



FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

November 20, 2019

Architecture Auditorium (ARCH 205)

3:00 PM - 5:00 PM

Present:

AGRUSA, Jerry; **APUZEN-ITO**, Garrett; **BANNA**, Jinan; **BATENI**, Sayed; **BEAULE**, Christine; **BISBEE**, Michelle; **CASHMAN**, Kimo; **CHANDRA**, Nandini; **CHESNEY-LIND**, Meda; **CHIN**, David; **CLAPP**, Justin; **CONWAY**, Thomas; **COONEY**, Michael; **DE SILVA**, Kahikina; **DENNISON**, Carolyn; **FARRAR**, Christine; **FULTON**, Lori; **GILLILAND**, Elizabeth; **GOVELLA**, Kristi; **GRISWOLD**, Jennifer; **HIGA**, Jason; **HIGGINBOTHAM**, Derrick; **HOFFMANN**, Kathryn; **HUFFMAN**, Brian; **IRVIN**, Vanessa; **JHA**, Rajesh; **KIRS**, Marek; **MARTIN, JR.**, Kaliko; **MATTHEUS**, Deborah; **MCKIMMY**, Paul; **MESSINGER**, Thane; **MIYAMOTO**, Camaron; **NGUYEN**, Truc; **NUTE**, Kevin; **OPPEGAARD**, Brett; **PETTIT**, Jonathan; **POKHREL**, Pallav; **RAY**, Stacy; **SENTELL**, Tetine; **SIPES**, Brent; **SORENSEN**, Christine; **SPEETJENS**, Jessica; **STEPHENSON**, Carolyn; **TALLQUIST**, Michelle; **TAYLOR**, Brad; **USPAL**, William; **UYEHARA**, Lisa; **VON DOETINCHEM**, Sandra; **WITHY**, Kelley; **WONG**, Vanessa; **YAGI**, Seanyelle; and **ZALESKI**, Halina.

Excused:

BOVARD, Penny-Bee; **DAVIS**, Katherine; **FEURSTEIN**, Anna; **GROBBE**, Niels; **HARRIS**, Chessa; **HARTMANN**, Nathan; **JULIEN-CHINN**, Francie; **LENZ**, Cory; **NG-OSORIO**, Jackie; **NÍ DHONACHA**, Siobhán; **POTEMRA**, James; **SAKAGUCHI**, Ann; **SANDERS**, David; and **YUAN**, Sarah.

Absent:

FOSTER, James.

Guests:

CROOKES, Graham; **FLORES**, Daniel; **FUJIKAWA**, Lisa; **HIGGINS**, Christina; **JOHNSON**, Shannon; and **MAYNARD**, Ashley.



- On average we have 2,500 instructor-based courses in 2016, 2017, and 2018, who are teaching 1100 unique courses. Those courses make up almost 60% of all the GenEd courses. There is an opportunity to simplify and streamline.
- We have had plenty of time to consult with board members, advisors, and chairs and all recognized the issues. Generally they are in strong support, and we have been made aware of the concerns. We are confident that shifting to course based designation can provide all the flexibility that the current program has and make things simpler for the students.
- Senator K. Hoffmann (LLL) explained that she is from a small program and four of the faculty members trade off courses constantly. Asked if there was a way to not teach a focus designation if it's been set up and the faculty member has been slotted into the course? Whether there is some flexibility if a faculty member did not want to teach a course with the designation was asked.
 - Senator G. Apuzen-Ito responded that probably the best mechanism is a course alpha system, using the alpha system as appropriate. Hoffman asked if for all of those courses, faculty have to go through a course change process right now. C. Beaulé (GenEd Director) responded that it is a one-time change. So you might have French 300A which can be a W and French 100B won't have a W. Hoffman further asked if the process can be made more streamlined going through the system. Beaulé responded that they are already doing so and looking at it through Kualā.
- Senator E. Gilliland (LLL, Second Language Studies) brought three statements in favor of the motion. The following statements were read.
 - Grayden Solman (Psychology) said he is sorry he cannot be there because he is teaching. He voices support to courses rather than instructors-based designations. Have served on WI focus board a number of terms, reviewed proposals, and teach both WI and O courses. Can see many benefits and few downsides to the proposed change. Will harmonize and stabilize course offerings for students, simplifies for student, minimize review. The constraints on individual instructors is minimal. Individual instructors can alter content and pedagogy to suit personal preference. Thinking not cursory. In the long run, reduce burden on all stakeholders and benefit UH as a whole.
 - Priscilla Faucette. (Second Language Studies). Also in support. As an advisor, role is to help students complete their studies in a timely manner. In 2016-2019, our undergraduate students at a 96% success rate. We help map out semester by semester when to take certain focus and other requirements. If course is instructor based and not course based, hinders future planning. Would be confusing if the course sometimes has a W and sometimes not depending on the instructor.



