Members present:
Stephen Ferreira, Brent Sipes (proxy for Anne Alvarez), Travis Idol, John Engel, Janice Uchida (proxy for Michael Kawate), Alton Arakaki, Dian Dooley (proxy for Alan Titchenal), Mark Thorne (proxy for Julia Zee), Mark Wright (proxy for Ania Wieczorek), Andy Kaufman, Richard Manshardt (proxy for Susan Miyasaka), John Yanagida

The meeting was called to order at 1:33 PM by President Stephen Ferreira.

I. CTAHR Senate Charter proposed revisions
A. Brent Sipes presented the Senate Executive Committee's proposed revisions to the charter.
   Discussion of the changes will be made at the next Senate meeting.
   Voting on the changes will be open to all eligible faculty after the next Senate meeting
B. Reasons to change the Charter
   1. the bylaws, which are operating rules, are mostly contained in the Charter
   2. the Charter itself is made difficult to change
   3. this creates a dilemma in trying to change simple operating procedures
   4. the Senate can inadvertently violate the Charter by not following the letter of operating procedures, such as when the Senate meets or the specific duties of committees
   5. the SEC has restructured much of the Charter, putting specific operating guidelines in the bylaws and leaving essential elements in the Charter
C. Two documents will be available online
   1. a marked-up charter with changes highlighted
   2. a draft revised charter with the changes incorporated
D. Minor changes to the Charter
   1. The university head is now a chancellor, not the president
   2. The timing of meetings and elections are less rigid
   3. Voting is problematic: current charter says it is secret and confidential
      We want to add paper and electronic balloting without tying ourselves to any specific technology
   4. There is a lot of repetition in the current charter that can be combined
E. Major changes
   1. Interactions with Manoa Faculty Senate
      We will no longer require a MFS to report to the CTAHR faculty Senate
      We will appoint an SEC member to the MFS
      We will elect 5 Senators to MFS rather than 6
      The 6th will be an SEC member
   2. Instructional committee duties will be changed to smooth flow of course
approvals and have SIC evaluate programs and learning opportunities and changes therein
3. Bylaw amendments may be proposed by SEC
   Faculty petitions must be signed by a certain percentage of eligible faculty
   The SEC will distribute proposed changes to Senate
   Voting will take place at next meeting.
   A 2/3 majority of Senators present must vote in favor of the changes for them to be accepted.
   This change is placed in the bylaws, not the Charter.

II. Prior meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

III. Administrative reports-deferred to next meeting.
   The Dean would like the Senate to deal with the issue of patenting of traditional Hawaiian taro varieties and genetic engineering of taro. This will likely go to the Research Committee for discussion and recommendation.

IV. Committee Reports
   A. The Instructional committee submitted a written report. It was read to the Senators by the Senate President (attached).
   B. The Research committee submitted an email report (attached).
   C. The Extension committee submitted a written report. Chair Alton Arakaki read the report and discussed two items with the Senators.
      1. Priority staffing: extension faculty feel comfortable with the open process but are not sure how priorities are set.
         Faculty should take initiative to make sure extension is prioritized.
      2. Faculty T&P guidelines: they recognize work of the personnel committee.
         They want to see how it affects extension faculty.
   D. The Elections committee submitted a written report and read it to the Senators.
   E. The Personnel committee has not met formally but has communicated on some issues. Chair Mark Wright discussed the following issues.
      1. Tenure and promotion issues were sent by Charly Kinoshita to Senate
         He must not have seen recommendations sent to the Dean’s office.
         His concerns seem to be more procedural issues with departmental personnel committees.
         There is not much the Senate can do at this level.
      2. The committee is concerned with how faculty housing treats extension faculty. They are given lower priority than other tenure-track faculty.
         Faculty housing may not recognize that extension specialists are equivalent faculty.
         It was suggested that the committee contact Ruddy Wong to get advice on how to proceed.
   F. Ad hoc Bioethics committee has not met.

V. Old and New Business. None.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 PM.
Personnel Committee report to CTAHR Senate, March 9, 2006

Contract renewal and Tenure and Promotion process in CTAHR:
Associate Dean Charly Kinoshita requested an update regarding Contract-Renewal and Tenure and Promotion process in CTAHR, at the Dean’s January Leadership Meeting. The personnel committee will request that Mr. R. Wong (holding the report prepared by the personnel committee review of these issues was addressed in 2004) provide Dr. Kinoshita with the final report. If considered necessary, the Personnel Committee could arrange a meeting with Dr. Kinoshita to discuss the issues raised in the previous report, as well as the points included by Dr. Kinoshita in his litany of concerns regarding DPC procedures in CTAHR.

Priority system for faculty housing an insult to extension faculty:
Quoted from a February 2, 2006 email from the faculty housing office: “Top priority is given to tenure track assistant professors. However, because you are an assistant specialist, you fall into group 3 category according to the Assignment Priority List. This list was created by the Board of Regents.

There were many people from the group 1 category that applied after you, in which they have higher priority. Therefore, pushing you down on the list.

If there are any other questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Best Wishes,

Faculty Housing Office
Ph: (808) 956-8449”

This amounts to a grievous insult to extension faculty. This issue may not arise frequently outside of CTAHR, as we have the majority of extension specialists in our college. The BOR appear to not recognize that Extension Specialists are of equal rank to Asst. Prof. / Asst. Researcher. They seem to consider Extension Faculty in general to be third rate members of the university faculty, or at least they give that impression. This issue should be taken up by the CTAHR Faculty Senate with the Board of Regents and the Faculty Housing Office, and we would appreciate guidance from the Senate on how to proceed with this.
December 15, 2005

TO: Stephen Ferreira
CTAHR Faculty Senate President

FROM: Jonathan Deenik, Chair
CTAHR Faculty Senate Instruction Committee

SUBJECT: Review of UHM-1 Form Course Proposals

1. **NREM 420 – Community and Natural Resource Management**

   Committee has recommended to accept this course proposal, but the following items should be addressed:
   a. The form is filled with spelling and grammar errors and requires editing to clean up language.
   b. Concerning the language in item 11, the committee was wondering whether the demand was for the instructor or the course content? We advise that the language be modified to reflect that students demand.

2. **NREM/TPSS 311**

   In reviewing this course proposal the committee raised some fundamental questions regarding the “O” requirement. First, what is the College’s position on the applicability of Speech 151/251 in satisfying the “O” requirement? Second, should there be a College wide course developed to satisfy the “O” requirement or should each department develop their own “O” course?

   Regarding this course proposal, the committee felt that it should be offered on an experimental basis first to see if student interest exists. This proposal also requires some proofreading. For example, we were wondering what the relationship is between ‘Current Topics in Plant Science’ and ‘Principles of Effective public speaking’ (item 4)?

3. **APDM 320/321**

   The committee agreed that the proposals are justified given the changing nature of the industry. A few questions came up:

   a. Are these two proposed course replacing APDM 221? If yes, then APDM 221 cannot be a prerequisite as stated on UHM-1 form for APDM 321.
b. The proposals expand 1 course (APDM 221) into 2 courses and then raises the level from 200 level to 300 level. Does the course content and course requirements merit an increase to 300 level?

c. The justification indicates that changes in the chemistry/technology of the field requires a new set of courses, but we note that there is no chemistry requirement for students in the program. Shouldn’t students have at least Chem 151?

d. There appears to be an omission in the table outlining APDM course requirements on p. 8 APDM 320 form. APDM 320 omitted from the table.
CTAHR Faculty Senate Research Committee
Minutes
January 19, 2006, 11:30am, Sherman 111

Absent: Anne Alvarez (Excused), D. Borthakur
Invited Guest: Christopher Helm, Director ORS

1. Chris Helm introduced himself and gave us his vision and perspectives of the ‘new’ ORS. His stance is that ORS emphasizes the SERVICE they provide to their clients. They are in the process of hiring more staff to deal with 2 bottlenecks: pre-award and contracts and grant review services. He stressed that speed is a priority as a support service and will provide more training by his staff to users of ORS as one way to gain speed. ORS has purchased a new software system to eventually have proposals prepared and approved by UH faculty online. This service will be ready in about 2 years. Another task that ORS has taken on is to review unnecessary duplication of efforts so as to maximize efficiency of expediting the pre- and post-award services.

2. The methods and processes of allocating McIntire-Stennis funds were discussed. The general consensus is that it is the responsibility of CTAHR Research Office to set program priorities in addition to draft proposal submission and review guidelines. The RFP should then be broadcast widely to the faculty during the academic year (not in the summer).

3. The discussion on the issue of the frequency of submission of the P-card transactions log to department office occurred. The overarching conclusion is to aim at creating less work for the faculty and for CTAHR fiscal office to come up with an efficient way to securely verify the expenses of the P-card online. A suggestion was made to review other university systems such as New Mexico State University or Colorado State University online system and adopt some of the practices or even hire a consultant to look into the matter. The key is to minimize unnecessary paperwork for both the faculty and staff of CTAHR and UHM.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Catherine Chan-Halbrendt

Next meeting date:
February 16, 2006 at 12:00pm Sherman 111
CTAHR Faculty Senate
Extension Committee Report
March 9, 2006
Alton Arakaki, Chairperson

Committee members: Joan Chong, Laura Jean Kawamura, Kaulana Keala, Julia Zee, Jari Sugano and Halina Zaleski (Liaison)

In November 2005 the Extension Committee agreed to focus its work on 2 issues:


2. Review process for tenure and promotion, and contract renewal for Extension faculty.

Outcomes:


The Extension Committee conducted 2 meetings with Extension Administrators to discuss CTAHR’s priority staffing process in recognition of present and future vacancies.

The Committee has come to the conclusion that the CTAHR staffing process is an open one, and that faculty need to be engaged in staffing process in the Departments and Counties. Email was sent to Extension faculty encouraging them to participate in the staffing process.

Other Potential Exploration: Need for administrative “trigger” to identify critical staffing needs to build Extension capacity to execute CTAHR’s strategic plan.

2. Review process for tenure and promotion, and contract renewal for Extension faculty.

The Extension Committee will be receiving contract renewal documents from Rudy Wong, Director of Administrative Services, and will be reviewing them.
Hi Steve,
I just sent this to the Elections Committee as your email was coming in. The report is listed below.
Andrew

Andrew Kawabata
Assistant Extension Agent
University of Hawai'i at Manoa CES
675 Kamehameha St.
Hilo, Hawai'i 96720
ph:(808)981-5150
tx:(808)981-5211

From: Kawabata, Andrew
Sent: Mon 3/6/2006 4:01 PM
To: Kawata, Michael; Kawabata, Andrew; Smith, Virginia; Sipes, Brent
Subject: Election Committee Report

Hi Virginia and Brent:

I will not be able to attend the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting on March 9th. I have a Master Gardener class that I am teaching that day. (Mike will not be able to make the date either.) Could one of you provide a brief update to the Senate on the status of the elections committee?

Elections Committee Report:

Eligible Faculty List Completed
(received from Janice Morikawa and distributed for corrections via Department Chairs.)

Call for Nominations will be emailed during week of March 6th with a closing date of March 23rd.

Elections to commence the first week in April and completed within that month.

Virginia: If you are attending, can I give you my proxy vote?

Mahalo,
Andrew