



UNIVERSITY  
of HAWAII®  
MĀNOA

**Mānoa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

*February 20, 2013; 3:00-5:00 p.m.; Architecture Auditorium*

---

**AGENDA**

**GUEST:** Chancellor Apple (3:00 - 3:30 pm)

- Chancellor Memo: [Graduate Faculty Status](#)  
[2/5/2013]

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. MINUTES:** Approval of [January 16, 2013 Senate Minutes](#) (Draft)

*Approved: 47:1*

**3. CHAIR'S REPORT**

**4. BUSINESS**

- [Resolution Honoring the Memory of Avis Morigawara](#) [Word]  
*Committee on Administration and Budget*  
*Approved: 52:1*  
[Memorial Tribute Service To Be Held in Honor of Avis Morigawara](#)  
Tuesday, February 26, 2013; 4:00 pm; Saunders Hall Courtyard
- [Resolution Clarifying the Awarding of Faculty Tenure to Partner Hires](#) [Word]  
*Committee on Professional Matters*  
*Approved: 36:10*  
[Issue #25.13: Partner Hiring](#)  
VCAA Memo: [Partner Hiring](#)  
[08/13/2012]  
VCAA Memo: [Proposed Partner Hiring Policy](#)  
[8/20/2011]  
VCAA Memo: [Executive Policy E9.215 Tenure Upon Initial Appointment](#)  
[2/9/2010]  
VPAA Memo: [Executive Policy E9.215 Tenure Upon Initial Hire](#)  
[11/30/2009]

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

---

**ATTENDANCE**

**Absent (6)**

Guliz Erdem; Scott Lozanoff; Richard Nettell; Torben Nielsen; Raymond Panko; Victoria Szymczak

**Excused (18)**

V Balaraman; Kimberly Binsted; William Boisvert; Thomas Ernst; R Ertekin; Miguel Felipe; Thao Le; Dore Minatodani; Kirstin Pauka; Carol Plummer; Benito Quintana; Robert Richmond; H Riggs; Kelly Roberts; Scott Robinson; Maya Saffery; Brandon Yoza; Brian Glazer

**Present (58)**

Aurelio Agcaoili; Williamson Chang; Ian Belton; James Caron; John Casken; Richard Chadwick; William Chain; David Chin; Thomas Conway; Robert Cooney (Ex-Officio); Robert Cowie; Linda Cox; Martha Crosby; Sandra Davis; Xu Di; Saori Doi; Timothy Dye; David Ericson; Jing Guo; Cynthia Hew; Peter Hoffmann; Wei Huang; Judith Inazu; Ken Ito; Albert Kim; Kenneth Kipnis; David Leake; Spencer Leineweber; Ingrid Lin; Jeannie Lum; Bonnyjean Manini; Patricia Masters; Jennifer Matsuda; Ashley Maynard; Luciano Minerbi; Gabor Mocz; Joyce Najita; Beau Nakamoto; ThanhTruc Nguyen; Martin Oishi; Ian Pagano; Robert Paull; James Potemra; Martin Rayner; Stacey Roberts; Scott Rowland; Todd Sammons; David Sanders; Ekaterina Sherstyuk; Janice Shoultz; Gwen Sinclair; Carolyn Stephenson; Anna Stirr; Ashley Stokes; Douglas Vincent; Annette Wong; Halina Zaleski; Herbert Ziegler; Pavel Zinin

---



UNIVERSITY  
of HAWAII®  
MĀNOA

## MINUTES

### 1. Call to Order – 3:06 pm

### 2. Guest: Chancellor Apple – 3:00 – 3:30 pm

- Discuss ways to improve Graduate Faculty. Recognizes different cultures. “Faculty are eligible for full Graduate Faculty status.” We should put more “meat” around what this means. Expectation in most universities is to mentor graduate students from the beginning, and such is included in tenure and promotion decisions; but this expectation is very different in different fields. We assume we hire high quality faculty given our hiring procedures. But this decision should be made at the Department level. So, the flexibility is in this policy, but we may want to consider other options.
- Some Graduate Chairs and deans feel they have no real control over graduate education. Deans should have control. Ultimately the Graduate Dean does have control, but the processes should be in place and operational to implement control. Inquiry: half of our faculty (College) are Specialists, but these are not considered faculty traditionally. Response: didn't realize Specialists could support graduate students on committees. Inquiry: no blanket rule should exist. Separately, contacting a college dean rather than going directly to the Graduate Dean is much more efficient. Response: problem is that faculty, not Grad. Chairs, too frequently go around their Grad. Chairs when they should be working through them. Inquiry: might add “status, consistent with Department procedures.” Inquiry: wants a study group to review the eligibility issue. We need to deal with the IRS, to put together a committee to do this. Chair: still an issue with this current Senate. Inquiry: we shouldn't include just the Department Chair, but other faculty as well as to whether a faculty member meets the eligibility criteria. Response: agrees, noting that every department has its own culture. “I have a libertarian streak...every department should be able to come up with their own criteria.” May be some departments that don't want faculty mentoring graduate students. Inquiry: criteria need to be specific. Response: in favor of what I've heard; not only a question of when and how faculty should serve. Faculty as a whole should be involved in such decisions...which faculty should be assigned temporarily to which students and so on. Inquiry: Sometimes some committees are just rubberstamps, formed just before a defense for instance. Response: couldn't agree more. We need to make sure we have great graduate programs here, a hallmark of great universities. Policies that support recruiting students should be in place, supporting students and helping them initiating their post PhD careers. Inquiry: Date on your memo is February 5<sup>th</sup>. Can this be changed? Response: can work out a time that will give every department a chance to develop its criteria for granting faculty this status. July 1<sup>st</sup> may be an appropriate date to implement. Inquiry: the Graduate School website already makes statement... Response: yes, we'll update it to take into account the intelligence picked up here today. [Applause]

### 3. Minutes - Approval of [January 16, 2013 Senate Minutes](#) **MSP with amendments 47:1**

### 4. Chair's Report - Monitoring Hawaii State Legislature. Not yet “crossover” time so still working on opposing some legislation that threatens university autonomy and budget.

### 5. Business



UNIVERSITY  
of HAWAII®  
MĀNOA

- [Resolution Honoring the Memory of Avis Morigawara \[Word\]](#)  
*Committee on Administration and Budget*

Doug Vincent, CAB Chair - memorial for Avis Morigawara; resolution read.  
**MSP 52:1**

- [Resolution Clarifying the Awarding of Faculty Tenure to Partner Hires \[Word\]](#)  
*Committee on Professional Matters*

Truc Nguyen and Ken Kipnis, CPM Chairs, - reviewed issues regarding spousal hire, especially extending tenure to trailing partner when they have tenure at a comparable institution. Issue of what happens when a Chancellor refuses to abide by the rules? Truc noted that the BoR can overturn such decisions if they wish. This resolution does not address partner hires specifically, but rather a question of extending tenure to those already hired, provided the trailing partner meets all the criteria for tenure. Inquiry: Regarding criteria, who determines what is a “comparable institution?” Even equivalence regarding the substance of tenure. Response: the term “comparable” isn’t included in the current resolution. Inquiry: the department has to approve the hire before the contract is approved. Response: in my experience we were reviewing the leading partner. If this is followed to the letter we’ll be a lot less likely to have inappropriate hires. Inquiry: criteria? Response: standard DPC criteria. Inquiry: back to “comparability,” do we want to stipulate who has the task of making the determination? Response: “comparable” is a joint decision of the department and the administration; not spelled out further. Inquiry: awarding tenure to new administrative hires, automatic? And if a department has no position and no vetting takes place, a rather odd hire? Or a “colleague” rather than a “partner?” Response: trailing administration spouse procedures already in place; needs tweaking and expanding the procedure to include academic positions. Vetting would already have taken place in the home institution and should also take place here. “Partner” is clearly defined. Inquiry: this policy would not require a hiring, but rather a DPC could decide to hire somebody on a probationary status. Inquiry: current procedures going out the window? Response: no; if the department has laid out, approved procedures, you can use them. This resolution insists that DPC be fully involved. Inquiry: what are “minimum qualifications?” Response: it’s up to the department vetting process to specify, decisions to be made at the department level. In the end it will be a DPC to decide what to recommend. Inquiry: this whole process seems to alienate new non-tenured faculty; looks like junior faculty may be edged out of a job? Response: no, this should not impact existing lines of positions within departments. As to administrators, why should the current situation favoring partner hires at the administrative level not be extended to faculty? To level the playing field. That’s where CPM is coming from. Inquiry: could also level the playing field by removing the administrative privilege? Response: we could.... Inquiry: what about foreign hires? Response: have asked about it but it’s really muddled.  
**MSP 36:10.**

## 6. Adjournment – 4:16 pm