CTAHR Faculty Senate Meeting
1 March 2011
Agricultural Sciences Building Room 219

Members present:
Brent Sipes          Scot Nelson          Samir Khanal,
Shriram Bhutada     Kelvin Sewake      Christopher Lepczyk,
Kent Kobayashi      Susan Miyasaka     Teresita Amore,
Helen Spafford      Loren Gautz        Wayne Iwaoka,
Brian Turano        Halina Zaleski     Qing Li, Hosik Min
Kheng Cheah          Ashley Stokes
Tomoaki Mirua       J.P. Bingham

Senators Excused:
Mark Thorne (proxy to S. Miyasaka)

Guests:
Associate Dean Carl Evensen
Associate Dean Charles Kinoshita
Associate Dean Ken Grace

I. The meeting called to order at 3:00pm

II. The 9 November 2010 meeting minutes approved with one correction of one missing attendee (Ashley Stokes).

III. Guest Speakers
A. Associate Dean for Research: Ken Grace
   - **Loss of earmarks.** The funding will come this year and next year, but is not expected for FY 2011 and FY 2012. It translates into a loss of $12M ($6M DOE grants & $3.2M TSTAR). The administration will announce about this year’s TSTAR proposals on March 4 with an expectation of not funding them.
     - Potential short-term solutions: more formula funds, state funds (barred tax?), lobbying the legislature
     - Potential long-term solutions: more competitive NIFA funding
   - **Formula funding.** The administration is working to make the application process simpler. The administration is also planning to announce another internal competitive opportunity next year.
   - **Experimental station policies.** The administration is looking into possibilities of generating revenues via some experimental stations (e.g., plant distribution policies, use of Waialee).
   - **Cluster hiring (Sustainability and Native Hawaiian Scholars).** CTAHR is looking into contributing by addressing food security issues.

B. Associate Dean for Extension: Carl Evensen
   - **Elluminate.** The extension office will sponsor one license per unit (departments, county extension offices, COF) to explore and experiment the utilities of the software.
- **Retirements.** Large gaps have been created by recent retirements of a number of extension faculty members. The administration is looking into a possibility of authorizing agents to work in other counties on a voluntarily and annual basis.

- **Federal funding.** While there is a slight increase in the Hatch fund, there is a 10% decrease in the Smith-Lever fund. The administration is working to streamline application processes for these funds and plans on releasing a new guideline in April.

- **Extension conference.** An extension conference is planned on April 20 and 21. One of the focuses of the conference is to discuss about effectively utilizing technologies (e.g., webinars, survey monkey, etc.)

IV. Committee Reports

A. SEC
   - the Sun Grant proposal was endorsed by the SEC
   - the SEC received minor comments for clarification on the CTAHR survey

B. Personnel: report enclosed

C. Instruction: report enclosed

D. Elections
   - Elections will occur during 3rd or 4th week of March
   - Results to be announced by the 1st week of April.

V. The meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.
The CTAHR workload document fulfills much of the Chancellors request, particularly for instruction. The proposed research and extension workload policy is, however, largely a discussion of scholarship rather than workload. For instruction, workload is counted primarily by the number of credits taught, and secondarily by activities such as advising. Comparable measures for extension would be activities such as number of workshops organized, or other activities that listed as outputs in the plan of work. Research is a little trickier, but comparable measures could be based on the plan and time lines for research activities.

Achievement should not be confused with workload. Comparing with instruction once more, teaching evaluations and other measures of achievement are not considered when evaluating workload, but are appropriately used for tenure and promotion. For research and extension, outcomes, impacts, publications and citations would be comparable to teaching evaluations and are appropriate to consider for tenure and promotion rather than for workload.

Last year the CTAHR Senate Personnel Committee had extensive discussions of using Scholarship Unbound for promotion and tenure and brought the result before the Faculty Senate. The Committee report on February 24, 2010, concluded that:

1. Article XV provides for representation of extension faculty on TPRC, therefore no resolution is supported
2. Scholarship Unbound not significantly different from examples in Appendix B, therefore no resolution to adopt is supported
3. It is the burden of the applicant to make case for scholarly activities in dossier; utilization of Appendix B suggested

Scholarship Unbound was NOT recommended for adoption and no motion for adoption by the Faculty Senate was made.
Six courses were reviewed since January. Only one course was approved. All others failed to adequately address CTAHR critical skills and competencies, both in methods for giving students these skills and in evaluating how well the skills could be demonstrated by the students at the conclusion of the course.

Course Proposal Format as displayed on the Senate website is not being followed. In some cases not all questions are answered. In others there seems to be a lack of understanding what is being asked for. A common problem is the lack of evaluation methods. Under how students will be evaluated, the proposal needs rubrics to establish how well the outcomes meet the stated objectives of the course. In some cases there is a need for objectives that can be measured in the outcomes.

The committee has found a need to have all new courses be first approved as experimental and then evaluated after being taught at least once. After two years courses not ‘modified’ to regular status are dropped. The difference between experimental and regular is that regular courses appear in the catalog. This will allow instructors to collect data on the need and acceptance of the course without loading up the Catalog with courses that could not meet proposed levels of coherence, pedagogy, content, learning outcomes, and quality.

Our direction from the SEC regarding evaluating courses for coherence, pedagogy, content, learning outcomes, and quality was ambiguous. We have chosen to be facilitative but firm in requiring complete and thorough coverage of the required indices before approval. In this regard, we will not approve courses that have a flawed UHM-1 and appendices posted on the Senate web site, i.e. the evaluation is of the posted material not other communications.

Prepared by: Loren D. Gautz, Chair of CTAHR Instruction Committee