

**CAPP Committee
Meeting Minutes**

MEETING DATE: January 10, 2023 3:00 - 4:35 PM
LOCATION: Zoom
ATTENDANCE: [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

MEMBERS		MEMBERS		GUESTS	TIME
Edo Biagioni	P	Siobhán Ní Dhonacha	E	Michael Bruno	3:30-4:30
Kathy Ferguson	P	Brian Richardson	P		
Patsy Fujimoto	P	Ku‘ulei Salzer-Vitale	P		
Hannah Manshel	P				
Jon Matsuda	P				
Ashley Maynard	P	Raphael Raphael	E		

Subject	Discussion/Information	Action / Strategy / Responsible Person
Call to Order	CAPP Chair Maynard called the meeting to order at 3:01 PM.	
Review of Minutes	Minutes of the December 22, 2022 meeting were discussed as circulated. Motion Ku‘ulei; Second Hannah.	unanimous approval
Chair’s Report	<p>Gen Ed Process</p> <p>Debbie Halbert, VP for Academic Strategy, has notified us that she has formed a “conference committee”, including representatives from each campus’s Faculty Senate, to consider the Gen Ed Proposal. The committee and process it is describing have not been vetted by any senate but the process is going ahead. It will meet Jan 27 and on 4 subsequent Fridays. No time has been set yet. In our memo to VP Halbert, CAPP stated we will bring an observer as well as our member (Ashley).</p> <p>Letter from Janice Yamada contains a timeline for completing the process which raises questions about what sort of timeline this is if the end has already been scheduled. That seems to short-circuit the process. What is the status of the process if there is already a date specified for completion?</p>	

	<p>Responses of the faculty and chairs are varied, but there is strong support among Manoa faculty for keeping 2/2/2 + lab diversification requirements. Many respondents suggested the faculty need more time to consider the proposal and object to being rushed.</p> <p>Past curriculum reform took more than one year just for Manoa to discuss; it was truly a faculty process, started and completed in the Senate. We can't hurry this.</p> <p>Space. The chair reported on her discussion with Nate Goore who is consulting with the administration regarding the use of space. One idea regarding faculty offices was to replace them with faculty cubicles. Faculty offices are our workplaces, where we keep the materials we utilize in our teaching and research. The labor of assembling and curating our collections is part of our job as faculty members. The model for faculty workspace should not be an airport lounge, no matter how fancy it is.</p> <p>Housing individual faculty outside of their departments separates faculty from their colleagues, undermines departmental self-governance, and is also a form of union busting because it creates problems in working together.</p> <p>There was discussion of plans to create shops on or near campus, to entice students to linger on campus, but we are not clear on what sort of marketing research has been done to suggest this is feasible.</p>	
SEC Report	No SEC report	

Graduate Council Report	<p>Edo reported the following:</p> <p>The Graduate Council voted in favor of the ASTR change of grade requirement from B to C, and the Microbiology graduate program sheet. They recognized Krystyna Aune for her work as graduate dean; she is stepping down to rejoin the faculty and the interim dean will be Julianne Maeda.</p>	
Discussion with Provost Michael Bruno	<p>CAPP welcomed Provost Michael Bruno to our meeting and thanked him for joining us. We raised two issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the Manoa Budget Committee's role in departmental hiring of faculty. We asked Michael to explain the purpose behind the new requirement that department's short lists of candidates for faculty positions be reviewed by his office prior to beginning the interview process. <p>CAPP's objections were that a) there is already significant administrative involvement in hiring, in that the administration has to approve the position in the first place, and b) the list of prospective hires, as created by the department and approved by the dean, still goes to higher administration who can alter the priorities set by the department and dean. Also, inserting a review step at this level causes delays and valuable time can be lost.</p> <p>Michael's response: there has been "miscommunication" about this step. It is not a review. He, not the whole Budget Committee, looks at the list, and he has never turned one down. "I've never looked at the names on the list," he commented. The purpose is to establish, prior to finalists being invited, that the hiring will take place in the approved area and at the approved rank.</p> <p>CAPP asked why this can't be done between the departments and the dean, where these conversations are already taking place. "That's a good question," he responded, and indicated that</p>	

the process “came out this way” because last year the small number of hires raised concerns that, if we were only going to make a few hires (N = 58 last year, approx. double that this year), he wanted to make sure that departments hire in the approved subfield at the approved rank.

Michael agreed to consider our suggestion and revisit it with the deans and/or the provost’s council. He went on to say that we need to “turn the page” on things we had to do during the budget crisis, but things have changed, now we have doubled the number of hires.

He says he will consider our suggestion and will revisit the issue with the deans.

