

Minutes
October 20, 2010
4:00 pm Senate Meeting
Architecture Auditorium

- I. Call to Order
 1. Announcements
- II. Approval of Minutes from [May 5](#) and [Sept 15 2010](#)
- III. New Business
 1. [SEC Resolution in Support of Obama Library](#) (Guest: Robert Perkinson)
 2. [SEC Resolution on the Proposal to Abolish PBRC](#)
CAB [Report](#)
CPM [Checklist](#) and [Report](#)
COR [Report and Checklist](#)
http://www.manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcafo/neworg_charts/index.html (opens in new window/tab)
 3. Committee reports
MAC: [Statement on Faculty Governance of Assessment](#)
CAPP: [BA in Pac Isl Studies](#)
COR: [Resolution on the UHM Open Access Policy](#)
CPM: Progress report on CPM charges
COA: Progress report on COA charges
CSA: Progress report on CSA charges
GEC: Progress report on GEC charges
- IV. Adjournment

Senators present: Apuzen-Ito, Garrett R, Biagioni, Edoardo, Bontekoe, Ronald Brandon, Paul, Brown, James, Caron, James, Cartwright, James, Caske n, Richard, Chao, Beei-Huan, Chapman, William, Chesney-Lind, Meda, Ching, Donna, Cooney, Robert, Cooney, Michael, Cowie, Robert, Daniel, Elton, Daniel, Shirley, Deenik, Jonathan, Demattos, Michael, Donegan, Patricia, Duffy, David, Eichelberger, Ariana, Enomoto, Ernestine, Erdem, Guliz, Ericson, David, Fisher, Elizabeth, Fong, Sheri, Garmire, David, Hallett, Brien, Halliday, Timothy, Harrigan, Rosanne, Hartwell, Jay, Hew, Cynthia, Hippensteele, Susan, Jarrett, Joseph, Kameeleihiwa, Lilikala, Kellett, Carol, Leake, Anne, Li, Dongmel, Lienert, Barry, Manini, Bonnyjean, Matsuda, Jennifer, Jonathan, Matsuda, Nguyen, Thanh Truc, Nielsen, Oishi, Martin, Pagano, Ian, Patriarche, Julia, Qu, Weilin, Rayner, Martin, Richmond, Robert, Roberts, Stacey, Sammons, Todd, Shoultz, Janice, Stenger, Victor, Synodinos, Nicolaos, Vincent, Douglas, Ward, Cynthia, Wen, Hsing, Young, Jean, Zaleski, Halina, Schultz, Jennifer, Kelly, Roberts Robert Joseph Matthew Shipley

Senators absent or excused: Phillips, Vaughan

Visitors: David Ross, Frances B. Hale, James Jackson, Page Jinbo, Martha Staff, Viet Nyo, Martha Crosby, Julie W. Krock, James Viernes, Tarcisius Katutaulaka, Robert Brewer, Ravna Isaki, Ray Allen, Feroza Jussawalla, Joyce Najita, G. Bryant-Greenwood, Ann M. Castelfranco, Sara Rutter, Paul Chandler, Mona Chock, Mochiko Bigus, Michael Weinstein, Lois Magnussen, Alvin Y. Yoshinaga, Adrian J. Dunn, Juanita Lin, Erik Gurtnier, Mirjana Jovovic, Robert Benham, Rebecca Caan, Durrell Kapam, Stuart Donachie, Patricia Halagao

I. Hippensteele opened the Senate meeting at 3:51 p.m. and provided a brief summary of the agenda and the important issues at hand.

In light of her report and announcements made in the Congress, Hippensteele noted she would forego a chair's report.

II. Hippensteele called for a motion to approve the Senate minutes of May 5, 2010. The minutes were displayed on the screen. One correction to add Paul Brandon as present was made. The minutes were approved as corrected.

A motion to approve the Sept 15 Senate meeting was made and seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. 1. Hippensteele introduced the resolution in support of the Obama library at UHM. The resolution was shown on the screen and read into the record verbatim. A motion to approve the resolution was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

III 2. Hippensteele introduced the issue of the administration's proposal to abolish PBRC. She outlined that the chairs of CAB, CPM and CoR would present their committee reports and then we would entertain questions. She requested that all questions and comments be brief, be directed to the appropriate person, not be redundant and stick to the issues. Hippensteele read the proposed resolution into the record verbatim.

David Ericson, Chair of CAB came to the floor. He noted that the committee had been alerted to the issue in the summer during the off-duty period, and decided they needed to try to meet to advise the SEC. CAB met 4 times in June. During one of those meetings, they met with the VCGRE and another they met with faculty of PBRC. Their decision turned on 6 issues, which were outlined in their report. The vote was in favor of abolishment and was very close (5 to 4). If any of the conditions were to change, their vote would likely to be different.

Truc Nguyen, chair of CPM took the floor. She noted that they had addressed this issue last spring and again this fall. They met with PBRC faculty. Their main concerns were the faculty ability to conduct research and positive scholarship.

One of CPM's concerns was that if the VCGRE was the Interim Director and proposed abolishment, this was a problem. Another issue was the rush with which the matter was dealt, particularly in light of pending retirements.

CPM voted unanimously at that meeting against the abolishment of PBRC.

Robert Cooney, chair of CoR took the floor. He noted that the CoR took a somewhat different philosophical approach in reviewing the proposal to abolish. The group reviewed the proposal on its merits, using the criteria provided for reorganizations. Members of CoR found that the administration had not made a valid case for the abolition proposal, and that there were a number of facts that were in error. CoR also found that abolishment of PBRC would negatively impact teaching and research. With respect to financial reasons, the administration had not adequately addressed these. CoR unanimously passed their resolution against the proposal.

