

MANOA FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

March 16, 2011

Art Auditorium; 3:00 – 5:00 pm

MEETING AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of [February 16, 2011 Minutes](#)
- III. Chair's Report
- IV. David Lassner: G-mail [proposal](#) and [contract](#) [3:15 - 3:45pm]
- V. New Business
 1. SEC: Motion to Endorse Achieving Our Destiny: UHM 2011-2015 Strategic Plan [\[Final Document\]](#)
Final Plan: [Pdf](#) | [Word](#)
Final Benchmarking, Planning and Budgeting Timeline Flowchart: [Pdf](#)
Approved: 1 against
 2. CPM: Report on Proposed Amendments to the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Faculty [\[Final Document\]](#)
Working Notes - Authorship Conventions: [Pdf](#) | [Word](#)
External Evaluators: [Pdf](#) | [Word](#)
Approved: unanimous
 3. CAPP:
Motion to Support a One-Year Trial of Electronic Registration Waitlisting [\[Final Document\]](#)
Memorandum: VCAA Reed Dasenbrock to Senate Chair Susan Hippensteele [January 20, 2011]: [Pdf](#)
Issues Involving Registration Waitlisting: VCAA's response to CAPP concerns [February 2, 2011]: [Pdf](#)
Update on Waitlisting: VCAA's e-mail to CAPP Chair Sarita Rai [February 25, 2011]: [Pdf](#)
Approved: 1 against
Motion to Recognize Students with High Academic Achievement during Graduation Ceremony [\[Final Document\]](#)
Memorandum: VCAA Reed Dasenbrock to Senate Chair Susan Hippensteele [January 18, 2011]: [Pdf](#)
Approved: unanimous
Report on Mid-term Grade Reporting [\[Final Document\]](#)
Memorandum: VCAA Reed Dasenbrock to Senate Chair Susan Hippensteele [January 20, 2011]: [Pdf](#)
 4. CFS: Report on 2011 Manoa Faculty Senate Election Results: [\[Final Document\]](#) | [PowerPoint](#)
 5. WGGE: Report on Graduate Education
- VI. Adjournment

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT: 55

Chizuko Allen, Edoardo Biagioni, Ronald Bontekoe, Paul Brandon, James Cartwright, Beei-Huan Chao, Donna Ching, Michael Cooney, Michael Demattos, David Duffy, Ariana Eichelberger, Ernestine Enomoto, David Ericson, Elizabeth Fisher, Sheri Fong, Brien Hallett, Jay Hartwell, Cynthia Hew, Joseph Jarrett, Kenneth Kipnis, Anne Leake, Chin Lee, Barry Lienert, Bonnyjean Manini, Jennifer Matsuda, Torben Nielsen, Lawrence Nitz, Julia Patriarche, Robert Paull, Vaughan Phillips, Martin Rayner, Robert Richmond, Todd Sammons, David Sanders, Lilia Santiago, Magi Sarvimaki, Bruce Shiramizu, Janice Shoultz, Nicolaos Synodinos, Douglas Vincent, Cynthia Ward, Hsing Wen, Kelley Withy, Halina Zaleski, Pavel Zinin

ABSENT: 35

EXCUSED: 22

Garrett Apuzen-Ito, Marguerite Butler, Richard Chadwick, William Chapman, Robert Cooney, Robert Cowie, Shirley Daniel, Jonathan Deenik, Patricia Donegan, Rosanne Harrigan, Susan Hippensteele, Ellen Hoffman, Kim Holland, Lilikala Kameeleihiwa, Carol Kellett, Mark Levin, Katrina-Ann Oliveira, Hamid Pourjalali, Weilin Qu, Sarita Rai, Stacey Roberts, Kaimi Sinclair

UNEXCUSED: 12

John Casken, Thomas Gallacher, David Garmire, Timothy Halliday, John Madey, Jonathan Matsuda, Crystal Mills, Paul Mitri, Richard Nettel, Raul Rudoy, Victor Stenger, James Yates

GUESTS:

C.S. Papacostras, David Ross, Robert brewer, Jing Huo, Matt McGranglor.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 by Vice-Chair Duffy.

II. Approval of [February 16, 2011 Minutes](#)

The Faculty Senate minutes of February 16, 2011, were approved as posted on the Senate web site.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT

1. WASC

The WASC visit went well. We will hear the official result in June.

