

UHM COE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
 8 Dec 2011 • 3:00–3:30 PM
 Multipurpose Building

Present: CDS: Kelly Roberts, JoAnn Yuen; CRDG: Helen Au, Kathleen Berg; Thanh Truc Nguyen, Mark Yap, Don Young; Dean’s Office (ex-officio): Jennifer Parks; EDCS: Stephanie Furuta, Tara O’Neill; EDEA: Chris Collins; EDEP: Seongah Im; ETEC: Catherine Fulford, Peter Leong; ITE: Beth Pateman, Frank Walton, Joe Zilliox; KRS: Michelle Cleary (for Judy Daniels); OSAS: Tom Benjamin; SPED: Linda Oshita, Jenny Wells, Marly Wilson; TDP: Paul McKimmy

Absent: CDS: Scott Bowditch, Jean Johnson, Leslie Lopez, Tammie Picklesimer, Norma Jean Stodden, Kiriko Takahashi; EDCS: Tony Torralba, Sarah Twomey; EDEF: David Ericson, Cliff Tanabe; EDEP: Rebecca Luning; ITE: Fred Birkett, Brooke Davis, Donna Grace; KRS: Coop DeRenne; SPED: Drue Narkon, Rachelle Reed; CESA: Jenna Kamei

Observers (non-voting): COEDSA: Eddie Meir (for Michael Laughlin)

24 total

MINUTES

Time	Item	Action
3:05 PM Call to Order	<p><u>Call to order</u>—Chair Nguyen</p> <p>Revision of minutes from 10 Nov 2011:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In <u>Present</u>: Alternate for Jenny Wells was Lysandra Cook</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In <u>Dean’s Report</u>: Under section on “Positions” Carried forward: Reading, Science, Math, ELL, RTI, and Assessment Coordinator.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In <u>Dean’s Report</u>: Under section on “Positions” New: Early Childhood/ELL; Early Childhood; Language, Literacy, Culture; Performing Arts; Autism; Technology; Assessment & Measurement; Rehabilitation Counseling; and Field Placement Coordinator.</p>	Minutes from 10 Nov 2011 approved as revised.
3:12 PM Old Business	<p><u>Old Business</u></p> <p><u>Ad Hoc Committee on Merit Pay</u>—Fulford</p> <p>Committee Chair Fulford reported that the committee members did lots of research on what is done in other universities to address merit, equity, and retention. Merit pay provides an opportunity to reward good work and help keep pay equitable. It is a way to retain and motivate valuable faculty and to discourage employees from seeking new positions in order to trigger pay increases. The committee report differs somewhat from BOR policy. They propose adding a college-wide committee since departments vary widely within the COE. They recommend limiting the length of documentation needed for submission of an application and decided not to include</p>	

examples of merit in the report (because it might limit considerations of what comprises merit). The written report has been posted on the Wiki and has been available since October.

Workload Policy for I Faculty—Nguyen

After extensive discussion of the version 4 draft of the workload policy at the November meeting of the Senate and subsequent email exchanges among faculty with Chair Nguyen and meetings between the chair and Dean Sorensen, Chair Nguyen compiled a revision, version 5 draft, annotated to reflect all suggestions and concerns, including those of the dean. The version 5 draft was distributed via email on 2 Dec to all senators, along with a list of items of concern that had been raised by faculty in feedback. Chair Nguyen indicated that no decisions would be voted on during this senate meeting; the purpose was to provide another opportunity for discussion. In addition, she reminded senators of the previously announced open meeting to be held on the following day, 9 Dec, at 2–4 PM in LSP 4B to further the discussion, in particular of the recommendations made by the dean for inclusion in the policy. She made it clear that it was her intent to have each recommendation considered, one by one, and not accepted or rejected wholesale. She also indicated that the big push for a vote on the workload policy was hers and not from the dean. Chair Nguyen said that she was personally aware of pressure from higher administration (the VC for academic affairs) to have a COE workload policy in place as soon as possible so she was trying to move the policy forward. She agreed that given its importance, decisions should not be rushed, and she was taking measures to ensure sufficient time for thorough discussion before any voting would take place on a revised workload policy. [Note: A workload policy was presented to the senate last month and approved and forwarded to the dean; that is considered “version 3” of the policy.]

Main points brought up during the discussion follow.

Tanabe read the following statement from the Department of Educational Foundations.

FROM THE EDEF FACULTY

The process of collaborative policy making is always delicate and must proceed with sincerity and good faith. This requires open and honest debate about the actual and original intent of the policy document. Anything less is surely to result in divisiveness and unproductivity.

The latest two adjusted versions of the I-Faculty Workload Policy are significant and, in addition to other concerns, change the intent of the original document. For example, the original document set a 3-2 load as an initial starting point. The new version appears to turn the original on its head

by moving the initial load back from the current 3-3 load to a 4-4 load (24 credits). Under the new version, anything less than a 24 credit load must, apparently, be earned and approved. This is problematic, to say the least, and certainly not in step with the intent of the original document. Nor is it in line with other Research 1 institutions.

Fulford said she agreed with much of what was said by EDEF. Additionally, she said the 5th rewrite was better than the 4th, but speaking for her department, ETEC was concerned about the matrix. It presents problems of “catching up.” She agreed that the original goal was to establish the 3-2 load and reference to 4-4 is a real problem, as is the “research” discussion. Other department policies have matrices, but she suggested COE just not go there because there are still lots of questions.

Zilliox suggested it be assumed COE is working from a 3-2 position and dump or significantly revise the point accumulation.

Wells expressed her personal opinion that it appears the dean’s suggestions are too restrictive/prescriptive. She wished to start from an assumption that all are presently doing their jobs versus creating a punitive document.

Fulford contributed that workload reduction based on advising was intended only as a stop-gap measure and is overly complex.

In response to an expression from EDEF that they were not comfortable with a line-by-line consideration of the dean’s suggestions, Chair Nguyen explained that the dean had made some valid points in regard to the acceptability at the VC (for academic affairs) level of the original policy (version 3). Also, some of the color coding in the version 5 document indicates much more editing and additions than there really are because many of the changes are just movements of text from one section to another and changes to the text. Based on her meetings with the dean, Nguyen explained that the dean wants inclusion of some metrics; Nguyen, however, disagrees with the inclusion of metrics in a policy document.

O’Neill expressed discomfort with a required turn around of 14 hours for a document as important as this one is. Chair Nguyen explained that the 14-hour turnaround request was hers and not from the dean. It was so that she would have some input for her (2 Dec) meeting with the dean beyond her own ideas and reactions. It was suggested that for the future a criteria of at least 48 hours be set for input from the COE on an issue/policy.

Wells added that the idea of shared governance is that time is given for sharing and not that a policy be hurried to meet a deadline. She reminded the group that the dean had an approved

	version from last year and she did not forward it to the VC. Fulford asked, isn't it basically a department/department chair decision? Is a college-wide policy even needed?	
3:45 PM	Adjournment for the COE Congress Meeting at 4 PM	

Upcoming

Next Senate meeting scheduled for:

Fri, January 13, 2012
12 noon in LSP 4B

DRAFT