

Faculty Senate

Professional Matters Committee meeting

Date: October 4th, 2012

Time: 2:00 pm

Attendees:

David Ericsson (Senate Executive Committee liaison)

David Leake

Kenneth Kipnis (co-chair)

David Leake

Scott Lozanoff

Gabor Mocz

Truc Nguyen (co-chair)

Jan Schultz

Gwen Sinclair

Vicki Szymczak (taking notes for today)

Halia Zaleski

Note: CPM will be used in place of Committee on Professional Matters in this document.

Kenneth Kipnis called meeting to order at 2:10

1. Minutes:

- Approved Minutes from the CPM meeting prior to the last CPM meeting were available on line and had been approved last year by the CPM.
- Minutes from the last meeting were approved with a unanimous vote

2. Report from the Co-Chairs regarding the Meeting of the Chairs and the Meeting of Representative Administrators and Faculty Senate Chairs.

a. Topics of Discussion

- i. The Faculty needs to be vigilant about maintaining a voicing faculty voice.
- ii. Administrative locus of the football team. Reed Dasenbrock indicated that there was no connection between Manoa and the football team.. Does Manoa control or does the president's office control? Does blame for the "Wonder Blunder" belong to the controlling interest?
 1. It is important to remember that our primary concern and the concern of the athletics department should be our students and the positive role of athletics in our students' lives.
- iii. Faculty housing: Kathy Cutshaw discussed evening of access for all faculty.
 1. Noted that faculty housing is often part of the person's total compensation package at other institutions.
 2. Noted that some faculty are not paid a salary that could be diminished monetarily and still be able to live decently if housing was included as part of compensation.
 3. Noted new faculty residential hall with parking was required as part of the new building project at the College of Education (funded from 2006 insurance proceeds due to fire). Tearing down the tropical agriculture building for faculty housing was abandoned
- iv. Administrative follow up on senate actions. This discussion concerns lack of notification back to the Faculty Senate when we take action (ie, resolutions).
 1. Procedural Change: For any motions, resolutions or requests from senate committees, include at the bottom that it is be

directed to a responsible administrator, charged with getting back to the Senate by a certain time (45 days) and name the administrator or department responsible for action.

v. Old resolutions: Ask Bonnyjean or Kristin what action has been taken on old resolutions. Is there an accessible record or spreadsheet?

1. Example: Removing barriers to cross or team teaching between colleges. Administration claims software will cannot accommodate team teaching because it forces one student to be assigned to one teacher. This resolution passed in 1998. What happened to it?

2. Purpose: Having procedures in place that encourage rather than discourages professors to collaborate and teach across departments.

a. Problem: If you have multiple people teaching 3 credit hours how do you account for your teaching load.

3. It has already been tossed to SEC.

vi. Faculty morale: little time was left for substantive discussion

3. Progress report on research Ken requested from Kristin's office.

a. Evaluations of Administrators (Item 36.12). Kristin's assistant made a request for 360 evaluations of administrators but did not yet receive the information and was not take seriously. Sent us tenure articles from the chronicle.

b. Numbers of courses taught by graduate assistants and lecturers (not sure about instructors). Numbers are coming in and are being calculated. Coming from the Vice Presidents office.

c. How are interim administrators vetted for permanent appointment (Item 22-13)(committee is convened for each situation and procedure is established for that instance)

i. Faculty side exceptions: Opportunity appointment, spousal hires

4. Post tenure review. (Items 5-13 and 24-12)

- a. Recommendation to have library prepare a bibliography of post tenure review articles for CPM
 - i. Try to identify standard practices and identify the practice at our own University.
 - 1. Discussion of what practices exist at institutions of higher education generally.
 - a. Adherence to a professional development plan
 - b. Firing of tenured faculty centers around for cause, substantive criteria, neglect of duty, incompetence, dereliction of duty or clear violation of academic norms
 - c. When does an extended leave of absence turn into a dereliction of duty?
 - ii. Questions about our own process.
 - 1. Do we have substantive criteria?
 - 2. Do we want standard guidelines?
 - a. Different disciplines have different codes of ethics, and some have no code of ethics.
 - b. We will incorporate statement made last year on this matter.
 - b. UHPA union involvement, can we ask them how frequently they represent faculty in this process.
 - c. Draft of August 13 2012 periodic review of faculty from Reed Dasenbrock to Bonnyjean Manini. It will be distributed for review and comment.
 - i. May invite Reed to next meeting; however, we must prepare our questions beforehand in order to structure the meeting efficiently.
- 5. Proposed parking rate schedule (Item 76.12): Rates were justified by costs. Can we look at the financial statements for parking facilities? Carolyn Stephenson is lead on this from sec
- 6. Status of University Affiliated Research Center (Item 27:13)

- a. Issue stems from University contracts that include restrictions on publishing or speaking about results especially when faculty findings prove harmful.
 - i. CORGE is lead in this. What has happened? If nothing has been done we should think about making a joint statement.
- 7. Examine the Value of Assessment (Item 14.13).
 - a. SEC has been informed that we do not believe CPM should be the lead on this item, unless the issue is framed in terms of academic freedom.
 - b. Truc will craft a statement that says CPM should be part of this discussion and but not lead.

Adjournment at 4:15

Approved on December 6, 2012 with 6 votes in favor of approval and 0 against. Respectfully submitted by Vicki Szymczak .