- Kenton Harsch (Second Language Studies Chair). Also in support. A problem is when we missed the deadlines for renewal of the HAP designation, for example. Our department has always had courses by the same instructor. When the deadline was missed, we had about 7-10 students who had to postpone graduation because it takes two semesters to get the designation back. The course is a major requirement for us, so a few graduating students had to take the course without the HAP designation, then add another course with the HAP designation. Goal in SLS to have every course with a designation be course based. Doing so makes it easier on students and advisors. Easier on instructors so know what to teach based following guidelines and hallmarks.
- Christina Higgins, guest from LLL Second Language Studies, requested clarification on last two questions. How does course-based designation connect to stability course offerings for students?
 - Senator G. Apuzen-Ito responded that the hope is that the dept will coordinate more than they do now on which courses and which alpha courses that they want in their curriculum to fulfill gened programs. It does require a bit more coordination. C. Beaulieu added for high credit majors, those departments getting together and mapping it out for graduation requirements including focus designations is the ideal. Recognize that there is flexibility in the number of credits and what is offered. There are small programs where it might be difficult to plan ahead. The alphas present an alternative that will be useful for programs with particular characteristics. The hope is that most faculty in most departments will be able to get together and have, like us, contentious but productive discussions about the shape and nature of the major program of study, we can focus on where those designations should be attached and shouldn't be attached. Allowing for variability in programs and faculty needs are built into the motion.
- Ashley Maynard, guest from Psychology. Seems alpha idea is a work around for the department to keep instructor based courses, which in her department is what they want to do. Also hearing that if faculty got together and came up with one rudimentary syllabus for a topics class, it wouldn't need the exact materials included wouldn't happen. The workaround creates a lot of work up front. Any thought of implications of that?
 - Senator G. Apuzen-Ito responded that topics courses can remain instructor based. You can ask for an exception. Beaulieu shared that they were told about different tracks in psychology and there are special topics classes. Those are an exception and can continue to be instructor based. Maynard further inquired if there were exceptions and also workarounds with UHM 2 forms. Beaulieu confirmed yes.



