

UHM COE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
 13 Jan 2012 • 12 noon–2:00 PM
 LSP 4B

Present: CDS: Scott Bowditch, Jean Johnson, Leslie Lopez, Tammie Picklesimer, Norma Jean Stodden, JoAnn Yuen; CRDG: Helen Au, Kathleen Berg; Thanh Truc Nguyen, Mark Yap, Don Young; EDCS: Stephanie Furuta, Tara O’Neill, Tony Torralba, Sarah Twomey; EDEA: Chris Collins; EDEF: David Ericson; EDEP: Seongah Im; ETEC: Catherine Fulford, Peter Leong; ITE: Brooke Davis; KRS: Judy Daniels; SPED: Drue Narkon, Linda Oshita, Jenny Wells, Marly Wilson; TDP: Ari Eichelberger (for Paul McKimmy)

Absent: CDS: Kelly Roberts, Kiriko Takahashi; EDEF: Cliff Tanabe; EDEP: Rebecca Luning; ITE: Fred Birkett, Donna Grace; Beth Pateman, Frank Walton, Joe Zilliox; KRS: Charles Morgan; OSAS: Tom Benjamin; SPED: Rachelle Reed; CESA: Jenna Kamei; COEDSA: Michael Laughlin

Observers/Ex-officio (non-voting): Dean’s Office: Jennifer Parks

28 total voting

MINUTES

Time	Item	Action
12:05 PM Call to Order	<u>Call to order</u> —Chair Nguyen Revision of minutes from December 8, 2011: under Workload Policy for I Faculty, FROM THE EDEF FACULTY, delete quoted section beginning with “Here are some other points....” Only the first two paragraphs were read into the record.	Minutes from 12/8/2011 approved as revised.
12:10 PM Manoa Faculty Senate Report	<u>Manoa Faculty Senate (MFS) Report</u> —Ericson & Nguyen MFS is moving forward with online administrative review. Contract let for feasibility study of building of new faculty housing. Two options for locations: land mauka of existing faculty housing and land on College of Education (COE) side of campus. Don Young added information: momentum coming from Manoa administration with the belief that housing is key to faculty recruitment and retention. Study had been done earlier—2009 study considered three sites. Site on COE land showed a parking structure. COE position has been to reduce the footprint of COE to existing buildings and opening up remaining 6-8 acres for other Manoa development. COE would want our new building built before other structures are done. College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources (CTAHR) faculty senate has put forward a letter objecting to possible use of land in Manoa. Nguyen and Ericson also reported on upcoming discussion in MFS, the continuing efforts to abolish the Pacific Biosciences	

	Research Center (PBRC).	
12:15 PM Dean's Report	<p><u>Dean's Report</u>— Christine Sorensen</p> <p>After welcoming back faculty to the spring semester, the dean apologized for misunderstandings regarding an earlier version of the workload policy for I faculty. She is very willing to work to arrive at a document that all can live with.</p> <p>The other item in her report was announcement of plans for filling associate dean positions: Don Young and Beth Pateman have agreed to return as associate deans for research and administration, and academic affairs, respectively.</p>	
12:18 PM Chair's Report	<p><u>Chair's Report</u>—Nguyen</p> <p>Reporting on the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFCS), Nguyen relayed the group's efforts to define itself. Does the body have any authority? Only if statements are backed up with statement from each of the faculty senates represented therein. ACCFCS actually confers with the university president, since it represents all campuses.</p> <p>Articulation of community colleges to four-yr institutions is progressing. They are having difficulty with the numbering system.</p> <p>There is a question about redefining the charge of the UH system faculty distance learning advisory committee, also known as Faculty DLAC. Distance learning centers around the state have different policies and procedures, e.g. who copies or pays for copies of exams to be proctored. The committee is trying to streamline procedures. Chair will ask if any of the fees assessed students who take distance learning courses can be returned to COE, since COE offers distance learning.</p> <p>Relating to distance learning, UH is moving forward earnestly. Information Technology Services asks that faculty look at the tutorial they provide to students to use Laulima. They want input on it and suggestions of what should be added. It is located on the student tab on the splash page for Laulima as the "orientation video."</p> <p>COE Technology & Distance Programs (TDP) has a new fiscal assistant in Everly Hall: Chloe Kubo. Please welcome her. On January 31 there will be a small (at her request) aloha event for Arlene of TDP on her last day.</p> <p>Announced scholarship deadline is February 17.</p> <p>Job fair for COE grads is March 31 at Waipahu High School.</p>	

