CTAHR Senate Meeting Agenda
12 April 2007
Kuykendal 201 and HITS
1:30 - 3:30 pm

Members Present:
Joannie Dobbs     John Yanagida     Alan Titchenal
Travis Idol       Norman Nagata     Anne Alvarez
Cathy Chan-Halbrendt Jari Sugano     Brent Sipes
Susan Miyasaka    Mike Kawate      Ania Wieczorek
Jim Carpenter     Jeri Ooka        John Engel
John Griffis      Diane Chung      Naomi Kanehiro
Richard Manshardt Rhoda Yoshino     Mark Thorne
Ronaele Whittington Via Proxy:

Meeting called to order by Vice President Joannie Dobbs at 1:33 PM.

I. Approval of 8 February 2007 Meeting Minutes
   -approved as amended

II. Reports
   A. Elections
      -in process of polling various departments
      -not all departments finished with voting
   B. Instruction
      -report submitted by Jonathan Deenik and is attached
   C. Extension
      -met several times to discuss agency requirements
      -recommendations sent to SEC
      -agent survey was presented at extension conference and will be posted on CTAHR website
      -will ask extension faculty to provide committee with priority issues to discuss
   D. Research
      -copy of report attached
      -met with SEC and with administration to discuss important issues
      -will make minutes and work projects available to new committee members
   E. Personnel
      -has not met since last Senate meeting
      -waiting on feedback from extension committee
      -will be submitting an outline of proposed actions for next year’s committee

III. Old Business
   A. Status of Bridge Funding (CY Hu)
      -several earmark programs lost total of $7.9 million in fiscal year 2007
      -did receive Hatch formula funds of $1.1 million recently
are also several earmark funding items in ARS formula funds retained
-will release 75% of what college received in 2006
-net loss is $6.9 million
-Dean is discussing with Congressional delegation about return of 2008 earmark funds
-will be forming a multi-state alliance to put language to establish TSTAR and ADAP into programs of subsequent Farm bills, not projects, so they become line items in USDA budget and not projects that can lose authorization
-Dean has $4 million initiative to provide bridging funds
-held two listening sessions to determine PI and project needs
-legislative request has been submitted
-bill to provide Farm Bureau with $1 million; CTAHR asking for additional $1 million for competitive grants
-Senate bill submitted for $500,000 additional base funding
-has met with Vice President and Vice Chancellor for Research for $1 million of RTRF funds
-are open to helping out, mainly the graduate assistants
-will use savings from CTAHR to provide remaining $1.5 million
-not sure of exact source of savings but frugal spending and 5-year planning has allowed for savings

IV. New Business: When Senate Term Ends
- elections must be completed
-SEC must approve
-new SEC officers must be elected
-then new committees can be formed

V. Next Senate Meeting - Fall 2007
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE SUMMARY
2006-2007

Prepared by Jonathan Deenik, Chair

The Instruction committee was made up of the following members: Jonathan Deenik (Chair), Gernot Presting (Secretary), John Yanagida, Alan Titchenal, Mark Wright, Diane Chung, and Janice Uchida (SEC liason). The Committee met six times during the last year. The discussions at the meetings centered primarily on reviewing UHM-1 forms and a revision of the current policy for buying out instructional responsibilities. Details for each of the meetings are outlined below.

First Meeting: September 14, 2006
ANSC 650 DNA and Genetic Analysis

The committee has approved the course proposal, but observes that there is a problem with the credit hours assigned. In order to qualify for 3 credit hours, the lab session does not meet the minimum number of hours (3). If both meeting times are designated lecture, then the 3 credits are satisfied. These issues should be addressed before the course is approved.

BE 150 Introduction to Biological Engineering

The proposal is missing a complete syllabus. In addition, the committee felt it would be helpful to attach a current syllabus for BE 191 to show that the proposed course is substantially different. The committee also suggests that the proposal include who will be teaching the course. If it is to be team taught, then team members should be identified and their contributions outlined.

Second Meeting: October 25, 2006
NREM 665 Coastal and Wetland Ecology and Management

The committee reviewed this course proposal and had several suggestions for improvement. First, the committee felt that the course content and organizational structure appears more like a 400 level course than a 600 level course. The committee recommends that if the course is to remain at the 600 level the syllabus and item #6 be changed to meet 600 level standards (i.e., less emphasis on lecture/exams and more emphasis on individual projects and discussion of current literature). The language in item #4 sounds more like a justification of the course and should be placed under item #2. The committee felt that there should be some kind of pre-requisites. If the instructor does not want to include specific course, then perhaps follow language recommended by Graduate division like “advanced undergraduate course work in ………” or “advanced training in……”

Third Meeting: December 5, 2006

VI. The committee made the following revisions to the

VII. Policy for Buying Out Instructional Responsibilities

This policy rests on the premise that persons with equal instructional appointments have comparable instructional responsibilities, and that mechanisms are in place to insure that each member of the faculty fulfills his or her teaching obligations.

The intent of this policy is NOT to punish particularly active and productive faculty.
Rather, this policy is intended to provide a mechanism for faculty who are willing and able to pursue exceptional research and other professional endeavors, to be released from their instructional responsibilities for a limited time.