- Senator N. Chandra (LLL), Trying to confirm something that seems self-evident. Renewal of classes becomes redundant. Asking because renewal process seems more complicated and tedious, so what happens?
 - C. Beaulieu responded that they are working on online proposal system that would pre-fill out answers to last time proposal was submitted. Getting rid of renewal process or extending time has been considered and rejected by GenEd committee. Chandra inquired if it can be simplified. Beaulieu responded would love it to be simplified. Committees need to work on it. Will try to simplify the experience. In some departments faculty are required to submit syllabi to Laulima sites or chair but other depts that is not the case. So, when departments apply for renewal, some departments may not have access to the last proposal and syllabus that was submitted. May have to start from scratch or go search for original proposal. Having answers to those proposal questions regardless of chair and regardless of instructor will simplify the process.
- Cristina Higgins, guest from LLL, Second Language Studies. Recently developed 100 level course designated HAP in 2018, but the problem she encountered was related to GA assignments. Department supports the PhD student experience in teaching. But, had to take away the HAP designation even though the course was specifically designed to be a HAP course. Her department is in support of this motion because of that result, of thinking through the dynamics of instructor assignments, particularly PhD students.
- Senator C. Stephenson (SOCSCI). Member of SEC and liaison to GEC but said she was speaking in a personal capacity. Also formerly a member of GEC, one of the boards, and review on diversification. Have great enthusiasm about General Education. Is why I started in Senate. Continues to be one of my passions. Thinks proposal is a disaster. Main thing is it infringes on academic freedom. If have designation, whoever gets it will determine what other instructors have to do--is tremendous infringement on academic freedom. Two kinds of focus courses--implicitly and explicitly tied to the subject matter; then also W and O designations that have nothing to do with instructional content of the course of the course to make course richer. Other issue is Senate meeting last March when this proposal was made in a slightly different form. The Senate had put three conditions on it. Because of parliamentary procedures, those had expired over the summer. So the GEC brought it forward and does not have to technically listen to those three conditions, but I would hope that they would pay attention to 2/3 majority vote. Conditions: 1) be a documented need for students being hurt by the current system and advantaged by the others. Sent out a survey to advisors. 158 advisors, 40 replies. examples of where hurt students, with only 4 who said hurt students seriously. Many said students might be confused. One reply said (read from survey). Also 2 comments in survey that said this survey is so biased (it is oriented to confirming whether you are



confused). 2) there be consultation with the departments before this came forth. Last semester GEO and GEC went to Council of Chairs, which is not a decision making body. They came back and said there was support, but there was no vote and how much discussion not sure. Provost Bruno said there 23 people there, three chairs objected for various reasons. Many chairs don't know this proposal exists asking for consultation from the department. 3) clear plan of implementation. It is attached to this proposal. Some of it is reasonable. However, that plan rests on focus boards. External recommendation is that we combine focus boards and not have individual procedures and separate requirements. This goes in the opposite direction of that. Plan of implementation has been changed in the last three weeks, different plan a month ago. Plan, though a step in the right direction, has a problem. Other: Last year's SEC Chair said this is offloading work of GEC and GEO to departments. If you have to have a course coordinator for every course, you have one more level of administration. Imagine change needs. Talked to OVCAA and threw up hands in horror at relabeling alpha courses. Coordination across courses means more work for faculty, not less work. External report- problem of lack of transparency in Gen Ed Office and Gen Ed program. When SEC asked for a copy of the survey, told by previous chair that it would not be provided. To their credit, the current chair provided the survey to the GEC, but SEC still has not seen it and is not happy about that. Still lack of transparency. How many courses have been course based and focus based. Told that information not available and hard to coordinate; asked today and staff member provided information in 10 minutes. Come back to the first point: horrendous infringement to academic freedom.

- Senator C. Sorensen Irvine (ED). In terms of a need for this change, ASUH came to the SEC about this issue. They asked the faculty body to do something about it because students were having to retake something because of lack of designation. Sorensen Irvine also went to external review team meeting. They were surprised at designations we use. It's out of the norm nationally, and other institutions have had to deal with it and they did not have issues with infringement. We talk about academic freedom and value that. Academic freedom does not mean you get to do whatever it is that you want. When we get together, we agree on the course objectives. For those accredited, for our programs we also have to identify the key assessments. How I teach and what I do can still be done. I see a lot of benefits for the students. I heard them. I believe them. This is a good move for us and benefits us. Aligns with other issues in the country.
- Chair T. Conway asked if other Senators had any comments to share before returning to those who have already spoken. None were seen.
- Senator K. Hoffman (LLL). Original concern was about academic freedom. In relation to if the faculty set up that a course must be W or O, and new faculty member is hired who comes in and is told they must teach this course, Hoffman conveyed that they don't in her



department put together courses as a faculty. They often put together courses individually, sometimes a couple of us together. Question on whether this needs to be sent to the Committee on Professional Matters since academic freedom is being discussed. Might that be another route that might help this discussion.