	<p>Booklet being prepared that will have all our students' names in it.</p>	
<p>12:25 PM Standing Committee Reports</p>	<p><u>Standing Committee Reports</u></p> <p><u>Curriculum & Program Planning (CCPP)—Nguyen for Walton</u> Graduate Division deadline is Monday, April 16 for graduate course proposals. For undergraduate proposals, dean has to submit by same date, so the March 9 meeting of the COE faculty senate is the last opportunity to vote on them, making February 14 the deadline for course proposals to Sarah in the Dean's Office.</p> <p><u>Personnel—Zilliox</u> Chair Zilliox forwarded his report to Nguyen by email: 7 full dossiers were submitted for the excellence in teaching awards; 35 people were nominated. The review committee needs to be convened; it is to consist of at least 4 members from different departments. Zilliox is soliciting recommendations from department chairs for members. They will select up to 2 of the 7 to recommend as the COE nominees for the campus wide awards.</p> <p><u>Budget and Facilities—Young</u> There has been no progress since the last faculty senate meeting; campus shut down the last 2 weeks of December. This is the last senate meeting for chair Young, who will move into the associate dean position thus vacating his senate seat and chair duties. He will be more than happy to work with the new committee chair. New chair was selected.</p> <p><u>Student-Faculty Relations—Bowditch & Torralba</u> Issue of grievance was taken to the committee; however, the committee cannot be engaged in a grievance against a particular faculty member. The committee is beginning to finish work on a faculty senate survey, which is to be up soon.</p> <p><u>Diversity—Twomey</u> Committee has discussed professional development awareness workshops.</p> <p><u>College Fellowship—Nguyen (interim chair)</u> Interim chair Nguyen publicly thanked the members of the UHM marching band who came to our COE Congress meeting to help with the alma mater song. She also successfully recruited one of the committee members to serve as chair for spring semester to take care of the college awards this year.</p> <p><u>Governance—Berg</u></p>	<p>Jenny Wells nominated and approved to fill vacated chair position for Budget and Facilities Committee.</p> <p>Ari Eichelberger nominated and approved to fill chair position for College Fellowship Committee.</p>

	<p>In the meeting held this week committee members reviewed the proposed by-laws from last year that are still relevant: including the Research Corporation of Hawaii (RCUH) employees in the COE Congress; adding duty of being liaison to Manoa Faculty Senate to those of the vice chair; adding duty of being chair of the Governance Committee to those of the past chair of the faculty senate. The last proposal is related to the planned process for conducting a dean’s review.</p> <p>Given the work of the MFS on administrative review, there seem to be two options for the COE faculty senate: to proceed with the original planning for a private review where feedback would go only to the dean and no records kept or wait for the MFS to finalize their work on a review modeled after that at the University of Michigan with public results.</p> <p>The question was raised by a senator of whether or not both options were possible: could the committee proceed to set up and conduct the review with private results while the MFS does their work, then possibly adopting the public model when it is finished.</p> <p>The other question for consideration is whether to pursue proposing a “senatorial” model for reorganizing the COE faculty senate. Reaction to such a suggestion was positive from those in attendance at the last Dean’s Council meeting. There was some discussion about pros and cons of the representative and senatorial models and a question of timing of any reorganization given that new senators are to be elected in April based on the personnel in place in departments as of January 2012. The committee will continue to explore this.</p>	
<p>1:05 PM Old Business</p>	<p><u>Old Business</u></p> <p><u>Workload policy for I faculty</u></p> <p>Chair Nguyen provided background on her discussion with the dean about faculty request to return to version 3 of the policy to be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA). Sometime during winter break, the dean and VCAA met about version 3, and Nguyen also got feedback from VCAA. She then sat down with the dean and created a new version, which was distributed as version 6.</p> <p>Major issues now are three, as laid out in the recent email from the chair: 1) all instructional workload decisions be made with students as the main concern; 2) all I faculty are expected to teach at least one course during the academic year; and 3) no “double dipping” – faculty who teach a course to students they are advising not get points for advising, too, when the purpose</p>	

of the course is essentially that.