2. BOR Policy Review

The BOR is revising its policies to move administrative items from the BOR policies to Executive policies. The ACCFSC and campus Senates and committees are reviewing the proposed changes, but have not been allowed enough time. The proposed Executive policies have not yet been completed, so adoption of the BOR policy revisions seems premature.

3. Senate Meetings

Hard-working Senate committees will bring a lot of motions to the April and May Senate meetings, so having and maintaining quorum is important.

IV. PRESENTATION: David Lassner: G-mail [proposal](#) and [contract](#) [3:15 - 3:45pm]

Lassner reported that he read the concerns regarding the Google proposal and contract in the minutes of the February Senate meeting. The proposal to use Google applications for education would allow us to keep the hawaii.edu addresses, and provide more space for users. Given that faculty had already had an opportunity to see the contract, Lassner opened the floor to questions:

Senator: The approach of having consultation after the contract has been signed is wrong, and leads to resistance even to proposals that may have merit. ITS should use a better process.

Senator: The proposal reads like an advocacy document. Effective evaluation needs a discussion of pros and cons and alternatives. ITS should respond to concerns. Under what circumstances would ITS not move faculty to Google?

Lassner: We haven't got there yet. The ACCFSC said that individual campuses had to be consulted. This made consultation too difficult for ITS. It is not possible to have 10 systems for the different campuses. We were under the impression that the Manoa Senate supported the move. The savings lower from moving to Google will be much lower if only the students are moved. We need to understand why faculty object to the contract.

Senator: Faculty object to corporatization. Google scholar is useful, will access to it be incorporated if faculty move to Google?

Lassner: What is Google scholar?

Senator: Faculty can access Google scholar through the library.

Senator: The deal is characterized as free to UH, but there are non-monetary benefits to Google, such as access to email and information mining.

Lassner: Google is really buying the students in the expectation that they will continue to use Google.

Senator: How does that fit into our mission? Should we encourage mindless acceptance by students?

Lassner: We can get out whenever we want. Any system we use means acceptance of that system.

Senator: Google will be able to look at our email.

Lassner: Google will scan for viruses only. They have no ownership of any email or data.

Senator: The contract says that Google will not add UH email to their fast indexing tool. Is a no cost contract enforceable?

Lassner: The UH general counsel says it is enforceable.

Senator: There was a recent scandal in Europe involving Google using a private contractor to take pictures of houses. It is not appropriate for any private company to see confidential email such as grant proposals. Will faculty be able to download email so that no copy remains on Google?

Lassner: It is possible to download email and not leave it on Google. The settings have to be adjusted accordingly.

Senator: UH does not have an option to leave Google once the UH hardware is gone. No hardware leaves no alternatives.

Lassner: The contract does not require us to stay with Google. If UH decides to leave Google, what would it move to? Either UH would need new hardware and software, or it could move to another private service, such as Yahoo or Hotmail (which is owned by Microsoft). Because our hardware is out-dated, new equipment would be needed in any event for a UH service. *After the meeting, David Lassner relayed his apologies for a misstatement that he made: Microsoft does not currently own Yahoo, although they had made an offer to purchase it.*

Senator: What happens when the contract expires after 4 years?

Lassner: Either side can make changes and renegotiate terms, so contract conditions may change. Google's purpose is to make money.

Senator: Google is free, those who so desire can already use it. What will happen to personnel at ITS?

Lassner: Personnel would still be needed to provide user support. Other units, such as mathematics, also have personnel who can support email service.

Senator: The projected savings of \$500,000 are small relative to the total ITS budget. What else might be considered for outsourcing? Classroom management?

Lassner: Some institutions are already outsourcing classroom management. Supercomputing is already outsourced. ITS is keeping an eye out for opportunities, such as outsourcing credit card payments.

V. New Business

1. SEC: Motion to Endorse Achieving Our Destiny: UHM 2011-2015 Strategic Plan [\[Final Document\]](#)

Final Plan: [Pdf](#) / [Word](#)

Final Benchmarking, Planning and Budgeting Timeline Flowchart: [Pdf](#)

David Duffy, Vice Chair of the SEC, presented this motion.

