

## DRAFT MĀNOA FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

May 4, 2011

Art Auditorium; 3:00 – 5:00 pm

---

### MEETING AGENDA

#### **I. Call to Order**

#### **II. Approval of April 20, 2011 Minutes** *[Approved: unanimous]*

#### **III. Chair's Report:** Senators: incoming, returning, and outgoing

#### **IV. New Business**

##### **1. SEC**

- Motion to endorse Proposal for Common Course Numbering *[Approved: unanimous]*

##### **2. Working Group on Graduate Education (WGGE)**

- Resolution to approve the formation of CoRGE *[Approved: 63 in support; 2 in opposition]*

##### **3. CAB**

- Proposal to Change Bylaws to Account for Senate Absenteeism *[First reading only – vote in September]*
- Motion on Centers *[Approved: 48 in support; 20 in opposition]*

##### **4. CAPP/GEC/CSA**

- Joint Resolution in Support of Collaborative Academic Offerings *[Approved: unanimous]*

##### **5. COR**

- Motion to Revise Faculty Classifications *[Tabled indefinitely: 67 in support; 4 in opposition]*
- Report on College and Unit Level RTRF Policies

##### **6. CAPP**

- Motion to Adopt and Transmit the New Grade Replacement Policy to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to be implemented as Mānoa Academic Policy *[Approved: 42 in support; 23 in opposition]*

##### **7. Ad Hoc Budget Committee**

- Motion to Accept Budget Report *[read - no vote]*

##### **8. CAB/COR**

- Joint Report: Assessment of Marine Facilities and Programs at UHM *[information item - no vote]*

##### **9. Year-End Committee Reports**

- MAC
- CAB
- CAPP
- CFS
- COA
- COR
- CPM
- CSA
- GEC
- WGGE
- Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)

#### **V. Adjournment**

---

### ATTENDANCE

#### **PRESENT: (88)**

Chizuko Allen, Garrett Apuzen-Ito, Edoardo Biagioni, Ronald Bontekoe, Paul Brandon, Marguerite Butler, James Caron, James Cartwright, Richard Chadwick, Williamson Chang, Beei-Huan Chao, William Chapman, Meda Chesney-Lind, Donna Ching, Thomas Conway, Robert Cooney, Michael Cooney, Robert Cowie, Linda Cox, Martha Crosby, Stewart Curry, Shirley Daniel, Sandra Davis, Jonathan Deenik, Michael Demattos, Jayson Dibble, Saori Doi, Patricia Donegan, David Duffy, Ariana Eichelberger, Ernestine Enomoto, David Ericson, Elizabeth Fisher, Brien Hallett, Timothy Halliday, Jay Hartwell, Cynthia Hew, Susan Hippensteele, Wei Huang, Joseph Jarrett, Daniel Jenkins, Lilikala Kameeleihiwa, Carol Kellett, Kenneth Kipnis, Anne Leake, Chin Lee, Mark Levin, Dongmei Li, Barry Lienert, Ingrid Lin, Scott Lozanoff, Bonnyjean Manini, Patricia Masters, Jennifer Matsuda, Jonathan Matsuda, Dore Minatodani, Luciano Minerbi, Paul Mitri, Joyce Najita, Richard Nettell, Thanh Truc Nguyen, Torben Nielsen, Lawrence Nitz, Katrina-Ann Oliveira, Ian Pagano, Raymond Panko, Julia Patriarche, Vaughan Phillips, Hamid Pourjalali, Sarita Rai, Martin Rayner, Robert Richmond, Todd Sammons, Lilia Santiago, Magi Sarvimaki, Janice Shoultz, Carolyn Stephenson, Ashley Stokes, Nicolaos

Synodinos, Jane Uyehara-Lock, Douglas Vincent, Hansong Wang, Cynthia Ward, Hsing Wen, Konstantine Xoinis, Halina Zaleski, Herbert Ziegler, Pavel Zinin