Faculty members making such requests are expected to:

1) gain approval for the temporary reassignment of duties from the appropriate chair and the dean prior to the start of the academic term
2) coordinate with the chair of the affected academic program to ensure that a qualified instructor/individual can assume the teaching responsibilities
3) provide funds to the affected Department to cover the cost of the temporary reassignment of duties.

The funds provided to the Department should be equivalent to the actual cost for a replacement lecturer per existing UH Manoa policy.

The committee also reviewed the following UHM-1 Form:
TPSS 220 Organic Food Crop Production

The committee reviewed this course proposal and had only a few minor comments for the instructor. First, the committee was confused as to why the instructor included a 2 repeat limit even though the credit limit remains as 1. The committee recommends some justification for this. We also noticed that a midterm exam is included in the syllabus, but it was not included in the grading scheme. The instructor needs to check percentages assigned to each graded components. The committee felt that the course is highly relevant to the CTAHR mission and wondered why the course has been limited to only 1 credit hour. The committee

Fourth Meeting: December 13, 2006
APDM 411 Production Data Management

The committee reviewed this course proposal and had a few suggestions:

a. For item 5 it states “See attached paper” but there is no attachment to the proposal.
b. The narrative under item 6 does not appear to be related to a justification of credits, level, and prerequisites. It appears to be more related to item 2.
c. Under item 7 it is unclear what “business skills (level#6) and computer skills (level #9)” are referring to.
d. Evaluation criteria as presented in item 8 are not consistent with criteria in the syllabus.
e. Please provide a correct answer to item 10.
f. Please correct grammar and spelling.

Fifth Meeting: February 1, 2007
TPSS 352 Topical Landscape Planting Design and Graphics Studio

The committee reviewed this course proposal and had several comments:

1. The proposal contained many typos including sentence fragments and awkward sentence structure.
2. There are several discrepancies throughout the proposal regarding contact hours and number of credits for lecture and lab portions. For example item 15 on cover page contradicts numbers found in sections 3 and 6 of the proposal.
3. The proposal does not clearly delineate lecture and lab components of the course. Is the studio portion the same as the lab portion?
4. Numbers in section 8 do not match numbers in the syllabus.
5. How does course financing relate to feasibility of using design studios (see section 10)?
6. Is it justified to require 4 textbooks? Will it be costly?
7. How did the instructor come up with the grading scheme?
8. The syllabus should include a schedule of lectures and labs.
9. Overall, the committee recommends that this proposal be returned to the TPSS curriculum committee for their careful review.

**TPSS 353 Landscape Architecture History, Theory, and Practice**

The committee reviewed this course and had several comments:

1. The proposal has many typos.
2. Section 8 heading has been deleted. Within this section it is stated that students will be evaluated on a final writing project, but in the syllabus it is stated as a final design project. Are these the same? Please clarify. Also in section 7 under “written communication” “students will be given assignments which include report papers….” How many assignments? This is not mentioned in the syllabus.
3. Overall, the committee recommends that this proposal be returned to the TPSS curriculum committee for their careful review.

**Sixth Meeting: April 11, 2007**

**TPSS 416 Introduction to Social, Ethical and Political Issues Associated with Biotechnology**

The committee reviewed this course proposal and had only a few minor comments for the instructor. First, the proposal did not include a complete syllabus. We suggest that the proposal include a syllabus that contains more detail on student evaluation and a proposed reading list. Second, there are not 17 weeks in a semester as it appears in the incomplete syllabus. The committee felt that a course of this nature would be taught best through a series of case studies. The committee recommends that the proposal include a list of proposed case studies and how they would fit in to the broad topics/issues already included. The committee also felt that in order to achieve the goal of the course the students would need a fundamental understanding of the science behind biotechnology. As the proposal stands, it does not ensure that students will have enough basic knowledge of the technology to be able to develop informed, coherent opinions of the topic. This needs to be addressed, and could be addressed by either including an introductory section (1-3 weeks, perhaps) presenting the fundamental science behind biotechnology or changing the prerequisites to make sure students have already had some course work specifically addressing biotechnology.
The election process for new Senators is ongoing. Unfortunately, we did not realize that the 2nd CTAHR Faculty Senate meeting was scheduled for April, which is usually the month when the elections are held. Elections are completed for the Center on the Family and NREM; all other department elections (i.e., FCS, MBBE, TPSS, PEPS, HNFAS) are ongoing. When elections for all departments are completed, we will submit the list of new Senators to the SEC for certification. After the SEC certifies the election, we will proceed with the election for the new SEC.

As a general comment, faculty are not willing to serve. This is my 3rd year on the Elections Committee, last year one department was under-represented, this year three or more departments could be under-represented. Because faculty are not willing to serve, the number of nominees for most, if not all, of the departments either just matches the number of seats available or is short; there are no alternates (i.e., nominees that were not elected). Therefore, should a Senator resign, rather than selecting an alternate, a special election will probably need to take place to replace that Senator.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mike Kawate, Chair
CTAHR Faculty Senate Elections Committee