2. **The Gen Ed proposal** – CAPP emphasized that it is the job of our committee to bring these proposed changes to the Senate. We are coordinating the response. We’ve surveyed faculty and chairs, gotten lots of input, and we need time to consider the responses and formulate next steps. CAPP received the input from our surveys on November 30; soon after we were notified that the conference committee is going forward and that a deadline is set for a decision. This sounds like the process will be concluded, regardless of faculty perspectives. President Lassner seems to want to move quickly; we understand he has suggested that if the Senate doesn’t agree, he’ll take it to the BOR.

Michael was receptive to our concerns that neither the BOR nor the administration are qualified to create curricula, which is the job of the faculty. “Manoa will not have a curriculum imposed on it,” by the System, he said, and won’t cede the decision to the other campuses. He indicated that his “reading is that if any of the campuses say no, it doesn’t move forward at that campus.”

One of the presumed purposes of the gen ed proposal, Michael indicated, is to facilitate seamless transfer of credits among the campuses. Everybody agrees that is a laudable goal. Michael said, "I for one am not impatient to get this done. I don't think anything good happens out of a climate of urgency. I know there have been concerns raised in a number of different quarters" and several faculty have said we need more time. He agrees we should have more time.

CAPP indicated our concern that President Lassner is rushing this process; he has issued edicts and "guardrails" about curriculum but they are not informed by a faculty perspective. We ask for Michael's support in speaking with the other administrators and the BOR that faculty must control the curriculum and we need more time to work it out.

Michael indicated he has told the president that this process will take time and he thinks Interim Vice Provost Laura Lyons agrees with his sentiment. He suggests that CAPP could communicate the work we are undertaking in an email to him, he could carry it to a meeting with David and Debbie.

CAPP emphasized that we want him as our chief academic advisor to support the faculty.

In a related discussion, we addressed an aspect of articulation: should the sending college or the receiving college make the decision about whether students have met the receiving college's requirements? CAPP suggested that it is logical for the receiving college to make that decision. Michael agreed.

Michael then discussed the example of Engineering, where the Manoa department works with the community colleges to establish what students need to know when they come to Manoa.

CAPP shared similar stories of working across campuses at the department level to make improvements to the curriculum and aid students transferring from one campus to another. CAPP also pointed out that articulation can be addressed independently of whole-sale curriculum change.

Michael liked the suggestion that we might better call the diversification requirement a breadth requirement, recognizing the goal is to achieve a breadth of education for students who are likely to change careers many times in their lives.

A related question of Hawaiian/second language requirements was discussed. Michael indicated, "I have a lot to say," on this subject, emphasizing that one of the four goals of the strategic plan is becoming a Hawaiian place of learning. UH is very serious about hiring more Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders onto the faculty, when and where we can. Many students want to take a language that is unique to this place, that they can't get anywhere else, to find new perspectives and develop new levels of respect for the communities they study. Being a Hawaiian place of learning makes us special and differentiates us from competing institutions. "It's time to put our money where our mouth is," he concluded.

Michael indicates he sees the value of the language requirement but also understands the perspective of departments that have large numbers of requirements for their major and resist the time spent on general education courses. CAPP also recognized this concern.

He asked CAPP if we have thought about what his office can do to facilitate more conversation, discussion, sharing, and making sure faculty voices are heard. "I have a lot of respect for the faculty and for their knowledge of their domains and beyond," he indicated. He suggested that perhaps he "could help in terms of convening a meeting

	<p>that CAPP would run but he could support with resources, space, and cajoling.” He indicated willingness to play a more visible role in the process.</p> <p>CAPP emphasized that we need his support in recognizing that we are not “dragging our feet” but are rather performing our due diligence. The faculty won’t participate in a sham process. He responded, “I totally agree” and expressed his view that “It will all break down if we lose that respect for our faculty,”</p> <p>CAPP expressed our appreciation to Michael for meeting with us and invited him to come back.</p> <p>He indicated, “I appreciate the invitation.”</p>	
<p>Discussion of process to consider the Gen Ed Proposal</p> <p>Updating the survey for faculty/chairs to get input on the Revised Gen Ed Proposal.</p>	See above.	
One Health Certificate	<p>One Health Certificate: CAPP approved the proposal and sent it to SEC for their December meeting but it was canceled so now we expect it to be considered at the coming SEC meeting in January. We have the final document from the proposing unit for SEC consideration.</p>	
Other	Next meeting is Jan 24; main focus will be on the Gen Ed requirements. We will all think about what we might propose based on the feedback we have gotten.	

	With regard to the hiring process: We could all follow up with our chairs and deans to say Michael was amenable to moving the discussion of candidate short lists back to the deans and chairs rather than pursuing it in his office.	
--	---	--

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy E Ferguson