to take up responsibility.</p> <p>Original issue is not whether evaluation is good or has procedural soundness but whether it has transparency to the UH community and students as the stakeholders want to know the results. We don't have to develop a new procedure. CPM did research of other systems out there in the previous two years.</p> <p>The University of Michigan evaluation system is a possible model for UH. It is handled by the administration, faculty and students can evaluate, rules/results presented to the state legislation. It is not clear how well the evaluation is understood by the legislation.</p> <p>Past experiences show that faculty doesn't participate even if opportunity is given. Participation is increasing with utilization of email system for distributing questionnaires.</p> <p>Administrators are evaluated once in every 4 years or more.</p> <p>Can faculty nominate someone for evaluation? Who can request evaluation? Individual faculty? A group of individuals? The majority of faculty? Or the entire faculty is needed? College of Education had an example request but they did not see the result.</p> <p>Faculty is evaluated all the time; the same should</p>	<p>Truc will send out "360 evaluation" questions to CPM based on what CPM formerly proposed.</p> <p>Truc will share "transparency questions" with CAB.</p>

Subject	Discussion/ Information	Action/Strategy/Responsible Person/s
	<p>apply to administration. Faculty should have leverage.</p>	
	<p>#36.12: Evaluation of Administration / Administrators - MOTION</p> <p>CPM is supposed to put forward a joint statement with CAB to SEC. The original “no change” position should be amended.</p> <p>Ken proposes a join meeting with CAB. CAB may have information that we don’t have.</p>	<p>Co-Chairs will arrange a joint meeting with CAB. CPM will meet with Doug Vincent, Chair of CAB, and CAB members on January 10, 2013 and then share our conclusions in the Spring Semester.</p>
	<p>#35.12: Faculty Classifications</p> <p>There are seven classifications of faculty at UHM.</p> <p>Administration does not understand current system. Chancellor Apple wants to focus on core elements only and eliminate/merge the F, I, L, M, and R classifications. Does not understand the role of specialists (S). Extension agents (X) have their outside external classification system also.</p> <p>If R faculty not productive, perhaps they should teach; contribute to the field and new researchers in their field.</p> <p>Reclassification is too big for one committee to consider. Efforts should be combined with CORGE.</p> <p>CPM will invite the chancellor and Vice Chancellor to let us know what they think and share their perspectives and clarify what actions</p>	<p>Co-Chairs will contact Robert Richmond, Chair of CORGE to arrange a meeting with CORGE and Chancellor Apple.</p>

Subject	Discussion/ Information	Action/Strategy/Responsible Person/s
	faculty should take.	
	<p>#6.13: Diversity Hiring Policy</p> <p>Not touched in this academic year.</p>	
	<p>#14.13: Examine the Value of Assessment</p> <p>Too sophisticated, too complicated issue! It is detrimental to professional life if faculty is evaluated like K12 teachers. The way how assessment handled deprives faculty from their individuality, distinction and freedom. Equivalent to forcing everyone to a Procrustean bed. On the other hand, anyone should be accountable. Administration should go to that bed also!</p> <p>CPM will not consider this issue this academic year but will review the work of other committees in this matter.</p>	<p>CPM advised SEC that CPM should not be the lead on this assessment issue and that it should be CAPP.</p> <p>Ken conducted discussions with Carolyn Stephenson regarding this item.</p>
	<p>#25.13: Partner hiring</p> <p>This item was completed last year. Why here again?</p> <p>SEC never posted the report on partner hiring.</p> <p>If tenure cannot be automatically awarded, the department has to be consulted. Department is not accountable for the cost of the individual not fit. They need to look somewhere else.</p> <p>Other interests apart from academic credentials, when you start doing that, you run the risk of forgetting the mission.</p>	

Subject	Discussion/ Information	Action/Strategy/Responsible Person/s
	<p>#27:13: Status of University Affiliated Research Centers</p> <p>Not touched yet. CORGE has invited CPM for joint discussion.</p>	
	<p>Issues raised by CPM members: Request for confidential information</p> <p>We have yet to engage fully in discussing the issue of confidentiality in research work and the public need for information.</p> <p>Work of researchers may be protected by confidentiality. On the other hand, public figures and agencies are seeking access to protected information. This is in conflict with research confidentiality.</p>	<p>CPM will ask the UH administration to address this concern and develop statements and policies in this matter.</p>
NEW BUSINESS	<p>Vacancies</p> <p>Resignations (Llilikala Kameeleihiwa and Henry Lew) have been reported to SEC.</p>	<p>New member (Ashley Maynard) will join CPM in January.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	<p>3:42 p.m.</p>	<p>Next meeting January 10, 2 p.m. Location TBD</p>

Approved on January 23 via electronic vote with 7 votes in favor of approval and 0 against, 2 abstentions. Respectfully submitted by Gabor Mocz.