The proposed Strategic Plan for 2011-2015 grew out of Defining our Destiny, but is more strategic and implementable. WASC expressed approval of our planning process. Although the Strategic Plan Working Group had a short time-line, they received 1300 responses from faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the community. These were distilled into four goals. The next steps will be identifying data to collect and review, and forming a committee to review the data annually and set priorities to support our goals. The flow chart attached to the Strategic Plan shows a budget process that starts early, involves faculty consultation, and is proactive rather than reactive. The Working Group is still taking comments; these can be sent to Hippensteele. The Chancellor's announcement of cluster hires in the areas of sustainability and native Hawaiian scholars is consistent with the Strategic Plan priorities.

Senator: What will be the responsibilities of departments?

Duffy: The responsibilities of departments will be to report on progress and to identify steps to achieve Manoa priorities.

Senator: The cluster hiring process must be careful not to use ethnicity as a criterion for hiring..

Duffy: Cluster hiring is a separate process.

Senator: Will the Strategic Plan inform discussions on closure, as desired?

Duffy: Potentially. The process of implementation will ask about relationships to strategic goals. Does a program move them forward? Should resources be allocated?

Senator: Will administration implement the Plan?

Duffy: We can only learn that by moving forward. The Plan has buy-in from the Chancellor. Manoa needs a sense of direction and this Plan helps us (faculty, students, and administration) work together on common goals.

Motion approved with 1 vote against.

2. CPM: Report on Proposed Amendments to the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Faculty [\[Final Document\]](#)

Working Notes: Authorship Conventions: [Pdf](#) / [Word](#)

Working Notes: External Evaluators: [Pdf](#) / [Word](#)

Truc Nguyen, Chair of CPM, presented the report.

CPM followed a broad consultative process, which included a faculty survey and meetings with the VCAA and UHPA. Five changes to the P&T Guidelines were proposed, and items 1, 3 and 4 were approved at the February Senate meeting. CPM is recommending approval of item 2 on authorship conventions and item 5 on external evaluators. In both cases flexibility is needed to accommodate difference among fields or disciplines, for example, a small and specialized field such as Hawaiian Studies may have limited choices for external evaluators, and a field such as agriculture may find appropriate external evaluators among non-university research institutes. Details on authorship conventions and selection of external evaluators should be removed from the P&T guidelines and clarified at the department level. DPC's are encouraged to act as quickly as possible to include such clarification in their guidelines.

Senator: What about fields with inconsistent authorship conventions?

Nguyen: DPC's can include a reference to the need for case-by-case evaluation, and the applicant can describe the conventions specific to their publications.

Senator: What about item 4?

Nguyen: The Senate acted in February to approve making the language identical to that in the UHPA contract.

Senator: There is a concern regarding faculty being put on short-term contracts rather than tenure-track.

Motion to approve the recommended language for items 2 and 5 was approved unanimously.

<u>Report on Proposed Amendments to the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Faculty</u>	
The five proposed amendments were regarding:	CPM
1. delegated authority for approving waivers (p.4)	CPM recommends that the UHMFS support amendment #1.
2. articulation of authorship conventions (p.7-9)	CPM requests additional time to better address the comments from UHM faculty on amendment #2.
3. associate professor and researcher tenure and promotion language (p.10-11)	CPM requests that VCAA's Office provide the origin of the "well on their way" phrase and rationale behind the proposed modification. With the origin of wording and rationale, CPM will recommend that the UHMFS support amendment #3.
4. Deans' authority to consider dossier after TPRC assessment (p.15)	CPM requests that amendment #4 be revised to reflect the exact language of the UHPA contract on p.24 rather than an interpretation of the contract language. We also ask that the following be inserted after the contract language. "Consideration by the Dean is for review only. This step is not an opportunity for the Dean to provide an additional assessment ." With that change, we also recommend that UHMFS support amendment #4.
5. relationship of external evaluator to faculty applicant (p.19)	CPM requests additional time to better address the comments from UHM faculty on amendment #5.

In our October 19, 2010 and November 15, 2010 reports, the Committee on Professional Matters (CPM) made previous conclusions and recommendations. On February 16, 2011, the UHMFS voted to pass items 1, 3, and 4.

We present here our final findings and recommendations for item 2 articulation of authorship convention and item 5 relationship of the external evaluator to faculty applicant.