**ABSENT: (36)**

**EXCUSED: (15)**

Venkataraman Balaraman, John Casken, Thomas Ernst, Sheri Fong, Rosanne Harrigan, Ellen Hoffman, Peter Hoffmann, David Leake, Stacey Roberts, Scott Rowland, David Sanders, Katerina Sherstyuk, Victor Stenger, Pal Wessel, Kelley Withy

**UNEXCUSED: (21)**

Kathryn Davis, Guliz Erdem, L Neil Frazer, Thomas Gallacher, David Garmire, Brian Glazer, Jing Guo, Kim Holland, Anne Leineweber, Henry Lew, John Madey, John Mahoney, Crystal Mills, Robert Paull, Weilin Qu, Kelly Roberts, Raul Rudoy, Bruce Shiramizu, Kaimi Sinclair, Annette Wong, James Yates

**GUESTS: (11)**

David Ross (Mathematics), Dave Davidson (FSC), Michilco Bigus (MAC), Comfori Sumida (MAC), Mari Ono (CAA), Sharian Naylor (GSO), Paul Chandler (LLL), Wendy Sora (OSA), Thomas Tsutsuatoto (CDSE), Ryoko Sekiguichi (CASSAS)

---

I. Call to Order at 3:00 pm

II. Approval of April 20, 2011 Minutes. The minutes were approved as posted.

III. Chair's Report - Susan Hippensteele

1. Senators: incoming, returning, and outgoing Senators. The outgoing senators were thanked for their service, and the incoming senators were introduced. The new SEC members, Bonnyjean Manini, Richard Nettell, Thomas Conway, and Ian Pagano, were introduced. Senate assistant, Kristen Herrick, and Senate webmaster, Carol Kellett, were thanked for their effective administrative support.
2. This Senate was acknowledged for a very productive year. This was the first year of having clear, posted committee charges to better coordinate work.
3. Legislative update: It appears that the UH Manoa budget will have a \$15 million cut next year. CAB has volunteered to meet over the summer, if needed, to work with the SEC on any issues that must be addressed. There is not at this point any discussion of retrenchment.

IV. New Business

1. SEC - Susan Hippensteele
  - a. Motion to Endorse Proposal for Common Course Numbering

---

Motion to Endorse Proposal for Common Course Numbering

The Manoa Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the General Education Committee to endorse, in principle, the following statement:

General Education core courses which are equivalent and/or share the same course number/alpha will be 100% articulated. They will share a common course alpha, number, title, course description, similar student learning outcomes and the same GE designation.

GE core course are identified as courses that fulfill Foundations/Basic and Diversifications/Area requirements. With the approval of the GE core MOA ([http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/aa/articulation/JI\\_MOA.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/app/aa/articulation/JI_MOA.pdf)) in May, 2010, all campuses have agreed to accept the diversification/area designation of the sending campus. Thus, the focus will be on courses meeting the Foundations/Basic requirements. (100-299 course numbers)

---

---

Where discrepancies are identified in Foundations/Basic courses, a disciplinary meeting will be convened by the Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost to discuss the discrepancies and agree on the common alpha, number, title, course description, SLOs and GE designations.

Current courses that do not meet the criterion will be renumbered. Campuses will facilitate the curriculum process to make necessary course changes to meet the goal of 100% articulation.

The Manoa Faculty Senate supports the proposal under consideration with the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs that a system-wide faculty implementation committee be formed and suggests that the following concerns and considerations help guide implementation:

1. In resolving discrepancies that exist, it is stated that "a disciplinary meeting will be convened by the Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost" but who will ultimately decide? Who has the authority to regulate?
  2. To what extent will the originating campus of the course be the primary one to set course description, student learning outcomes, content and so on?
  3. Currently not all departments use the same alpha designations. For example, Speech is different from Communications. Physiology might be Zoology at another campus. How will that be determined or altered accordingly?
  4. What about courses where the numbers are the same but the content is not? How will those be articulated?
  5. How do we intend to work through or mediate unresolved conflicts? Agree to disagree?
- 

Discussion:

The motion was discussed by the GEC and has their support.

