CTAHR Faculty Senate
Minutes of the 28 April 2010 Meeting


Excused: K. Sewake, N. Nagata, S. Nelson

Absent: L. Gautz, S. Khanal, Q.X. Li, P. Singleton, J. Sugano, G. Teves,


The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

1. The minutes of the 24 February 2010 Senate meeting were approved with a correction of spelling to “Titchenal.”

2. Dean Hashimoto

Dean Hashimoto will step down 30 June 2010, take a 9 month sabatical and then return to work on a biofuels project. He thanked the Senate for the opportunity to serve the college as Dean.

Dean Search. Vice Chancellor Dasenbrock is still negotiating with candidates. An interim appointment, for at least a few months, is likely. Dean Hashimoto has declined to continue serving.

Budget. A flat budget has been developed with the caveat that things can always change. GA have been funded with a combination of Hatch and academic funds.

3. Interim Associate Dean Cox

Communicating has been a focus over the past few months. There are additional national areas to report on. Listening sessions are being planned. The budget is still being developed.

4. Associate Dean Kinoshita

The 2010 CTAHR Student Research Symposium was the most successful yet. Thankyous were offered to faculty, staff and students. Enrollment is expected to increase in the Fall semester.

Academic Deans across campus met and discussed tenure and promotion issues. External review letters seem to be unbalanced with more coming from candidate suggestions than
from departmental suggestions. Greater balance is sought. Solicitation of letters may begin in the spring rather than fall. Departments will need to better define whether positions are single PI or multiple PI type expectations and provide evaluation criteria. Departmental criteria should be evaluated regularly. The new faculty orientation will continue to touch on uniformity in dossiers, but much is departmental specific. Candidates need to be clear on their contributions in scholarship. Many departments, except for TPSS and PEPS, do not have criteria over and above the university’s although it is allowed and encouraged. Development of departmental criteria does include a step involving UHPA.

5. Associate Dean Hu

Hatch funding has been distributed as formula funding and through an rfp. The budget situation has impacted this. Chairs prefer that GA be funded. Grant dollar intake remains down but the number of submitted proposals has increased and the number of funded proposals has increased. The revised USDA NRFA AFRI is funding 5 priorities and seeking large multistate projects. The college is looking at funding integrated projects in the USDA priority areas.

6. Manoa Faculty Senate

Several unit reorganizations have been proposed by the administration. Some are friendly whereas others are contentious. The MFS is ensuring that proper procedures are followed. A new Manoa strategic plan is being discussed.

7. Committee Reports

Personnel Committee. A report providing an outline for an employee handbook is attached. The February report on Scholarship Unbound was reviewed.

Extension Committee. A report reviewing six issues discussed over the year is attached. The “agent focused committee” statement in the report elicited much discussion and was felt to contradict the Senate Charter.

Elections Committee. A successful election was conducted and new Senators certified by the Executive Committee. A. Reilly volunteered to chair the committee next year. Qualifications for election as defined in the Charter limit election to faculty employed by the university and disqualify RCUH employees keeping valuable colleagues from serving on the Senate.

Instruction Committee. A report is attached. eCAFE contains 3 university questions and no college level questions. The evaluation may contain departmental level questions. The Manoa Faculty Senate will not interested in requiring SLO in all campus syllabi.

Research Committee. A report is attached. Because of tight budgets, nonbudget items were explored. The Senate may need to resolved that it is impossible to articulated a
unified research workload across disciplines. In the absence of Senate input, the administration will act. Faculty should be represented and involved.

8. ACCFSC

A. Titchenal attended. Streamlining purchasing and travel was the main focus of the March meeting. Meda Chesney-Lind <meda@hawaii.edu> is collecting horror stories to push changes. There has been talk of outsourcing hawaii.edu to google gmail. T. Lim pointed out that Yale investigated and rejected a similar proposal.

9. Senate Survey

Data was summarized and presented to administrators and administrative offices. Briefly 66% of faculty feel supported; morale in 35% of faculty is derived from self and from unit colleagues in an other 23%; 51% of faculty reported high morale; and 37% felt that over the last 7 years morale has increased with 10% feeling it had decreased. Discussion occurred as to whether offices and administrators should reply to the Senate, whether the ppt summary could be shared with faculty, and what expectations faculty have regarding the data collected. Some faculty expressed a desire to have much of the data made available while other faculty expressed concerns of respect and privacy for the targets of the survey. Does the data/information belong to the faculty or does the data/information, much like eCAFE, belong to the administrator. This may be an issue the next Senate would like to continue.

10. Resolution of Appreciation for Dean Hashimoto

The following resolution was presented

WHEREAS Andrew Hashimoto has lead the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources (CTAHR) as Dean for 10 years, and

WHEREAS Dr. Hashimoto has served CTAHR as Director of the Experiment Station for the same 10 years, and

WHEREAS Dr. Hashimoto has administered a college the size of a small university with a staff and faculty of over 400 employees and 760 students, and

WHEREAS Dr. Hashimoto has faithfully overseen the research and extension activities of faculty across six islands that totals nearly $19 million annually, and

WHEREAS Dr. Hashimoto has guided the development and implementation of two strategic plans for the college challenging CTAHR to emerge as a leader in research, impact, and student outcomes among colleges at the University of Hawaii, and

WHEREAS Dr. Hashimoto has tirelessly worked with political leaders and influential constituents to advance the interests of CTAHR, and
WHEREAS Dr. Hashimoto has selflessly served and advocated for CTAHR across the state, nation, and world, and

WHEREAS Dr. Hashimoto has spoken with candor and clarity, with wisdom and pragmatism, to faculty, staff, students, and clientele in good times and bad, and

WHEREAS Dr. Hashimoto has exemplified the ability to make difficult and at times unpopular decisions as well as the perseverance to stand by those decisions,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the CTAHR Faculty Senate expresses its deepest appreciation for Andrew Hashimoto’s years of service, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CTAHR Faculty Senate wishes him good health, happiness and success in his future endeavors.

A. Wieczorek moved to adopt the resolution. K. Cheah seconded the motion. The resolution passed unanimously.

11. Adjournment of the 2009-2010 CTAHR Faculty Senate and convening of the 2010-2011 CTAHR Faculty Senate.

Newly elected Senators were seated.

Nominations for the Executive Committee were solicited. K. Cheah, T. Idol, H. Min, and T. Miura accepted nomination. A motion to close nominations was made, seconded and passed. The nominees were elected to the Senate Executive Committee by acclamation.

New Senators were given the opportunity to select committee assignments.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Respectively submitted, Brent Sipes
Extension Committee Report
April 28, 2010

(Compiled by committee members: Tom Mason (Chair), Glenn Teves, Jari Sugano, Julia Zee, and Norman Nagata, with input from Extension Specialist James Leary)

1. Promoting the Value of Extension

• Building Extension's Public Value (BEPV) workshop held with Dr. Laura Kalambokidis from University of Minnesota Extension to demonstrate how our programs create public value and how to communicate this value to stakeholders whose support is crucial to Extension.

• This committee proposes using simple, easy-to-read brochures and publications to disseminate information to legislators, the new dean, UH administrators and our stakeholders which will demonstrate the value of extension. Also, we must take advantage (especially in times of great fiscal restraint) of web-based solutions to promoting the value of extension. Personal/Program web sites would be one way of doing so (plus these could be considered "scholarship" for Extension Agents).

The Extension Committee recommends that the Associate Dean of Extension form an ad hoc committee to develop promotional materials and provide technical support for web-based scholarship opportunities.

2. Tenure and Promotion/Post Tenure Review

• DPC responsible for defining "scholarship", input from Extension needed on scholarship in Extension specifically. Revisit Scholarship Unbound documentation.

• It would be helpful to have Agent representation on DPC and including this in the Personnel Guidelines is suggested.

• Harold Keyser was charged with evaluating the T&P process for Extension candidates. Extension Agents and DPC/TPRC members should consult "Appendix B - Supplemental Guidelines for Librarians, Specialists, or Extension Agents" before reviewing applications: http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/faculty/tenure_promotion_contract_renewal/

• Extension Survey (Wayne Nishijima requested - 2007) final report contained several recommendations that should be revisited.

• Many seem to believe that there is not a problem with Agents getting promoted at the TPRC level once department/college level support is gained (and research confirms this claim), but more support is still needed for Agents in the post-tenure review process.

Extension committee recommends that the next Faculty Senate - Extension Committee continue to look into these issues.
3. Inclusion of Specialists on Extension Committee

- Specialists should be invited to join Extension Committee, provided they understand that the work of the committee is to focus on Extension Agent issues and where these intersect with other faculty roles (Instruction, Research, Specialists).

*Confirm that the work done by the CTAHR Faculty Senate - Extension Committee is Agent-focused with the CTAHR Faculty Senate*

4. RTRF - concerned with overhead fees on grants

- There was no further discussion regarding this issue, other than the suggestion, by Dick Bowen, that we could "argue that community based grants don't really require much college overhead and that an exception should be made for your grants".

*Extension committee recommends the next Faculty Senate - Extension Committee seek clarification with Associate Dean of Extension and Annette Chang in CTAHR Administrative Services about the RTRF issue and percentage of overhead taken by Administration for Extension grants.*

5. Role of Extension Director - Report on Extension Priorities to New Dean

- Extension Committee suggests that the Extension Director form an ad hoc committee to address needs of agents, outside the scope of committee responsibilities

- Input sought on the status of Interim Director Linda Cox's ad hoc Outreach Technology Committee.

*Extension committee recommends the Associate Dean of Extension form an ad hoc committee to address Extension’s priority issues.*

6. Continuity of Committee work from year-to-year

*Extension committee recommends that a Committee Chairperson and a Chairperson-elect are selected each year to provide a transition between years and a continuity in addressing ongoing issues.*
Personnel Committee Report
April 28, 2010

The Personnel Committee did not complete work on the contents for an Employee Handbook. I have enclosed a draft prepared by Lynn Nakamura-Tengan that could be used as a starting point for the Personnel Committee next term.

Table of Contents:
Organizational Structure
  UH system org chart
  UHM Mission, strategic plan, and links to relevant statistics on UH students and Programs
  RCUH- purpose, scope of responsibilities, (using revolving fund accounts)
  UH Foundation
  UH Administrative Units
  CTAHR Organizational Chart (Ruddy Wong has a 1-page document on file)
  Description of CTAHR admin units, functions (3-5 line description), people in respective positions (e.g. Admin Services: Acct clerk, Admin Officer, Institutional Support, Director, Personnel Officer, secretary) A current telephone directory would be helpful here.

Instruction, Research and Extension
  Extension Programs and Offices
  Research Programs and Stations
  Writing a Plan of Work
  Process for submitting grants as P.I. or subcontractor
  Faculty Support Services: refer to Faculty and staff page
  http://www.uhm.hawaii.edu/faculty_staff/
  Library resources access

Faculty Governance
  UHM and CTAHR Faculty senates, committees
  UHPA - mandatory dues, etc.

Personnel Issues:
  Tenure and promotion process
  DPC committee composition
  Dept TP criteria and process
  Post-tenure review process and guidelines
  Health Insurance
  Retirement
  Payroll deduction process and access to forms
  Housing
  Grievance
  Employee Assistance

Getting Started
  Getting an email address, faculty identification card
  Establishing your faculty "home page" and having your background information available on the UH/CTAHR web
Fiscal matters (P.O.s, travel procedures and documentation, revolving RCUH accounts, fiscal deadlines, etc.)
Registering Emergency Alert contact information with UHM Office of Emergency Management
Printing business cards
Getting a P-card
In general, the committee thinks that the survey was helpful to identify what the problems and concerns are. However, the committee thinks that the survey did not provide enough detailed ideas and thoughts to reach recommendations.

Many difficulties people are facing have resulted from economic downturn and budget cut. Realistically speaking, there are not many things that can be done under the given circumstance. Thus, the research committee's discussion more focused on non-monetary issues.

1. Lack of administrative support and inefficiency in fiscal matters and grant proposal submission

   Response from Admin: Personnel at the fiscal office had been changed and the efficiency has been improved.
   Recommendation
   i. Give them some time to work on it and see if there are still problems
   ii. Administration also suffers from the lack of manpower. Due to budget cut, the manpower problem won't be able to be solved.
   iii. It is a good idea to computerize the grant proposal submission and eliminate paper work. However, it cannot be just done within CTAHR. Bring up the idea to UH level. ORS is beyond CTAHR's boundary.

2. Research workload

   Vice Chancellor asked C.Y. to come up with how to assess research workload
   The committee was unable to reach a conclusion and make a recommendation. More opinions need to be heard. First of all, it is not clear if we can use the measure of research productivity as the measure of research workload. We need consensus from the majority. Then, we need to come up with how to create some guidelines that can be fairly used across different disciplines, different research focuses and different FTE allocations. Extramural funds awarded, peer-reviewed publication, and graduate students involved were identified as a general rule of thumb. However, coming up with specifics for those three guidelines is not easy. For instance, some research requires smaller amount of funds than others. It is easier to publish a peer-reviewed article in some disciplines than in the other disciplines. Some units do not have graduate programs. Thus, the research committee welcomes more ideas and suggestions. The committee also thinks that the chairs and directors of all units need to be involved. If we conclude that it is not a possible idea to set up a guideline, at least we need to reach consensus.

3. Research Prioritization

   We concluded that we do not have sufficient information on this issue. We recommend creating a post-hoc committee in which both administration and faculty representatives participate to discuss this matter. More opinions need to be heard.
Instructional Committee Report  
April 28, 2010

Course Proposal Reviews
• The committee reviewed BE 120, BE 410, BE 420L, BE 470, ECON/TPSS 429, and FSHN 141
• Decisions have been made for all but BE 120 and 420L, which were recently submitted

College-level eCAFE Questions
• The committee reviewed a request by Associate Dean Charles Kinoshita to create a CTAHR account in eCAFE for the purpose of including college-wide questions on all eCAFE course evaluation surveys
• A faculty survey was created and faculty responses were evaluated
• Although most faculty were in favor of standardized evaluation questions for all CTAHR courses, there were concerns the increase in the number of questions and the reliance upon standardized eCAFE questions, which are course-specific rather than program-wide

Improving Course Proposals
• The SIC would like to require all course proposals to include student learning outcomes in the syllabus. We have not made a formal motion to the full Senate; this is for future committee consideration.
• There is also interest in having instructors include grading or evaluation rubrics in the syllabus for the benefit of students as well as for evaluation by the Instruction Committee
• No formal action by the full Senate has been proposed; this is an issue for future committee work and Senate action