CPM continued to discuss the challenge of crafting standard authorship and external evaluator statements that would fit all disciplines across the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. We found it to be practically impossible to do, especially after our survey of UHM faculty in September 2010. We found one common theme amongst all of our conversation and deliberations, that the responsibility of defining discipline or field specific authorship conventions lay with the department and college. It is at the departmental personnel committee (DPC) level that nuances of authorship and meaning of order, placement, contribution, and merit are best understood. Therefore, those nuances, if any, should be clear in DPC guidelines.

The same argument can be made of external evaluator criteria. Though a true blind external evaluator is deemed in most cases as preferable, there are disciplines such as Native Hawaiian studies in which all scholars know each other. In some cases, an external evaluator might also not be at a comparable university, but may be someone of repute at the United States Department of Agriculture or Smithsonian Institution National Museum of Natural History. Those who work on specific research such as the NOAA POES contains a Medium Energy Proton and Electron Detector may have all, at one point or another, written papers together. For that reason, we removed the long list of external evaluator restrictions and replaced it with objectivity language.

In addition to our past meetings with VCAA Dasenbrock and Dr. McCreary, we also invited members of University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (UHPA) to meet with CPM to share any concerns they might have had with the proposed amendments. **CPM members Nguyen and Chesney-Lind along with SEC Liaison Zaleski met with James Kardash, Associate Executive Director of UHPA, on March 4, 2011.** JN Musto stopped in to show his support for the purpose of our meeting, but was unable to stay for discussion. At the meeting, Dr. Kardash thanked CPM for inviting UHPA's opinion and also thanked us for our work on reviewing the document at hand. We were informed that UHPA goals are like ours, that the very important document had been seen, viewed, reviewed, vetted, and approved by the faculty. We shared our Fall 2010 survey process, talks with VCAA Dasenbrock, and final suggestions on authorship and external evaluator wording. We left with the positive sense that UHPA supports CPM's suggestions.

Recommendations

If our proposed revisions to the authorship and external evaluator language are accepted and incorporated, CPM recommends that we vote to approve all proposed amendments to the *Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Faculty*.

In addition to our suggestions for current proposed revisions to the *Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Faculty*, we strongly suggest the following for all DPCs.

CPM strongly suggests that any DPCs that have not reviewed and renewed their tenure and promotion guidelines since the approval of the 2009-2015 UHPA contract do so and submit it for approval by their Dean and Chancellor's Office.

CPM strongly suggests that DPCs revise their criteria for tenure and promotion to include a STATEMENT REGARDING AUTHORSHIP CONVENTIONS particular to their field. Otherwise, TPRC members may use the same criteria by which they judge the merits of publications of their own disciplines.

CPM strongly suggests that DPCs revise their criteria for tenure and promotion to include a STATEMENT REGARDING EXTERNAL EVALUATORS particular to their field. Otherwise, TPRC members may use the same criteria by which they judge the external evaluators of their own disciplines.

3. **CAPP: Motion to Support a One-Year Trial of Electronic Registration Waitlisting** [[Final Document](#)]
Memorandum: VCAA Reed Dasenbrock to Senate Chair Susan Hippensteele [January 20, 2011]: [Pdf](#)
Issues Involving Registration Waitlisting: VCAA's response to CAPP concerns [February 2, 2011]: [Pdf](#) / [Word](#)
Update on Waitlisting: VCAA's e-mail to CAPP Chair Sarita Rai [February 25, 2011]: [Pdf](#)

Edoardo Biagioni, a member of CAPP, presented this motion.

A friendly amendment was made so the motion reads as follows:

The Manoa Faculty Senate supports a one year trial of the Registration Waitlist proposal with the proviso that the administration returns to the Manoa Faculty Senate for reconsideration and adjustments.

VCAA Dasenbrock clarified that wait-listing in Fall 2011, would be tried only on undergraduate courses that typically fill up. Implementation issues will be identified. It would be possible to use it for key graduate courses.

Senator: How will students that are not yet in the system be accommodated?

Dasenbrock: When a seat opens up, students on the waitlist that are not eligible will not be able to register. Faculty will still be able to add students manually.

Motion approved with 1 vote against.

Motion to Support a One-Year Trial of Electronic Registration Waitlisting

The Manoa Faculty Senate supports a one year trial of the Registration Waitlist proposal with the proviso that the administration returns to the Manoa Faculty Senate for reconsideration and adjustments.

4. CAPP: Motion to Recognize Students with High Academic Achievement during Graduation Ceremony
[Final Document]

Memorandum: VCAA Reed Dasenbrock to Senate Chair Susan Hippensteele [January 18, 2011]: [Pdf](#)

Edoardo Biagioni, a member of CAPP, presented this motion.

