

FACULTY SENATE
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: March 7th, 2012

ATTENDANCE:

Ronald Bontekoe	X	David Duffy	X	Anne Leineweber	X	David Sanders	X	Tani Sebro (GSO rep)
Marguerite Butler	X	Tim Dye	X	Laura Lyons	X	Victor Stenger		
Donna Ching	X	Thomas Ernst	X	Karol Richardson	X	Patricia Steinhoff	X	Guests: Reed Dasenbrock Susan Hippensteele
Danielle Conway-Jones		Judith Inazu	X	Robert Richmond		Brandon Yoza	X	Hokulani Aikau Rob Cowie
Michael Cooney	X	Lilikala Kameeleihiwa	X	Kelly Roberts				
William Chain	X			Martin Rayner	X			

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION/STRATEGY
I. DISCUSSION OF SPIC RECOMMENDATION RE DOCTORAL PROGRAMS	The Strategic Plan Implementation Committee has proposed, among other things, that in future departments only offer admission to their doctoral programs to students for whom they can provide five full years of adequate funding. Drs. Dasebrock, Hippensteele, and Aikau, representing the SPIC, explained the rationale behind this proposal, which is to improve UHM's reputation as a place in which to pursue graduate studies.	
PROBLEM ISSUES	The implementation of the proposal will be complicated, as doctoral programs vary dramatically, and not all of them have equal access to external funding for their graduate students. In particular professional degree type doctoral programs (in Education, for example) require some degree of accommodation, in that many of the doctoral candidates in these fields already have full-time jobs. There is also the problem of maintaining "critical mass" in doctoral programs, especially those with significant coursework requirements. If the number of students enrolled in doctoral programs falls below a given threshold, there may be problems in offering the necessary courses. Susan Hippensteele and Peter Garrod are currently surveying graduate programs at UHM to learn how much, and what kind of, support would be needed to make implementation of the SPIC proposal possible. Another important concern has to do with possible pressure being exerted upon graduate programs to bring them into compliance with the proposal. At present, departments determine their own admission policies (subject to Grad Division requirements). Will they be forced by the administration to cut back on their admission offers if they can't provide the five full years of funding for their admittees? Dr. Dasenbrock stressed that coercion would not be applied by the administration, but "conversations" would occur instead.	<i>CoRGE will be drafting a resolution endorsing the SPIC proposal, but specifying various provisions regarding its implementation, in order to ensure that the implementation is handled flexibly and with due respect for UHM's various graduate programs.</i>

2, JABSOM TENURE POLICY RESOLUTION	The proposed policy was presented by Mariana Gerschenson at the Feb. 27 CORGE meeting. JABSOM is proposing to tenure all FUTURE faculty appointments at 0.5 FTE G- funds. In comparison with other UH Units, JABSOM is unusual in that only 20.4% of faculty are tenurable. However, LCME requires that most teaching faculty are on tenure track. The ability to obtain tenure at 50% G-funds would essentially allow JABSOM to double the number of tenurable faculty over time. JABSOM faculty has approved this proposal after several years of discussion.	
PROBLEM ISSUES	<p>How can one avoid that other UHM units want to follow this path, or that upper administration will pressure units to adopt a similar model?</p> <p>This arrangement might affect existing FTEs</p> <p>The model might be a disaster for teaching-intensive units</p> <p>It is important to ensure that non-JABSOM funds will not be used towards covering potential future salary gaps resulting from this policy</p>	<i>A draft resolution was presented emphasizing that no imposition occur on any other Manoa unit for ten years. Other time frames (e.g. 5 years) were discussed. A revised resolution was drafted stating that “no similar FTE reduction plan ... be forced upon any other Manoa unit”. The draft resolution also addresses the issues of use of non-JABSOM funds and effect on existing FTEs.</i>
OTHER ISSUES	<p>The JABSOM tenure model might make sense for other units, and the Senate should not dictate what units can and cannot do.</p> <p>Likewise, the Senate should not create a policy that prohibits action for 10 years.</p>	
3. MOTION OF NON-CONFIDENCE IN VCRGE	<p>The VCRGE, Dr. Ostrander, had a meeting with Alan Lau to discuss whether Alan would be acceptable as PBRC Director. The VCRGE deemed Alan Lau and his proposal to unfreeze 2 positions unacceptable. Consequently, the VCRGE has not stepped down as Interim PBRC Director.</p> <p>The VCRGE has a major administrative conflict of interest with regards to his dual roles as PBRC Interim Director and VCRGE.</p> <p>At this point in time, the VCRGE has ignored 3 prior resolutions of the Manoa Faculty Senate to appoint a new Director and step down as PBRC Interim Director. The most recent of these resolutions, dated January 18, 2012, specifically asked the VCRGE to take action within 30 days.</p>	<i>The CORGE discussed the wording for a resolution of Non-Confidence, which will be co-sponsored by CAB and CORGE. Some versions included references to the Kewalo Laboratory. The final motion will be simple and focus on the major point that the VCRGE has now ignored 3 prior Senate resolutions that asked him to step down as PBRC Interim Director.</i>
PROBLEM ISSUES	<p>The ultimate fate of the PBRC is still in the hands of the President, Dr. Greenwood. The President may want to defer the decision until a new Chancellor has been found.</p> <p>The VCRGE may be acting as directed by his superiors.</p>	

	Why is the resolution not directed to the person who can actually resolve the VCRGE's conflict of interest (i.e. President Greenwood)?	