Vice-Chair Dennis Vanairsdale presided for Chair Harry Davis who was on a trip.

I. Discussion on Contract Renewal and Tenure/Promotion Guideline Revisions
During the 2008 Contract Renewal and Tenure/Promotion Review Cycle, the Chancellor issued a memo which rescinded a prior permission for certain candidates who sought both contract renewal and promotion, to consolidate the two documents into one single document. Instead, the memo issued by the Chancellor just two weeks before the deadline emphasized the different goals of the two documents and the reason that they should be distinct in addressing Contract Renewal and Promotion and/or Tenure. Several non-tenure track faculty expressed surprised at the requirement to complete two large documents in a relatively short period of time (less than 2 weeks).

The issue of the coincidence of due dates for Contract Renewal and Tenure/ Promotion Review came about when the Contract Renewal deadline was switched from spring semester to fall semester. On some campuses, Contract Renewal still has a spring due date. While Tenure/Promotion is systemwide, Contract Renewal guidelines are established by each campus individually.

According to Leigh Dooley, a request was made to the Chancellor to give blanket extensions to all candidates required to produce the contract renewal document in addition to the Tenure/Promotion document. Blanket extensions were not granted,
However, the Chancellor did grant extensions to all who requested them on a case-by-case basis.

The Evaluation Committee is reviewing the Guidelines for Contract Renewal and Tenure/Promotion with a view to making the guidelines for both as similar as possible—or the same — so that only one comprehensive document would be required.

Ibrahim Dik pointed out that a separate dossier for Contract Renewal was required by Human Resources System Guidelines to legally comply with system requirements. Leigh Dooley and the Evaluation Committee were not aware of the Human Resources requirements, and will investigate requirements to comply with system HR guidelines.

The Evaluation Committee received Chancellor Richard’s Memo of January 22, 2009, the response to Chair Davis’ Memo of December 8, 2008 on Contract Renewal and Tenure/Promotion Guidelines on the same day as their scheduled meeting. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee did not have time to thoroughly discuss the recommendations and prepare a report for Faculty Senate. The memo will be discussed at the February meeting.

A Faculty Senate Motion was proposed by Cynthia Kimura to return the two memos on Contract Renewal and Tenure/Promotion Guidelines: Harry Davis December 8, 2008 and Chancellor Richards January 22, 2009 — to the Evaluation Committee to discuss at their next meeting on February 27, 2009 — and to prepare a report for Faculty Senate on their discussion, about the Faculty Senate concerns that were addressed.

II. Discussion on College Reorganization Plan Document
Dennis Vanairsdale called for comments on the Reorganization Plan Document.

The Senate discussed Chancellor Richard’s memo of January 23rd “Resolution on the Reorganization.”

Concerns continued to be expressed about the Print Shop, Telephone, and Mail Room being moved administratively to Auxiliary Services, while physically remaining in Naio. Chancellor Richards views these services as campus-wide operations, and has moved the administrative control to Auxiliary Services. Senators recalled this was consistent with Accreditation Committee Report recommendations. According to Gene Phillips, there is a potential for increased difficulty and bureaucracy in carrying out the day-to-day tasks with the Print Shop, located in Naio and signatures, permissions, etc., administered from Olopu. It appears that the decision is final at this point.

According to senators who attend the open departmental forums on the Reorganization Plan, Dr. Richard’s current position is that the Plan will stand as written, and that Departments and individuals may petition for revisions or modifications on an annual basis, preparing reasoned requests based on the Tactical Plan and Strategic Plan.
Senators spoke to the recorded minutes of previous Faculty Senate meetings, and the fact that Faculty Senate had approved only the Executive Summary of the Reorganization Plan — not the complete and final Reorganization Plan. Senators especially sought information about specific details related to positions numbers that would impact faculty.

Dr. Richards has fulfilled the UHPA requirement to communicate with faculty in public and departmental meetings about the Reorganization Plan, but is not accepting any modifications to the Reorganization Plan at this time.

One senator explained that when the Reorganization Plan goes to the Board of Regents (BOR) for approval, according JN Musto (UHPA), the BOR, will ask for the opinions of the Faculty Senate, and Unions impacted by the changes.

Senators expressed appreciation for the need of the Reorganization Plan to comply with the Accreditation Committee recommendations. Faculty saw the need for Dr. Richards to have the Reorganization Plan approved quickly due to Accreditation timeline obligations. However, testimony of individual senators demonstrated the need for further discussion and compromise on aspects of the Reorganization Plan in the future. Some specific examples included positions in Legal Education (Cynthia Kimura) and Continuing Education/Community Services (Trude Pang) where faculty worked 100% in one area, but on paper were split 50/50 between two departments. The official Reorganization Plan position chart does not reflect the job functions that are fulfilled by these individuals. Other individuals expressed concern over positions in Nursing and The Culinary Institute of the Pacific.

Senator Steph Nelson summarized the discussion, pointing out that the Faculty Senate position need not be adversarial, and that the door was till open to modification in the future in proposals based on the Strategic and Tactical Plans.

**Motion of Senator Steph Nelson, Seconded and Discussed.**

_The Executive Committee should draft a memo for approval by Faculty Senate to the effect that: For accreditation purposes, the Faculty Senate approves of the full Reorganization Plan of _____(date), with concerns about the process, and stipulation that Administration will work with units through their tactical plans and other appropriate means. Faculty Senate requests that this memo accompany the Reorganization Plan through the process to the Board of Regents._

**Motion Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed.**

**III. Discussion of SLOs**

Leigh Dooley, representing the Evaluation Committee stated that in spite of rumors at UH-Manoa Faculty Senate, community colleges had not accepted SLOs at the course level for evaluation of faculty. SLOs at the community colleges are being developed at the program, not the course level — except in courses that need SLOs for outside
evaluation. The “Principles of Practice for SLOs” document signed by the Administration and consistent with Accreditation policy includes the following clause which protects faculty:
“The results (of SLO data) are not used in any evaluation of faculty.”

Motion on SLOs
There was a motion for Faculty Senate to drop the current SLO agreement in the event that SLOs are implemented at the course level, bypassing the current process, and not submitted to the coordination of the SLO Committee headed by Christine Korey-Smith.

Vote: 13 in favor/ 0 opposed
Senators were encouraged to comply with requests from the official SLO committee to complete forms relating course content to program objectives.

IV. Discussion on the Strategic Plan
In the remaining minutes senators addressed the Strategic Plan. Consensus among senators was that it lacked faculty input and participation. Questions were raised as to how the plan was formulated. The senate representative to the Strategic Plan committee stated that they had never met as a group, but were asked to respond to drafts. Other senators pointed out that a significant part of Strategic Plan requirements filter down from UH-Manoa requirements.

Since the Strategic Plan sets the course for the College and determines how budget will be allocated, senators felt the need for a special session to carefully examine the contents. Inclusion of e-portfolios, and exclusion of specific program interests will impact the future of individuals and departments in applications to acquire funds using the current Strategic Plan as justification. A Special Session of the Senate to specifically review and discuss the content and impact of the Strategic Plan was suggested and agreed upon.

The date for the Special Senate Meeting to discuss the implications of the Strategic Plan in its present form was called for Friday, February 13th at 1pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Beresiwsky
Secretary