A friendly amendment was made to replace CAPP with Manoa Faculty Senate so the motion reads as follows:

Although the Manoa Faculty Senate acknowledges that the final Grade Point Average will not be available at the time of graduation, it supports the proposal to replace the single “Graduation with Distinction” designation with a standard tripartite designation of cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude as follows:

3.5-3.74 GPA: cum laude
3.75-3.9 GPA: magna cum laude
>3.9 GPA: summa cum laude

The Manoa Faculty Senate further recommends that the designations be recorded on the diploma and transcript.

Senator: Why were these particular GPA cut-offs chosen?

VCAA: These are consistent with our peers, but not universal.

Senator: How many students will be affected?

VCAA: When students at graduating with distinction are asked to stand at commencement, about a 1/4 stand.

Senator: Will including these on the diploma involve extra work?

CAPP: Diplomas have to be individually printed with the student’s name anyway.

Senator: How will students be recognized at commencement?

VCAA: Students will be asked to stand at commencement. Actions at commencement are not official because final grades are not yet available.

Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to Recognize Students with High Academic Achievement during Graduation Ceremony

Although the Manoa Faculty Senate acknowledges that the final Grade Point Average will not be available at the time of graduation, it supports the proposal to replace the single “Graduation with Distinction” designation with a standard tripartite designation of cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude as follows:

3.5-3.74 GPA: cum laude
3.75-3.9 GPA: magna cum laude

>3.9 GPA: summa cum laude

The Manoa Faculty Senate further recommends that the designations be recorded on the diploma and transcript.

5. CAPP: Report on Mid-term Grade Reporting [\[Final Document\]](#)

Memorandum: VCAA Reed Dasenbrock to Senate Chair Susan Hippensteele [January 20, 2011]: [Pdf](#)

Edoardo Biagioni, a member of CAPP, provided the report.

CAPP provided a report on mid-term grade reporting to allow earlier identification of students experiencing difficulty so appropriate assistance can be provided.

Senator: Mid-term grades can already be reported through laulima.

VCAA: There is a capability to report mid-term grades in banner, and we wanted feedback as to whether to turn it on. We determine whether advisors can have access to mid-term grades in laulima.

Report on Mid Term Grade Reporting

While tracking underperforming undergraduate students is worthwhile, CAPP does not support mid-term grade reporting as the appropriate solution.

6. CFS: Report on 2011 Manoa Faculty Senate Election Results [\[Final Document\]](#)

[Powerpoint](#)

Ian Pagano, Chair of CFS, provided the election report.

The turnout was 34%, which is better than last year. The next step is to elect the SEC, and CFS is asking for nominations or candidates. All senators are eligible, both departing and new, unless they have been on the SEC this year or last. The deadline for nominations is Tuesday at 7 am.

List serves are available for each constituency, in the form name-constituents@lists@hawaii.edu.

7. WGGE: Report on Graduate Education

Ron Bontekoe, Chair of WGGE, provided the report.

The SEC gave WGGE a charge to reform the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council wanted WGGE to recommend oversight of underperforming graduate programs. WGGE met with the Graduate Council, Graduate Division, and GSO. WGGE does not recommend that the Graduate Council be made a committee of the Senate, because it is too big, and it relies on the membership and experience of graduate chairs.

WGGE recommends restructuring the Graduate Council to increase faculty autonomy and to make the Graduate Council more independent of Graduate Division. The agenda should be posted in advance to allow time for real consideration of the issues. The Graduate Council should have as co-chairs a Senator and the Dean of the Graduate Division, with another Senator serving as Vice-Chair. The Graduate Council should have two liaisons, one from COR and one from the SEC.

COR should become the Committee on Research and Graduate Education or CORGE.

WGGE is considering a graduate student bill of rights.

Senator: A Senate committee can include non-senators, so graduate chairs can be added to CORGE.

Senator: Will input be obtained from graduate students?

Bontekoe: WGGE included a graduate student, and proposal has been endorsed by GSO.

Senator: BOR policy requires Senate oversight of academics, and the proposed changes will provide that through the liaisons who will refer items to the Senate as appropriate.

Bontekoe: A motion will on the structure of Graduate Council will be brought before a future meeting of the Senate.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.