The Dean's Council saw the document at their meeting yesterday. Department chairs are ultimately responsible for workloads of their faculty. There is desire to maintain flexibility in the policy so chairs can determine workload that best serves their department and students' needs.

Subsequent discussion revealed concerns that leaving out the 3:2 expectation (last paragraph on page 1) may set up departments against each other, inadvertently. Another problem is that as written this is not what the UHPA contract says, so references to the contract need removed. Policy of 3:2 is not being executed equitably across departments. The sense last year in the discussions at that time was that the 3:2 policy be written in and departments make every effort to carry it out. If the specifics about 3:2 are not included, then the status quo will continue and the policy will be 3:3 by default, which handicaps COE faculty in Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) reviews when departments across the street have 3:2 and 2:2 policies that do not subsequently have additional accountability requirements.

Discussion continued with the argument that there are departments in COE that would be hard pressed to meet the 3:2 policy. This was called a red herring because the budget situation of the last few years resulted in the loss of a number of non-tenured, temporary personnel that allowed for 3:2 policy execution. The argument continued, that without the policy that states a 3:2 goal, there will be no pressure for the college to change, and COE faculty will be continually at a disadvantage in TPRC considerations.

It was further argued that teaching takes away from research. The School of Nursing, Dental Hygiene, and Social Work—professional schools—have a 3:3 policy. Other universities, especially the research 1 institutions, have 2:2 loads at their colleges of education. If we want to encourage and support the research at this college we need to look at the ways other colleges do it. There were questions asked about whether these workload policies have matrices of assignments in them. There is a requirement that chairs document what and why the workload is for each faculty. A Google search brought up a policy from Iowa: "Regular teaching load is 6 credits" appears over and over. Suggestion was made that maybe we need to establish the "regular teaching load" in our policy.

There was a suggestion that the new line in the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

	<p>criteria for doctoral work will now need to be considered in the workload policy determination.</p> <p>Chair Nguyen asked about the assembled body’s agreement with each of the three statements in her email. In response to statement 1, there is the question of using the “must” put students’ and department’s needs “first.” It was suggested that there’s a need to add consideration of “quality” — students need “quality instruction.” In response to statement 1, consensus was to strike the UHPA language, include the 2:3 goal, eliminate the “must” statements, and include the issue of quality instruction.</p> <p>Regarding statement 2: consensus was it was not a problem to include this discussion on background. For statement 3, expectations to teach at least one course, there seemed to be general agreement.</p> <p>Other items included the need to add verbiage about other culminating experiences. In further discussion, under procedures, it was suggested that the workload assignment process not be part of the policy document. Suggestion was to delete #4 in the procedure.</p> <p>Chair Nguyen originally proposed to contact each of the members of the ad hoc committee and ask them to serve on the reconvened committee to sit down with the dean. After further discussion, it was decided that the committee would not be reconvened, but rather the I faculty senators who have been part of the discussion help with crafting another version.</p> <p>In addition, it was proposed that the whole faculty senate not vote on this, but that it be an issue voted on only by I faculty.</p> <p>It was agreed that the issue of the 3:2 load is likely the largest sticking point.</p>	<p>I faculty senators to work with Chair to craft next version of workload policy.</p> <p>Only I faculty to vote on I faculty workload policy.</p>
1:43 PM New Business	<u>New Business</u> NONE	
1:45 PM	Adjournment	

Upcoming ***Meeting schedule for rest of spring 2012***

- Friday, Feb 10 12:00 pm in LSP 4B
- Friday, Mar 9 12:00 pm in LSP 4B
- Friday, Apr 20 12:00 pm in LSP 4B
- Thursday, May 10 time and place TBD – Congress and Senate