- C. Beale responded that all diversification and foundations are already course based as well as a portion of the focus classes. Moreover, major programs are put together by faculty. General Education is an entirely voluntary enterprise. You do not have to put designations on any of your courses. If an individual faculty member chooses not to teach a course that is writing intensive, then they do not need to teach that course. Faculty have teaching obligations under our contract, but not to teach particular courses. Hoffman responded that sometimes we do. Conveyed that she (Hoffman) was hired to teach very specific courses. Hoffman disagreed and referenced her letter of hire that states very specific courses. Beale responded that, again, it is entirely voluntary to participate in the General Education program. Teach it or not, require it or not is more of an internal matter for the department. Beale suggested those would be a violation of academic freedom perhaps more so than being told that you have to teach course with a W or an O. Faculty members may not feel prepared to teach W, O, or E; that's what consultation with boards and resources is for. Right now, boards are so overwhelmed by the 500-600 proposals per year going through the GenEd Office, and these are faculty volunteers who do this. We are the only program that Beale said she could find allows faculty members to choose whether or not their courses are going to be part of the GenEd program. It is course based every else just as it is course based in the regular GenEd Program. Beale gave examples from Math and History.
- Senator J. Pettit (Religion). Doesn't think this is infringing on academic freedom, these are skills the courses are imparting, not telling you that you have to design your syllabus in a certain way. If you put in a course-based proposal versus an individual one, in our department it saves one or two people some effort. Conveyed he doesn't see how this is adding more work.
- Guest Ashley Maynard. Mention of last Council of Chairs meeting jogged her memory. A chair expressed concern that you could have 449A or B oral or C ethics and D etc and have different combos; she came up with twelve. Will all those fly and be in the course catalog? Having all of those permutations will be a lot of upfront work. Someone coming in may not be able to teach right away if not already set up. Seems complicated and does seem like a professional matter. Want some assurance that the Abcdefl is sensible.
 - Senator G. Apuzen-Ito asked if Maynard was talking about a topics course. Maynard responded not necessarily. Apuzen-Ito continued that if department



chooses to put different alphas on, to students would be more transparent rather than looking up the instructor with the designation and hopefully they renewed it. They know A will always be a W. Beaulieu added if a department wanted Psych 300 with 12 diff permutations, could certainly do it. What is important to remember about focus is that the proposal is intended for faculty to spell out how the hallmarks and certain outcomes are inherent in the course. A lot of work at first, but less work in the long run. A lot more paperwork than instructor renewal. Maynard asked if the courses in the example would have to be renewed. Beaulieu responded yes, after five years as course based. Maynard stated so there is not less work but a lot more work--the setup, the proposal, the renewal. Apuzen-Ito said there is the UHM 1 Form to create the document and have been doing it for 17 years and people are used to it; there's a transition period but beyond that there is one renewal per alpha. Emphasized that there will be adjustments from the teaching perspective but we are doing this for the students. Want to promote simplicity and transparency in the GenEd Program.