A motion was made to limit the discussion to 5 minutes per senator. The motion was seconded and passed with only 1 opposed.

Q. A question was asked of CAB as to why the committee was split in their vote, particularly when other committees were unanimous in their opposition.

A. Ericson noted that the CAB report delineates the arguments for and against, and that the main concern of those favoring the abolishment was that PBRC faculty was not focused on a central area of research, that many faculty replacements would have to be hired, and that the PBRC was overstaffed and that these personnel could be used better in other units.

Q. A senator asked what the minority view/arguments were.

A. The CAB minority report noted that PBRC was a world class unit and there seemed no justification for abolishing it.

Q. Another senator asked if there was any information about the performance of PBRC relative to other units.

A. Ericson noted that such a comparison was not made or available.

Q. The senator inquired about how the conditions delineated in the CAB report could be enforced.

A. Ericson noted that the Senate was only advisory and we have to assume the administration will act in good faith.

Q. Another senator expressed a question as to why the VCGRE would be proposing the abolishment of PBRC. Was it an effort to clean up his budget?

A. Ericson noted that any monies taken from PBRC would be transferred to other units. He could not speculate on any other motivation.

Q. Another senator inquired about whether there were other reorgs on the VCGRE agenda.

A. Ericson noted that the VCGRE stated there were none.

Q. A member of CAB (Nielson) noted that the VCGRE had indicated that the staff support of PBRC was excessive in relation to their research funding output. This was one rationale for the abolishment.

Q. A member of CoR (Mike Cooney) noted that the CoR wrote some reports after their meeting that have been debated. However the primary process that CoR went through was to review the proposal according to the criteria set forth. He feels strongly that the faculty must ask the administration to justify their decisions and proposals and we must hold them accountable.

The chair of CoR concurred with this point of view.

Q. Another senator asked why the VCGRE is not attending this meeting.

A. Chair of CoR noted that the VCGRE was invited to attend the CoR meeting but was unable to meet at the scheduled time. Hippensteele noted that the VCGRE was invited to attend the Senate meeting, but he declined as he felt he had little more to add and did not want to create a more emotional discussion than desirable.

A motion to call the question was made, seconded and passed.

A motion to approve the abolishment of PBRC was made and seconded. The motion failed

4 in favor, 48 opposed

A motion to not recommend approval of the abolishment of PBRC was made and seconded.

47 in favor, 2 opposed

The motion passed.

One senator questioned the wording of the vote. It was pointed out that a friendly motion to amend the language could have been made but the vote was taken and stands.

III 3. a) Hippensteele introduced the issue of Assessment and asked Paul Brandon, the Chair of MAC to take the floor.

Brandon noted that the issue of student learning assessment was discussed by the Senate last spring. He reviewed a proposed statement on Faculty Governance of Program Assessment. The statement clearly states that program assessment is to help improve programs, and not to evaluate an individual student, faculty member, or staff, nor used in decisions for hiring or program closure. He went through the statement briefly and asked that the senate review the matter so that when it comes for a vote in November we can effectively deal with it.

Q. A senator asked about clarification regarding not using the assessment for hiring.

Q. A senator asked a question about the senate's 2006 or 2007 decision to have separate faculty directed staffing for assessment rather than being controlled by the administration.

Another senator noted that the 2007 report is referenced in the statement and is on the website.

Q. A senator asked what the practical implications of passing this resolution will be.

A. The Chair of MAC noted that in his experience this type of statement is an essential precursor to setting the assessment policy. Hippensteele noted that resolutions are transmitted to the administration and the BOR.

III 3 b). Hippensteele called upon the vice chair of CAPP to present their proposed resolution on the creation of a BA in Pacific Island Studies. The resolution was read into the record verbatim.

Q. Is this the only UG degree program in this unit?

A. Yes.

Q. Are there any similar programs elsewhere in the US?

A. No. There may be a program developing at the U of the South Pacific and perhaps Australian National University would be the only other place such a degree would be developed.

Q. Will there be additional resources needed now for this program?

A. Not at this time. The Library also has good resources.

Q. What about resources in the future?

A. As student enrollments increase, additional resources may be needed.

Q. What data were used to estimate the demand for program?

A. Faculty from the PI studies noted that this had been under development for a number of years. They started with a single course which has been offered for several years. Surveys of students taking this class were conducted on a number of occasions. Of the 120 students taking the class, about 25% have expressed an interest in an UG major. The department expects an initial enrollment of 10.

Q. Sometimes students are enthusiastic, but when there are no jobs in the field, they lose interest, could this occur here?

A. 3 tracks have been developed to address this issue.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the BA in P.I. studies.

The motion passed unanimously.

III 3 c) The chair of CoR was called to present the motion to develop an open access policy to promote the efficient and cost effective access to scholarly research.

Q. Since some journals require a copyright transfer form, how will the paperwork to do this?

A. There will be a form that you can get from the library to send to the journal. There will be no penalty if the faculty cannot or does not want to respond.

Q. Is this redundant to other repositories?

A. It may be but would still improve accessibility if we had such a repository at UHM.

Q. Another question about the process to opt out was raised.

A. The proposal contains a provision for a waiver. A representative from the library noted that the scholar will submit their peer reviewed manuscript which will be posted to the UHM repository. This may be prior to the typesetting process. Most publishers allow researchers to post research at an earlier process. MIT and Harvard have a similar system. NIH also requires researchers to post their articles.

Q. One faculty noted that before the typesetting the copyright does not exist, so faculty can submit a final draft for posting. This has been common practice in physics for some time.

It was noted that we no longer had a quorum.

A motion to adjourn was made.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.