

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

Meeting Date: November 1, 2012

Location: Ag Sciences 202

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

| Members | | Members | | Members | | Guests | Time |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|--------|------|
| Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa | E | Henry Lew | E | Victoria Szymczak (For M. Levin) | E | | |
| Kenneth Kipnis | P | Gabor Mocz | P | Halina Zaleski | P | | |
| Scott Lozanoff | E | Thanh Truc Nguyen | P | David Ericson (SEC Liaison) | P | | |
| David Leake | E | Janice Shoultz | E | | | | |
| Mark Levin (Sabbatical) | E | Gwen Sinclair | P | | | | |

| Subject | Discussion/ Information | Action/Strategy/Responsible Person(s) |
|----------------------|--|--|
| CALL TO ORDER | The meeting was called to order by Ken Kipnis at 2:15 p.m. | Note that no quorum reached. No official action can be taken or resolved at this meeting. Truc to send out immediate message about date and time of next meeting. Note that Henry Lew and Lilikala Kame‘eleihiwa have indicated via email to CPM that they cannot continue. David Ericson to report back to SEC the need to fill the vacancies. |
| MINUTES | Sent by Truc to CPM from Victoria. | Needs to be reformatted (see template at bottom of http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/committee/standing/cpm.html) and needs change in spelling of names and morale to moral. |
| | Request by Kristin for previous Sept minutes | Truc will send. |
| OLD BUSINESS | Progress Report for CPM | Ken will draft. Truc will add. CPM to review. |

| Subject | Discussion/ Information | Action/Strategy/Responsible Person(s) |
|---------|---|---|
| | <p>Admin Eval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ken, Truc, Kaiulani, and Kristin met with Tammy Kuniyoshi from HR office. Ken and Truc reported on the 360-process that they heard. • Note that any kind of evaluation faculty might conduct can't be called evaluation, is only feedback • Conducted every year by UHM, but not on each administrator; each administrator may get reviewed every 4-5 years. • Cannot take away questions, but can add. • Formally, if there are issues, there are plans developed between the administrator and the supervisor (VC) • If something needed, faculty initiate a request for because of concern about shortcoming or administrator • The review is sent to faculty, community, and other stakeholders <p>We discussed the Michigan system and considered reopening the suggestion to UHMFS to see if we should pursue again.</p> | |
| | <p>Post Tenure Review</p> <p>Everyone reminded to read Melinda Wood and Christina Des Jarlais article Post Tenure review practices at the University of Hawaii Journal of Higher Education about post-tenure review at UHM.</p> <p>Is there training provided to Chairs and Directors on how to conduct a post-tenure review? Perhaps by CTE? Council of Department Chairs?</p> <p>A discussion of if post tenure review is really needed? It's an issue of dereliction of duty, moral turpitude, productivity.</p> | <p>Truc to provide link to article from UHM again: http://muse.jhu.edu/eres.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/journals/journal_of_higher_education/v077/77.4wood.pdf</p> |
| | <p>Adjunct Faculty Discussion</p> <p>We have data from Kathy Cutshaw's office. Seems GAs do teach about 5% of courses and it's always higher during the summer. Truc cautioned that the data is by course, not by credit hour. So a 3-credit course was counted as 1 and a 1-credit discussion lab is also counted as 1.</p> <p>Having GAs teach increases the competition because you are in the position they want; can be problematic because it disrupts the political aspect of a university.</p> <p>There are different models for using lecturers. Professional model where we bring in community professionals to teach the specialized classes (like</p> | <p>Truc to send data to CPM prior to next meeting.</p> |

| Subject | Discussion/ Information | Action/Strategy/Responsible Person(s) |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | <p>veterinarians).</p> <p>Other issue is the argument that by giving graduate students teaching experiences, we are making them more attractive hirees. How much experience do we give them? Does it contribute to their education, or because we are using them because they don't cost that much?</p> <p>Remember that seven years of continuous can apply for tenure-track position because you've just demonstrated continuous need for that position.</p> | |
| NEW BUSINESS | <p>Ability of E/M to teach. UHPA saying they cannot teach.</p> <p>Don't many have academic appointments and have tenure somewhere? Maybe issue is pay? If it is, then perhaps they take a lecturer's salary for 0.25FTE?</p> <p>64, 58, 114 taught in Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Summer 2012 taught by E/M Are these 100% E/M? Maybe they are only assc or part time E/Ms.</p> <p>Sometimes, they step in. Short administrator years because they are thrust back into faculty and are out of date with the field. Might be better if they did have to teach a course every once in awhile. What about teaching at another University?</p> <p>Overall, might prefer that UHM make it a requirement that E/Ms teach a seminar or course if they want tenure in a department?</p> <p>Question of awarding of tenure when hired. CPM issued a statement last year about the requirement that faculty have the chance to review and say yea or nay to awarding tenure.</p> <p>Does the contract say anything?</p> | |
| ADJOURNMENT | 4:01 pm | Next meeting December 6, 2012 at 2pm in Philosophy Conference Room. |

Approved on December 6, 2012 with 6 votes in favor of approval and 0 against. Respectfully submitted by Thanh Truc Nguyen.