- Senator K. De Silva (SHK, Hawaiian Language and Hawai'i inuiākea) shared that she talked to her Chair and he has severe reservations about this change. There are concerns among faculty, one of which is of workload. Conveyed that they understand that for large programs, it can be streamlining for them. However, work will increase for her faculty. Provided example of 301, 302, 401, 402 classes with multiple sessions every semester. At the moment are able to offer foci as instructor sees fit as well as non foci. Having to sit on an extra committee to make sure that master syllabus works and make sure we align with each other is more work. Conveyed also that upfront work of individual alpha designations for courses is a concern. Students know who is teaching it and know it will be writing intensive. Another concern is the rotation of teachers as they come in and having to be faced with teaching W or O course, is a change in our course syllabus even if it's already been brought up that it isn't. Multiple assignments change based on focus.
 - Senator G. Apuzen-Ito responded that he doesn't fully appreciate why doing what is being done now but with designating a course number and alpha would be more work. De Silva shared that at moment we put in as individual teachers. If multiple teachers, we need a master syllabus? That means a committee would need to meet for course based foci. Apuzen-Ito clarified that if a single instructor always teaches a course with a designation, the coordination will be in the proposal part--table of common elements or master syllabus. Once that happens, we revisit every five years as long as instructors stick to hallmarks, then they are doing what they are doing already. Each instructor does not have to worry when their designation is up and when they have to renew. De Silva asked what are the responsibility of course coordinator? Beaulieu responded that a course coordinator



is simply a contact person who agrees to ensure all sections of the course meet the hallmarks. De Silva stated it's still an issue of additional workload for course coordinator or multiple course coordinators. Not only concerning their own course, but others and years to follow. Beaulieu responded it's a point of contact, not syllabus review. Might mean the coordinator sends out an email of here's the table of common elements. Might be the dept chair or undergraduate advisor. What course coordination means is up to you. Is already the case that department chairs are signing off as assuring they will make sure the hallmarks are followed. It's a point of contact.

- Senator J. Clapp (AA, Academic Affairs). Identified discussion as alphabet soup of course designation, not sure if key issue was addressed. Expressed that proposal doesn't add any stability or decrease confusion because students have to learn what the alphabet system represents and we still don't say when courses will be offered. In relation to second and third whereas, shared observation that he is not linking those two together.
 - Beaulieu agreed. Explained that for her, it's a last resort and considers it a workaround for departments who cannot agree where in the curriculum focus designation should be offered. They should all be course based and stable just like they are everywhere else. The creation of alphas is a workaround, not the intended solution. If all departments do that alpha combination, then we're back where we started. Clapp asked if reduced workload of GEC is where we end up? Apuzen-Ito responded actually reducing workload of instructors by factor of two.
- Senator M. Cooney (SOEST). Was vice chair of GEC year before and resigned because a lot of the sessions were never brought to the committee. Today is the first time he heard about the survey. Not saying this is a good or bad proposal. There is a benefit to getting this lined up before it comes in. Would like to see chairs visited and spoken to and debated with. Not enough to say others around the country do it so why are we doing it this way is not enough of an argument. Don't think this has been consulted properly. Conveyed his issue was with the process. Consultation with chairs not done well at least to get their thoughts and their buy in if they have buy in. Need for a better process is good enough reason to send it back rather than decide in this very small group.
 - Senator G. Apuzen-Ito responded that they could send out an email to everyone on campus. Christina (Gen Ed Director) and former chair of GEC did meet with Council of Chairs. That body, Senator Stephenson suggested, is not an adequate body. But, there was that attempt. Emphasized that the boards provide a valuable experience, 31 people representing their departments, hundreds of proposals reviewed. They are very conscientious individuals who understand what it is that their department is doing. Beaulieu also responded that they also consulted with Council of Academic Advisors, with Council of Chairs, at many Chairs meetings,



with individual colleges from Arts & Sciences, have talked to many department chairs. If want to make individual appts with every one of them and come back in 8 years.... Consulted with last year's GenEd board and this year's GenEd board, steering committee had an entire year of consultation. Put together surveys of all faculty, of all chairs, of all students including student leadership, an exhaustive study of good things and problems in GenEd. This particular thing came up again and again. How much consultation do we need before moving forward with a decision? Talk has been for three years. Was not a small group of people. Exhaustive study and consultation. This was a small scale change recommended by the external report. We are ready to begin implementing a change. Not sure who else we need to talk to that we haven't talked to already. Consultation getting a bit ridiculous.

