

**Committee on Professional Matters (CPM)  
September 29, 2011**

**Minutes**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>SEC</b>	<b>Present</b>
Halina Zaleski (Chair)	<b>X</b>	Mark Levin	<b>E</b>	Bonnyjean Manini (SEC)	<b>X</b>
Venkataraman Balaraman	<b>E</b>	Henry Lew	<b>E</b>	<b>Guests</b>	
Williamson Chang	<b>X</b>	Crystal Mills	<b>E</b>	VCAA Reed Dasenbrock	<b>X</b>
Ariana Eichelberger	<b>E</b>	Thanh Truc Nguyen	<b>X</b>	Beverly McCreary	<b>X</b>
David Leake	<b>X</b>	Jan Shoultz (Recorder)	<b>X</b>		

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
Minutes of August 30		Sent out today by Truc and will be reviewed for next meeting
CPM Representative to SEC Retreat		Truc will represent CPM at SEC retreat on Wed, Oct 12 1-5PM
Discussion with VCAA Super TPRC (Issue 32) Emeritus Faculty (Issue 33) Composition of DPC (Issue 38) Proposed Partner Hiring (Issue 45)	<p><b>SUPER TPRC (Issue 32)</b> VCAA Dasenbrock presented his perspective on TPRC structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review conducted last year of peer research organizations;</li> <li>• Manoa structure is different than peer organizations;</li> <li>• Provost (similar to VCAA) has a role;</li> <li>• Make up of TPRC is not in the current contract so that if faculty and administration agree, the structure could be changed;</li> <li>• Problems with current TPRC structure from his perspective are that it is a logistical problem with 13+ TPRCs; currently members from the same college are excluded; TPRCs may vary in their discussion and considerations of dossiers of faculty</li> <li>• He preferred having 3-5 TPRCs with a disciplinary focus rather than 1 Super TPRC for the campus.</li> </ul> <p>Members from CPM raised the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is effectiveness of peer TPRCs measured? The VCAA would use efficiency as the measure. (Similar result with less effort.)</li> </ul>	<p>Review of Peer and Benchmark data will be resent to committee to make sure that all current CPM members have the data.</p> <p>Halina, Williamson, and Jan will discuss this further and report to CPM at later meeting.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Concern was voiced by CPM faculty regarding the loss of broad representation of faculty on TPRCs and in decision-making.</li> <li>•CPM members are concerned about the workload of the faculty who would be assigned to a smaller number of TPRCS. The CPM faculty believe the workload for the faculty serving on such TPRCs would be much higher. The VCAA suggested that the workload would not be that much greater for the faculty if there were 3-5 TPRCs and if there were 1 TPRC perhaps some workload adjustment could be provided. Administrative time would go down with a smaller number of TPRCs as Dr. McCreary currently spends about half of her time working on review of faculty with the current TPRC structure.</li> <li>• CPM Question: where would workload reduction come from? The college?</li> </ul> <p><b>EMERITUS FACULTY</b> <b>(Issue 33)</b> VCAA stated that this topic did not come from administration. Questions were raised by CPM regarding criteria and benefits.</p> <p><b>COMPOSITION OF DPC</b> <b>(Issue 38)</b> •VCAA reported that the issue related to Composition of DPC r/t CRC has been addressed.</p> <p>•Composition of DPCs in general should be governed by faculty. There are Guidelines for DPCs in the <i>UHPA Contract, UH Manoa Guidelines and Criteria for Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion</i> documents and within specific unit procedures (if approved). Dr. McCreary stated that from her perspective the majority of faculty do not read the contract and departmental guidelines. She went to the deans to say that the UHMFS suggested that departmental guidelines be reviewed. It is hoped this might be accomplished by May 2012 and sent forward for approval to the VCAA and UHPA. VCAA Dasenbrock stated that this is a 5 year or multi-year process.</p> <p>CPM recommended last year to UHMFS and</p>	<p>To be discussed by CPM on another agenda.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>it was approved that each unit consider appropriate authorship conventions for their faculty and that the objectivity of external reviewers be addressed.</p> <p><b>PROPOSED PARTNER HIRING (Issue 45)</b>  The VCAA stated that partner hiring has been done at UHM and he thought this was approved. He referred to 4 documents that had been circulated to CPM members for this meeting.</p> <p>The terminology used is leading/trailing partner. The VCAA stated that we need this policy to address the complexities in partner hiring. He believes partner hiring happens more frequently now. Dr. McCreary stated that the trailing partner's CV is vetted by the department.  Questions were raised regarding position allocation, trailing partner CV may not match need within the department.</p> <p>Halina thanked the VCAA and Dr. McCreary for their attendance and they left.</p> <p>Halina suggested that CPM work in subgroups this year as it is difficult for all members to be present on the same day. The subgroups may consult with the VCAA and Dr. McCreary as needed.</p>	<p>To be discussed by CPM on another agenda.</p>
CPM Rep for CAB on Administrator Evaluations	<p>•Evaluation of Administration/Administrators (Issue #36)</p> <p>Much work and discussion in CPM last year</p>	<p>Halina will email to see who will be representative from CPM.  To be discussed at a later meeting of CPM</p>
<p><b>Other Issues for CPM this year include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 vs 11 mo and I vs R faculty (Issue #35)</li> <li>• Individual Course advertisement (Issue #34)</li> </ul>	<p>Suggest a survey of faculty regarding their perspectives.</p> <p>Truc provided information regarding frequency of course advertising in <i>Ka Leo</i>.  <i>Advertising paid for by individuals.</i></p>	<p>Halina will send an email  To be discussed at a later meeting of CPM</p> <p>Truc will draft a statement and circulate to CPM for review</p>
Next Meeting of CPM		Halina will send email