The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Working Group on Graduate Education (WGGE) - Susan Hippensteele
  - a. Resolution to Approve the formation of CoRGE

---

#### WGGE Resolution re CoRGE

Whereas, the Working Group on Graduate Education, in cooperation with the Senate Executive Committee, negotiated an agreement with Graduate Division regarding the oversight of new graduate education programs and policies, and that task will necessarily fall to a Manoa Faculty Senate standing committee; and

Whereas, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs works with the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP) and the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education works with the Committee on Research, which would, moreover, seem better able than CAPP to accommodate an expanded charge; and

Whereas, effective review of newly proposed graduate education programs and policies requires a senate committee that contains people collectively familiar with the full range of graduate programs and the potential impact of new policies on those programs; and

Whereas, current and past graduate chairs are most likely to have the relevant experience; and

Whereas, current and past graduate chairs will be able to represent most accurately the interests of the programs they represent if their constituencies are organized, as far as possible, to respect the natural affinities existing between the graduate programs offered by different departments; and

Whereas, graduate students have a legitimate interest in being represented on any committee charged with the oversight of changes to graduate education policy;

Therefore, be it resolved that, effective August 2011, the Manoa Faculty Senate's Committee on Research will be reconfigured as the Committee on Research and Graduate Education, containing no fewer than twelve members--at least nine of whom will be Senators, one will be a GSO-appointed graduate student representative, and the remainder of whom will be non-Senators who serve, or have served, as graduate chairs within their departments.

---

---

Be it also resolved that Senator and non-Senator membership shall inclusively represent eight graduate education constituencies, and that it will be part of each representative's responsibility to consider not only the program needs of their own departments, but also those of other departments within their constituencies.

Appendix:

The eight graduate education constituencies to be represented on CoRGE

- 1) College of Arts and Humanities, School of Hawaiian Knowledge, School of Pacific & Asian Studies
  - 2) College of Languages, Linguistics and Literatures
  - 3) College of Social Sciences, Social Work
  - 4) College of Natural Sciences, SOEST
  - 5) CTAHR, Education
  - 6) Medicine, Nursing & Dental Hygiene
  - 7) Business, TIMS, Law
  - 8) Engineering, Architecture
- 

Discussion:

The proposal was discussed with and approved by COR with modification of the number of Senators and non-Senators. There would be nine Senators. The non-Senators would be graduate chairs and would be voting members. The committee membership would be selected to ensure broad campus representation. In addition to the work already done by COR, the Committee is expected to handle issues raised in the Graduate Council and to review new graduate programs. CAPP is already heavily burdened, and this will spread the workload more evenly.

The resolution was approved with 63 in favor and 2 opposed.

3. CAB - David Ericson
    - a. Proposal to Change Bylaws to Account for Senate Absenteeism
- 

CAB Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws of the Congress and Senate

ARTICLE II.  
ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Section 3. Duties of Senators

[Following the first paragraph referring to the expectation that Senators will attend all Senate meetings and serve on a Senate Standing Committee, add the new paragraph:]

“Three unexcused absences from a meeting of the full Senate or of a Senate Standing Committee in a semester will constitute a voluntary resignation from the assigned Committee and the Senate. The Senate will inform the member’s Department Chair of the resignation. An unexcused absence is when the member does not inform the chair of the Committee or the Senate of a reason for the absence.”

---

Discussion:

This is a proposed bylaw change to address the problem of Senator absenteeism, which results in no quorum and inability to conduct Senate business. This is the first reading, second reading will be in August, and if approved it will go to congress. This applies to 3 unexcused absences in total per semester. The resignation is considered voluntary because absenteeism is under the control of the individual Senator. CAB has conducted a survey of reasons for unexcused absences by Senators and many have conflicts with other duties, while others simply forget. The Senate has increased the number of alerts to remind people of upcoming meetings. Faculty who teach at the time of Senate meetings should not be Senators. Excusing an absence retroactively does not effectively address the problem, while prior notification allows better scheduling of work. Informing the committee chair or Senate secretary is not difficult.

- b. Motion on Centers
- 

Motion on Centers

---

---

The Manoa Faculty Senate requests that the Administration ensures that all Manoa instructional, research, administrative or public service centers (programs, institutes, offices etc.) are reviewed every seven years by the cognizant administrator in accordance with BoR Policies and Bylaws, beginning Fall 2011 (Academic Affairs, Chapter 5).

---

Discussion:

Although a Senate motion might appear unnecessary because review is already required by the BOR, the BOR policy is not always implemented, particularly for centers that occur at the college or campus level. More detailed policy will be proposed in the fall. The VCAA reviews academic programs already, and suggests that “Administration” be replaced by the “cognizant administrator” to make it clear how responsibility for these reviews will be distributed. The motion provides that the Administration is expected to ensure that the process happens, and not necessarily to do it themselves.

A systematic review process will ensure that decisions to form or dissolve centers or institutes will be informed by the faculty. The Senate is being proactive rather than waiting for administration to act. Discussion considered whether the formation and review of centers should be an administrative prerogative, or whether it should rest in the hands of the faculty. Many academic or research centers result from faculty initiatives or are tied to particular grants. There are hundreds of centers, and reporting lines may be unclear. Some institutes are on paper only. Review is needed to sort the active from the inactive units.

Friendly amendments were made to specify that the cognizant administrator conducts the review, and that the reviews begin in fall 2011.

Units should be reviewed and judged consistently. Questions include whether the BOR polices provide criteria or guidance for program reviews, and whether the reviews will be substantive. Manoa has a nationally- recognized academic program review process, and we can use lessons from this. Concern was expressed regarding the motivation for the motion.

Question was called and passed.

The motion as amended was approved with 48 in favor and 20 opposed.

4. CAPP/GEC/CSA - Sarita Rai

a. Joint Resolution in Support of Collaborative Academic Offerings

---

Joint Resolution of CAPP, CSA, and GEC in Support of Collaborative Academic Offerings

---

Whereas: The Manoa Faculty Senate, in 1998, approved recommendations from the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (UGE) that, in part, called for interdisciplinary collaboration for Freshmen only courses; AND

Whereas: The University administration has mounted a variety of strategies to address the special academic needs of incoming freshmen, many of whom are the first in their families to be exposed to higher education. Notable efforts include the College Opportunities Program (COP) and Access to College Excellence; AND

Whereas: Faculty too have endeavored to meet the special needs of incoming Freshmen. Notable here is English 100 with its small class sections that are reserved for Freshmen; AND

Whereas: Although several strategies have been used to permit groups of faculty to collaborate in teaching single courses at UHM, these arrangements have been built upon administrative work-arounds, as in a course with four separately listed coordinated sections taught as one, or un-credited pro-bono instructional contributions by faculty. Both strategies have significant shortcomings and limitations; AND

Whereas: Although Manoa offers both Freshmen-only courses and courses that exceed the standard 3-credit formula, it has become evident that barriers still stand in the way of collaboratively taught courses; AND

Whereas: The existing course approval and course listing system, in imposing the requirement that every student semester-hour (SSH) be wholly credited to a single department, effectively prohibits on-the-books instructional collaboration involving faculty from different departments and colleges; AND

---

---

Whereas: Team taught courses may also serve the needs of non-Freshmen; AND

Whereas: The Community Colleges have formulas for shared recognition and acknowledgment when colleagues from different departments collaborate on interdisciplinary offerings; AND

Whereas: The increasing focus upon SSHs necessitates the creation of a Manoa standard for sharing credit where instructional collaboration occurs across departmental and collegial borders; AND

Whereas: Collegial deliberation and cooperation on how best to meet the academic needs of incoming freshmen may well, over time, improve the quality of lower-division courses, reduce Freshmen attrition, and, by improving the quality of instruction that students receive when they enter, improve the performance of Manoa sophomores, juniors and seniors; AND

Whereas: Any new courses conceived under this rubric would have to clear standard review at the department and college levels and would have to receive the standard approvals when claiming to satisfy Foundations and General Education requirements; AND

Whereas: The Manoa Faculty Senate has a salient responsibility for the character of our academic program, which responsibility includes overseeing the academic experience of incoming freshmen;

#### THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

That the Manoa Faculty Senate urges the Administration to alter the course approval and course listing systems so as to facilitate interdepartmental and inter-collegial collaboration on team-taught courses.

That the Departments and Deans work out formulas for collaboration that fairly recognize the contributions of faculty, departments, and colleges when such collaborations take place.

---

#### Discussion:

The 3 committees are proposing the motion to encourage cross-campus collaboration by allowing departments to share the student semester hours for taught courses jointly. Now SSH are credited to one faculty member and this can discourage collaborative courses.

A friendly amendment was made to delete the specific example.

The question was called and passed.

The motion as amended was approved unanimously.

The VCAA offered to take the lead on implementation.

5. COR - Michael Cooney
  - a. Motion to Revise Faculty Classifications (as revised)

---

#### Faculty Senate Motion to Revise Faculty Classifications at UH-Manoa

We recommend that the faculty and administration at UH-Manoa work toward consolidating the current faculty subclassifications (I, R, S, A, B, and any others) in favor of a more appropriate, single Faculty "PF" classification, which recognizes the combined I (Instruction), R (Research) and S (Service) duties of all Professional UH-Manoa faculty. Here, under Instructional duties, we include all college-level teaching, under Research duties, we include all scholarly activities, and under Service, we include university or community service, outreach, as well as Specialist, Agent, Administration, and other service-related duties would fall, as appropriate.

This change is needed in order to remove the implied barriers between the different functions (Instruction, Research, Service) that are, in practice, expected to be carried out by all Faculty at UH-Manoa. This change would also help resolve

current inequities within and across units where faculty can, in practice, opt out of one or more of their normal faculty duties due to the rigid classification imposed at time of hire.

UH-Manoa Tenure and Promotion guidelines should be revised to include all 3 areas under which Faculty can organize their activities: Instruction, Research, and Service. The relevant criteria for each category, along with the expected standards, would be defined in the Faculty's home department/unit Tenure and Promotion and Workload Guidelines, after seeking and obtaining approval of both their campus Chancellor and UHPA.

All offer letters to new faculty will be required to detail job expectations as they relate to the 3 faculty activities (Instruction, Research, Service). All existing Faculty will be given the option of using the new classification, pending approval of the Dean.

---

Discussion:

A PowerPoint was presented to provide background on faculty classifications. The charge to COR was to review I and R, and was expanded by the committee to include all classifications. COR did not intend for this to be a divisive issue among faculty with different classifications. All faculty are professionals with duties determined by their home units. Statistics were provided on the numbers of I, R, and S faculty in various units.

Budget constraints will continue to be a reality for UH Manoa. The intent of the motion is to provide that faculty duties and expectations remain in the hands of the faculty, rather than administration. The motion is prospective rather than retroactive. The motion is consistent with the UHPA contract, which refers to faculty, rather than I, R, or S faculty.

The motion is intended as a charge for the SEC and future committees to encourage further investigation and development of a more specific proposal. A charge for the future senate does not need a vote, but bringing the issue before the Senate opens the floor for broader discussion before further work is done.

UH is not unique in having these different classifications, but it may be unusual, particularly in having general-funded or tenure-track faculty in all classifications. It is not apparent why S, A, or B classifications might be considered unsustainable. Classifications are not a budgetary, but a flexibility, issue. This applies less to extension and librarians, but applies to teaching loads, and to faculty that do not teach when teaching loads are high. Flexibility under the current system varies by unit. Unit policies and expectations can affect promotion and tenure, and can preclude buyouts from teaching.

Combining classifications might make sense for I and R, but not for S, A, and B faculty. S faculty might be forced to do activities for which they are not qualified, or might not be hired at all if they are not qualified to teach. Specialists do scholarship not service. Extension specialists play an important role in the community and need to be recognized as such. Extension agents might also be at risk under any one-size-fits-all proposal. Extension specialists and agents publish. Agents do not teach in the classroom, but only in non-traditional settings.

The intent is to further study the idea, and this may lead to A, S and B being excluded. COR discussed the issue of extension agents, and expected that such faculty members would not be penalized if each unit determined the expectations of their faculty.

Motion to table approved with 67 in favor and 4 opposed.

- b. Report on College and Unit Level RTRF Policies - provided online without discussion.

---

COR Report on RTRF Use  
April 2011

The COR requested information from the Chancellor's office and individual Deans and Directors regarding use of RTRF by the University. After discussion the CO drew the following conclusions:

Characteristics:

1. The online data on RTRF by the VCRGE is highly informative and responsive to the previous resolution of the Faculty senate relating to transparency
-

- 
2. Use of RTRF by the UH System (25% of total RTRF) is less transparent
  3. At the unit level:
    - a. Most units have RTRF policies and those policies range from vague to detailed
    - b. Only a few generate a lot of RTRF
    - c. Many distribute at least some portion to the departments and/or PIs that generate the funds
    - d. Much of RTRF is used for essential services leaving little discretion for its use directly by those responsible for generating the funds
    - e. There are clearly different needs and constraints between units on RTRF use and no universal policy is likely to be workable for all units

Recommendations:

1. Provide the same level of transparency, that presently exists for the 25% of funds controlled by the VCRGE, on line at the UH system and unit level regarding RTRF expenditures for the 25% that remains with System and the 50% that goes to the units.
  2. Provide all unit policies regarding RTRF on line and update them regularly as needed
  3. Provide a yearly date for which all information for the previous year becomes available and communicate that the information is available to the COR for their review at that time
  4. Provide for greater faculty input at all levels, but particularly at the unit level, on the use of RTRF
- 

6. CAPP - Sarita Rai

- a. Motion to Adopt and Transmit the New Grade Replacement Policy to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to be Implemented as Manoa Academic Policy

---

Motion to Adopt and Transmit the New Grade Replacement Policy to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to be Implemented as Manoa Academic Policy

The Manoa Faculty Senate adopts the new Grade Replacement Policy stated below to be effective Fall 2011 and asks that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to facilitate the implementation of the new policy.

Grade Replacement Policy

University of Hawai'i Manoa Undergraduate students may repeat up to three (3) Manoa courses for grade replacement. Both grades will be reflected on the transcript. However, only the higher of the two grades will be used in the calculation of the cumulative grade point average. Degree credit for any repeated course is given only once.

Policy Details

1. This policy applies to courses first taken in the Fall of 2011 and beyond at University of Hawai'i Manoa.
  2. All courses taken for A, B, C, D, F, including plus and minus grades may be repeated for grade replacement under this policy.
  3. Students re-taking a class under the Grade Replacement Policy must take it for a letter grade: grades cannot be replaced by NC or W.
  4. All grades for courses repeated beyond the three (3) allowed under the Grade Replacement Policy will be calculated in the cumulative grade point average.
  5. Replaced grade(s) will not affect academic actions already recorded on the transcript such as probation, suspension, eligibility for financial aid, scholarships, deans' lists, honors status, and graduation with high academic achievements.
  6. Students must indicate at the time of registration that they are choosing to exercise a Grade Replacement option.
- 

Discussion:

Background on the proposal was provided in a PowerPoint presentation. UH Manoa graduation and retention rates are lower than those of our peers. Academic policies might negatively impact graduation and retention rates. UH Manoa policy allows any student to repeat failed and low-passing courses, and grades for all attempts are included in the student's GPA. It is difficult for a student with a low GPA to enter a major that requires a minimum entrance GPA, or to graduate from a program that requires a minimum graduation GPA. At UH Manoa 23% of freshmen do not return for their second year, and students with low grades are particularly likely to drop out. Many comparable research universities allow



some form of grade replacement, and most have higher first year retention and graduation rates than Manoa.

CAPP is proposing that, for up to three UH Manoa courses, students repeating the course be able to have only the higher grade included in the GPA. A comparison of student GPAs under the old and new policies was provided.

Concern was expressed that we lack an understanding of the reasons for our low retention rates. Grades reflect student performance. There was concern that allowing replacement of even good grades could increase class sizes. First-year students may not be ready for university, and it may better to apply the policy only to first-year classes or only to lower division classes, and not affect upper division grades. In programs with a graduation requirement higher than 2.0, students may end up taking additional courses to meet graduation requirements as high as 3.0.

Proposed Amendment:

However students may repeat for grade replacement

Only those courses in which they received a grade of C-, D+, D, D-, F, or an NC.

Discussion on the amendment:

The policy will not lead to grade inflation; students will receive higher grades only if they perform better. Grades are also affected by the time students spend working to support their studies. The arguments for replacement of higher grades are not the same as for lower grades. The Committee on Enrollment Planning would support the amendments. Limiting replacement to low grades is unfair to students with higher grades.

Proposed amendment to the amendment:

Only lower division courses

For a 3-year trial period beginning next year.

Discussion on the amendment to the amendment:

A three-year trial period is a good idea under any circumstances, and the policy should be revisited when data is available. Why is the Council of Academic Advisors opposed to the policy? On a point of order, the discussion was limited to the amendment. The VCAA spoke in favor of keeping the motion limited to grades of C- or lower.

The question was called and passed on the amendment to limit the grade replacement to only grades of C- or below.

The amendment failed with 24 in favor and 44 opposed.

An amendment was proposed to have a 5-year trial period starting in 2011. The amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Discussion on the original motion as amended to add a 5-year trial period:

An analysis of schools with and without grade replacement indicates that this policy will have little or no impact on first year retention rates, or 4-, 5-, or 6-year graduation rates.

Question was called and passed.

The original motion as amended was approved with 42 in favor and 23 opposed.

7. Ad Hoc Budget Committee Lilikala Kame`eleihiwa, John Wendell

a. Motion to Accept Budget Report (pending final revisions)

The report from the budget task force is available on line. The findings were summarized. There is a lack of transparency in the UH budget process, making it difficult to determine whether there are sufficient funds to achieve our mission. Any talk of faculty retrenchment is unwarranted. The administrative budget has increased greatly, and any cuts in personnel should be focused on this area rather than on instructional faculty.

8. CAB/COR - Susan Hippensteele

a. Joint Report: Assessment of Marine Facilities and Programs at UHM (information item - no vote)

The marine facilities report is available on line. A brief description was provide giving the reasons for the review of marine laboratory facilities, and noting that there may be a renewed discussion of the closure of the Kewalo laboratory in the future. The Senate wanted to anticipate such a proposal by obtaining a faculty-led review of the overall marine laboratory facilities and capabilities to inform any future discussion of laboratory closures.

9. Year-End Committee Reports on line

- a. MAC
- b. CAB
- c. CAPP
- d. CFS
- e. COA
- f. COR
- g. CPM
- h. CSA
- i. GEC
- j. WGGE
- k. Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)

Chair Hippesteele recognized and thanked the outgoing SEC members Shirley Daniel, Martin Rayner and Halina Zaleski. Susan Hippensteele's term as Senate chair ends at the end of this semester. The Senate thanked Hippensteele for her outstanding service.

V. Adjournment at 5:20 pm

Respectfully submitted  
Halina Zaleski, Senate Secretary