- Senator E. Gilliland (LLL, Second Language Studies). Read statements from others, but listening to others resonated with her own. First with academic freedom...was hired with expertise in second language writing. Came into a course with O designation and had to teach it. Was surprised course was not W. Had to make sure enough assignments that had oral designation skills. From the perspective of academic freedom, it's not imposing on her freedom at all, as long as she was doing something in the course that fulfilled those hallmarks. From the perspective of self as bachelors chair, have a lot of GAs teaching undergrad courses who don't teach on a regular basis so work to make sure they know what the SLOs are, if course taught by multiple people the SLOs are the contract with the institution. Same with the focus designation. As coordinator, making sure SLOs and focus designation are required. If the department is not checking in, seems problematic on that point and not the GenEd side.
- Senator C. Stephenson (SOCSCI), appreciated comments that this might make it more complex for students. Entirely voluntary-is voluntary now. If course based proposal, not entirely voluntary. I would have to teach my non core course with a particular focus designation because some grad student who happened to teach it in the summer decided that they want to teach it in that way. Let's imagine someone wants to teach it in a different way, we're back into what Ashley said about permutations of courses. Can you imagine with course catalog what people would say? It would not be voluntary? I'm going to be forced to teach it in a way someone this year said it will be taught in the next five years. 500-600 courses a year--too much work. This year, 185 courses this semester. This does not in any way solve the problem of students being confused. Some semesters not at all. Idea of adding letters is nonsensical. Don't make the center of this proposal a workaround. Turn down absolutely. Or send back with conditions or send surveys out to 100 chairs and tell them what it is. This is bad for students, faculty, and bad for GEC.



Send back and limit to only courses that are inherently core. Let those teaching electives teach them as electives. Or defer with conditions.

- Senator H. Zaleski (CTAHR, Human Nutrition, Food and Animal Sciences). Want to summarize strengths and weaknesses. We are definitely an outlier for a segment of our GedEd designations. The rest of the world is course-based. There are discussions of academic freedom but there are course descriptions in the catalog; I cannot decide to teach else instead. There is a process and faculty in the program decide on degree requirements for that program, then that core is a faculty decision but not an individual faculty decision. Electives, we do have academic freedom to teach what we want, but we make a commitment to the students that we provide what is required for their degree. We always balance, faculty governance is that's our commitment to the students. Individual electives are where individual faculty choice applies. There is always a balance to providing needs for students and what faculty wants to teach. What we are deciding here, it remains up to the individual program what they required. We have been elected to represent UH Manoa faculty. We have a responsibility in this meeting. We have to decide how much that stability for students and academic governance what programs require as opposed to ability of individuals to do whatever they want.
- Senator M. Cooney (SOEST). On academic freedom, both are true. Teach the content. In other academic disciplines variety and change are part of the discussion. On the process side, this is a big change. We should recommend at a minimum that the proposal be sent to all chairs on campus and ask them to discuss with their faculty and it seems totally fair. They can send back a short response of major problems. Really appropriate to let faculty across campus weigh in on it. I think it's the most respectful way to do it. At least consider that process.
- Senator B. Sipes (CTAHR) moved to call the question. Seconded by Senator D. Higginbotham (LLL).
 - 37 in favor, 6 against, 1 abstention on motion to call the question.
- Motion to change to all course based focus proposals.
 - 18 in favor, 21 against; and 4 abstentions
 - Motion does not pass.

5. NEW BUSINESS

None.



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

6. ADJOURNMENT

Senator C. Irvine moved to adjourn. Senator P. McKimmy seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 4:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Thanh Truc T. Nguyen acting MFS Secretary.

Approved on February 19, 2020.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA FACULTY SENATE

2500 Campus Road • Hawai'i Hall 208 • Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822

Phone: (808) 956-7725 • Polycom: (808) 956-9813

E-Mail: uhmfs@hawaii.edu • Website: <http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/>

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution