Senate Meeting-3:15pm, PASS Room, Wed., March 7, 2001

Refreshments 3:05-3:15

I. Approval of minutes (Vice Chair) (Please proceed on time if Chair is late from Waianae) 3:15-3:18

II. Reports: 3:19-3:45
A. Standing Committee Chairs-
   1. Budget and Planning - Franklin Iha
   2. Faculty - Warren Imada
   3. Elections - Jean Hara
   4. Academic/Institutional Support (unfilled)
   5. Legislative Relations - Paul Lococo
   6. Program Review - Gail Levy
   7. Student - Larry Andres
   8. Curriculum - Jim Goodman
B. Ad hoc committees -
   1. Revision of ADP - Fritz Osell
   2. LCC Reorganization - Sinikka Hayasaka
   3. Chloe Holland Community Service - Candace Hochstein
   4. DE Oversight subcommittee - Jim Goodman
C. Chair's report on last BOR and ACCFSC meeting at HCC
   1. Dean Smith memo
   2. Financial aid
   3. Standing Committee on Written Communications
   4. DE status

III. Old Business: 3:46-4:30
A. Personnel Policies (moved to Faculty Committee)
B. Action form responses? (follow-up) (Jack Pond)

IV. New Business: 4:31-5:00
A. TPRC concerns
B. Resolution on CC workload

V. Announcements 5:01-5:05
VI. What's on your mind? 5:06-5:30
VII. Next refreshments volunteers?

Next meetings: April 4, May 2

Aloha!

SENATORS EXCUSED: L. Andres, P. Lococo, D. Pascual, J. Pond.

SPECIAL GUESTS: Linda Currivan, Mary Jane Dobson, Leslie Munro.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order with a quorum at 3:28 pm

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the February 14, 2001 meeting were read and approved with minor corrections.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

PROGRAM REVIEW – Senator Levy is planning to see what is being said at the Excellence in Education Conference on this issue. She has been told that at the System level, decisions on five of the indicators have been reached. She also received a call from Cheryl Chappell-Long, from the Chancellor’s Office, stating that final decisions have not yet made and that discussions are continuing.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – The Curriculum Committee’s March meeting was canceled, as the subcommittees were not able to meet. Acting Assistant Dean B. Howard has voiced a concern that due to year-round scheduling, curricular changes will not get into the Catalog and Schedule of Courses. The curricular process is not in sync with the new changes, and programs will have to submit curricular/program information a year in advance due to the College’s year-round scheduling.

AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORTS:

REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE – Senator Hayasaka asked Senator Imada to update the Senate on the latest information coming from the Provost’s Reorganization Committee. He reported that the Committee has met twice and has decided to have three vice chairs. It will develop parameters and examine the mission statement for its intent and validity. If the mission statement is no longer valid, then it is felt that there may be a reason to reorganize. The vice chairs are Shelley Ota, Lisa Hayashi and Keith Corenevsky.
CHLOE HOLLAND SERVICE COMMITTEE – The next clean up is Saturday, March 24 at 7:00 am. Volunteers will meet at the flagpole.

DISTANCE EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE – Kay Porter gave her email address in the Bulletin (jporter@hawaii.edu). Those who want minutes from the DE System Committee should let her know by email. They are planning to hand out a Best Practices pamphlet at the Excellence in Education Conference. Senators will soon receive a copy through campus mail.

NEW BUSINESS:

Dean Smith’s Memo – Senior Vice President and Executive Vice Chancellor Dean O. Smith has written a memo to President Mortimer asking him to deny the Community Colleges’ request to delay the implementation of the new general education requirements at UHM. While the memo had wide distribution, no CC Senate Chair received a copy from him. There is concern over #2 on page 2 regarding Focus Requirements which reads, “...there appears to be some misunderstanding over the focus requirements. They are graduation requirements specific to Manoa, and like the current second language requirement or the current upper division portion of the Writing Intensive requirement, they need not be completed prior to a student’s transfer to Manoa.”

Tuition Increase – The proposed tuition increase did not have a lot of student-comment except from LCC and MCC students. Now that there is an impending strike, students are voicing concern about the tuition increase. They appear to be supporting the strike, but they also want the support of the faculty against the tuition increase. The proposed increase will affect the vocational students who must take more than 12 credits per semester. The rebuttal to this is that vocational students need to apply for financial aid. Additionally, vocational students would end up paying the same as other students since they finish faster (they pay for fewer semesters). A survey seems to indicate that vocational students are not receiving financial aid, but the accuracy of the instrument was questioned. It was also noted that just because students do not receive financial aid, it doesn’t necessarily mean that they applied for aid and were denied. It was also noted that as the CCs are being asked to be more entrepreneurial, compete with private colleges (such as Heald), and deliver the programs in competitive ways that meet the needs of employers, industry and students. Increasing the tuition for vocational students is not assisting the CCs in doing different things. If anything, it is detrimental.

Standing Committee on Written Communication – The Committee’s task is to develop criteria for courses that satisfy the written component of the UH Gen Ed requirement. LCC reviewed the criteria and feels no changes are needed. The abovementioned committee will be a model for the General Education committees.

Distance Education – Chancellor Tsunoda has stated that DE is frozen due to the budget. There will be no further expansion beyond what is scheduled now, that is, until additional funding is found.

TPRC Concerns – Leslie Munro wants the Senate to be aware of concerns she has brought forth in her memo to UHPA and other Faculty Senate Chairs. The memo outlines her concerns regarding TPRCs. She feels the selection of TPRC members is both inequitable and unethical and that the process lacks clear criteria for recommending or
denying tenure and/or promotion and results in inequitable application of the inadequate guidelines. She has indicated to the Chancellor and Provosts that she no longer chooses to participate in the tenure/promotion review process. The administration has deemed her decision to be contrary to her professional obligations and has indicated that future nonparticipation would result in disciplinary action. Professor Munro requested the Senate for a motion to ask UHPA to look into the matter.

Motion 01-06 (Hayasaka/Neils): That the LCC Faculty Senate recommends that UHPA look into the issue of TPRCs as outlined by Dr. Leslie Munro in her letter of 2/19/01.

PASSED – Y=13; N=0; Ab=1

Community College Workload memo – This resolution was written by HCC, KCC and LCC faculty. Linda Currivan and Mary Jane Dobson were present to answer questions. It is intended to remind the Chancellor that she should address the workload issue. Senate concerns included “Why should this issue be passed when faculty take on additional courses as overload?” “Other CCs nationwide do not require community service and professional development as we do in Hawaii.”

Motion 01-07 (V.): To approve the resolution to modify the current UH Community College Faculty Workload requirements and reinstate single semester sabbatical leave opportunities.

PASSED – Y=13; N=0; Ab=1

Division Chairs Meeting – The question of the campus buying site licenses for software versus having individual divisions purchasing software was raised. The advantage of having a site license is that not only would the college be able to use the software, but it would also be cleared for professional use at home. The Senate deferred taking any action due to a lack of financial information.

Elections/New Senate Meeting – A joint meeting of the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 Senates will be held on May 2 at 3:00 pm. The Senate Secretary should send a letter to all indicating that nominations for the next year’s Senate officers are being sought until April 1. Elections will be held at the May meeting. The letter should also indicate that nominations will also be accepted from the floor at that meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

✓ The next meeting of the Senate is April 4, 2001. Refreshments will be provided by Senator F. Iha and …

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:30.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: Jack Pond, Secretary from notes provided by Senator C. Hochstein.
Hi Jack,

Here is a summary of the notes I took. I am sorry if I did not take them in the detail that you would need to make the minutes. I will be placing a copy of handouts into your box in LA. Thank you for writing the minutes.

Candy-

Wednesday, March 7, 2001


Senators absent: L. Andres, D. Pascual

Guests: Linda Currivan, Mary Jane Dobson, Leslie Munro

Meeting called to order: 3:28 pm

Amendments to the previous minutes: Minor changes in punctuation and spelling. There should be a "period" at the end of the paragraph on page 1 under Committee Reports. The word Service needs to be changed on page 2 in the title of the Chloe Holland Community Service (Service). Motion 01-02 The wording of the motion should be changed to, "The Senate urges the Interim Provost to appoint a committee to do follow-up on the ADP as stated in the pamphlet."

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Budget and Planning - Nothing to Report

Faculty Committee - Nothing to Report

Elections Committee - Nothing to Report

Legislative Committee - Nothing to Report

Student Committee - Nothing to Report

Program Review
-Gail is planning to see what is being said at the Excellence in Education Conference.
-Gail has been told that at the System level, they made decisions on 5 of the indicators. Then she got a call from Cheryl Chappell-Long stating that it really isn't decided yet and that things are still being discussed.

Curriculum Committee
-The Curriculum Committee met on February 14 to distribute information.
-The March meeting was canceled due to the sub committee's not being able to meet.
-Acting Assistant Dean Bernadette Howard has voiced a concern that due to year round scheduling, curricular changes will not get into the catalog and schedule of courses. The curricular process is not in sync with the new changes, and programs will have to submit curricular/program information a year in advance due to the year round schedule.
AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ADP - Nothing to report.

Reorganization Committee - Senator Hayasaka asked Senator Imada to update the Senate of what is happening in the Provost's Reorganization Committee. The Provost's Reorganization Committee has met twice. They have decided to have 3 vice chairs and set up, as of yet, undefined parameters. They want to revisit the mission statement for its intent and validity. If the mission statement is no longer valid, then they feel that there may be a reason to reorganize. The three vice chairs are Shelley Ota, Lisa Hayashi, and Keith Corenevsky.

Chloe Holland
- The next clean up is March 24, Saturday at 7 am.

Distance Ed Oversight Committee
- Kay Porter gave her email address in the Bulletin. It is jporter@hawaii.edu
- If you want a summary of the minutes from the DE System Committee, please email her.
- They are planning to hand out a Best Practices brochure at the Excellence in Ed conference.

NEW BUSINESS

Dean Smith's Memo
- The Community College Faculty Senates received this from other individuals. It is interesting to note that although Dean Smith was not CC'd on the original memo to President Mortimer, Dean Smith choose to respond to it, and send it to everyone except the CC Senate Chairs.
- President Mortimer did not respond to the CC Senate chair's memo or Dean Smiths.
- There is a concern over #2 on page 2 regarding Focus Requirements.

Financial Aid/Tuition Increase
- The proposed tuition increase did not have a lot of student comments except for LCC and MCC.
- Now that there is an impending strike, students are voicing concern about the tuition increase. They appear to be supporting the strike, but also want the support of the faculty of no increase of tuition.
- The proposed tuition increase will affect the Vocational students who must take more than 12 credits a semester. The rebuttal to this is that vocational students need to apply for financial aid. A survey was done, and it appears that vocational students are not receiving financial aid.
- The accuracy of the survey was questioned. It was also noted that just because students do not receive financial aid, it doesn't mean that they haven't applied for the aid and been denied.
- It was also brought up that as the CC's are being asked to be more entrepreneurial, compete with private Colleges (such as Heald), and deliver the programs in competitive ways that meets the needs of employers, industry and students, that increasing the tuition for vocational students is not assisting the CC's do these different things. If anything, it is detrimental.

Standing Committee on Written Communication
- New standing committee requirements for the General Education (see handout).
- The reason that it has gone to the Faculty Senate is so that when some issues go forward to be modified for ENG 100, the Faculty Senate's are receptive to the proposed changes (LCC is okay and does not need to change).
- This committee is supposed to be a model for the General Education committees.

Distance Education
- Chancellor Tsunoda states that DE is frozen due to budget. This means that no further expansion beyond what is on the schedules now. That is, until someone figures out how to fund things.

Personnel Policies
- Nothing to Report

TPRC Concerns
- Leslie Munro wants the Senate to be aware of concerns she has brought forth in her memo to UHPA.
- The memo was sent to UHPA, and all Faculty Senate Chairs.
- She would appreciate a motion to ask UHPA to look into this matter.

Saturday, March 17, 2001   America Online: QIMFONG
MOTION: That LCC Faculty Senate recommend that UHPA look into the issue of TPRC's as outlined by Dr. Leslie Munro in her letter of 2/19/01. Hayasaka/Niels
Yes-13 No-0 Abstain-1
Motion Pass

Community College Workload memo - this memo was written by HCC, KCC, and LCC Faculty. Linda Currivan and Mary Jane Dobson were present to answer questions. This resolution was written with the intent to be given to the Chancellor's office regarding the workload issue. It is to remind the Chancellor that she should address this issue.

-Concerns: -why should this issue be passed when faculty work overload?
-other CC's nationwide do not require Community Service and Professional Development as we do in Hawaii.
Motion to pass the memo.
Yes-13 No-0 Abstain-1
Motion passes

Division Chairs Meeting
-the question of the campus buying site licenses for software vs having individual divisions purchasing software was brought up. The advantage to having a site license, is that not only would you get the software for the college use, but for professional use at home.
-the Senate deferred taking any action due to lack of financial information available.

Elections/Meeting for the new Senate
-This will be on May 2 at 3 pm.
-a letter from the Secretary of the Senate to the new Senators and carryover Senators be sent. It should indicate that the Faculty Senate is seeking nominations for the next year's Senate by April 1. Elections will be held at the May meeting. The letter should also indicate that nominations from the floor will also be accepted at the May meeting.

Next meeting is April 4
Food and Drink - Frank Iha

That's what I got Jack. Let me know if I can help you decipher anything.

Candy-
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Kenneth P. Mortimer
President, University of Hawaii and
Chancellor, University of Hawaii at Mānoa

FROM: Dean O. Smith
Senior Vice President, University of Hawaii and
Executive Vice Chancellor, University of Hawaii at Mānoa

SUBJECT: Proposed Postponement of Revised UH-Mānoa General Education Requirements

This is in response to your request for comment and recommended action concerning the January 19, 2001 memorandum to you from the Council of UH Community College Chairs. Their memorandum addresses the new general education requirements at Mānoa, scheduled to become effective for students who enter the UH system in the fall 2001 semester and eventually obtain a Mānoa baccalaureate. The chairs contend that the Community Colleges have had insufficient time to modify their course offerings to prepare students for the new core, and they ask that you act to postpone the implementation date.

The chairs’ memorandum contains a summary account of events that is inaccurate in certain specifics. Most difficult to understand is their statement that the Community College campuses “...only recently (this week) became aware of UHM Faculty Senate ‘stopgap’ actions (10/18/00 and 12/6/00) that identify ‘old core’ courses....” In fact, copies of this important resolution of October 18, 2000, were distributed and discussed on October 20, 2000, at the Hilo meeting of the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC). The records of that meeting show that seven of the eight Community College chairs were at this meeting. In addition, the matter has been discussed almost monthly at ACCFSC meetings since November 1999, and all Senate reports and resolutions have been promptly posted on the Web.

Nevertheless, the chairs raise the point that the faculty governance committees needed to administer the new requirements at Mānoa are only now being appointed. These committees must act to provide the specifications for the Focus Graduation Requirements. Until that is done, neither Mānoa nor any other campus in the system can offer a course that satisfies these
graduation requirements. The Mānoa Faculty Senate is aware of this and is proceeding as rapidly as possible to address these questions.

Furthermore, there appears to be some misunderstanding over the focus requirements. They are graduation requirements specific to Mānoa, and like the current second language requirement or the current upper division portion of the Writing Intensive requirement, they need not be completed prior to a student’s transfer to Mānoa.

The faculty at Mānoa share with the faculty of the Community Colleges a commitment to make this transition to new general education requirements as smooth as possible. There are uncertainties over the Focus Graduation Requirements, and these apply equally to Mānoa students and to students intending to transfer. However, to delay the implementation of the new requirements is not an appropriate way to address the situation.

I recommend that you deny this request for a delay.

I am available at your convenience to discuss this matter further.

c: Regent McElrath
Regent Kim
BOR Secretary Iha
Vice President Sathre
ACCFSC Chairs:
Barry Baker, UHM-Faculty Senate
James Carpenter, UHM-CTAHR
Ross Christensen, UHM-Libraries
Michael Delucchi, UH-West O'ahu
Robert Fox, UHH Congress
Catherine Fulford, UHM-Education
Dianne Ishida, UHM-Nursing and Dental Hygiene
Laurence Jacobs, UHM-Business Administration
Karen Jolly, UHM-Arts and Sciences
David Lally, UHM-Medicine
David Miller, UHH-Arts and Sciences
Michael Shintaku, UHH-Agriculture
William Wilson, UHH-Ka Haka ʻUla O Keʻelikolani
Rosemarie Woodruff, UHM-Student Affairs
Criteria for courses that satisfy the written component of the
University of Hawai‘i General Education
Written Communication/Communication Skills/English Communications Requirement

The introductory writing course focuses on preparing students for writing they will do both as college
students and as citizens who make contributions to the larger public discourse. While in the introductory
writing course, students learn—through recursive writing processes, teacher and peer response, reading,
and research—to develop complex ideas in a variety of genres and for differing audiences. They synthesize
personal experience and knowledge with ideas they encounter as they read and discover as they write.
Instruction proceeds according to the assumptions, teaching practices, and learning goals described
below.

The writing requirements vary for the campuses throughout the system. On all campuses, students must
complete the written communication requirement during their first 24 credits or take appropriate
prerequisite courses. Course titles and descriptions vary but the course content conforms to the
guidelines below. All campuses also require writing-intensive (WI) courses to be completed in the
subsequent year(s); instruction in these courses follows a single set of UH System guidelines.

Written Communications/Communication Skills/English Communications Guidelines

Assumptions

Teachers and students work from the following assumptions, which are embodied differently in the
practices of different teachers.

- Writing is the work of individuals in communities, linking the past and present, the private and public.
  At the college level, communities are represented by academic disciplines, which use different kinds
  of writing to advance and codify their knowledge, to carry out their work, and to serve their members.

- Writing is intellectual work. Learning to write involves learning to develop complex ideas in various
  genres for various audiences.

- Writers integrate complex ideas from academic and serious public discourse with their own
  experiences and knowledge.

- Writing involves making decisions about audience, appropriate conventions, and language; students
  learn to make such decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions for their readers.

- Writing is both personal and social and adapts itself to individual contexts such as self-reflection and
  to social contexts such as collaborative projects.

- Writing is achieved through the processes of response and revision, in which peers and teacher give
  students reactions to their compositions; writers may use these responses for revision.

- Publishing or sharing writing deepens and improves student interest in writing.

Teaching Practices

Throughout the course, teachers

- Encourage students to think of themselves as writers who engage in reflection and self-assessment.

- Emphasize inventing, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading as recursive elements of writing
  processes.

- Help students understand the rhetorical concerns of writing situations, audience expectations, and
  appropriate writing strategies.

---

1 As of 4/28/00, approved courses include English 100 (all campuses), English as a Second
Language 100 (UHH, UHM prior to F00, KapCC, and LCC), English 101 (UHM), English Language
Institute 100 (UHM F00-present).
• Respond to student writing to facilitate revision at all stages of the writing process.
• Share with their students their own experiences as writers both in and out of academic settings.
• Provide opportunities for students to interact with one another and to work collaboratively.
• Communicate with students regarding progress, opinions, and questions using various forms such as journal responses and e-mail.
• Interact with students in conferences and in group and class discussions.
• Provide instruction in basic research activities.
• Help students find pleasure and satisfaction in the aesthetic, intellectual, and persuasive dimensions of writing, so they will understand writing's worth for their personal and professional lives in college and beyond.
• Follow the assessment practices described in the CCCC's "Writing Assessment: A Position Statement" (http://www.ncte.org/positions/assessment.html).

Learning Goals

As they complete the course, students

• Write well-reasoned compositions that reveal the complexity of the topic they have chosen to explore or argue.
• Read for main points, perspective, and purpose; evaluate the quality of evidence, negotiate conflicting positions, and analyze the effectiveness of a text's approach, in order to integrate that knowledge into their writing.
• Choose language, style, and organization appropriate to particular purposes and audiences.
• Synthesize previous experience and knowledge with the ideas and information they encounter as they read and discover as they write.
• Use sources such as libraries and the Internet to enhance their understanding of the ideas they explore or argue in their writing; analyze and evaluate their research for reliability, bias, and relevance.
• Use readers' responses as one source for revising writing.
• Use standard disciplinary conventions to integrate and document sources.
• Edit and proofread in the later stages of the writing process, especially when writing for public audiences. Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Basic Requirements

Students are expected to write a minimum of 5,000 words of finished prose. This total is generally divided into six to nine papers. As the guidelines suggest, the instructional emphasis is on the student's writing; assigned reading serves the purpose of the assigned writing.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Colleen Sathre

SUBJECT: Community Colleges' Tuition Recommendation

Attached you will find the Community Colleges' recommendation for the 2001-2002 to 2005-2006 tuition proposal to be submitted to the Board of Regents. We have included an analysis of issues we considered in making the recommendation.

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Michael T. Rota
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

c: Sr. VP/Chancellor Tsunoda
Vice Chancellor Unebasami
Provosts
Faculty Senate Chairs
UH Community Colleges
Tuition Proposal Recommendation

The UHCC portion of the Tuition Proposal was as follows:

**Undergraduates:** No UHCC tuition increases are proposed for the next two years. Beginning in 2003-04, resident tuition increases of $2 per credit are proposed. Beginning in 2001-02, Community College resident and nonresident students will pay for all credits for which they are registered. This will affect the 24% of UHCC students who enroll for more than 12 credits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Credit Rate</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>$242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summer Session:** Continue a Community College rate that is lower than that charged at the baccalaureate campuses, but increase it each year by amounts equal to the baccalaureate increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Credit Rate</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Apprentice and Journey Worker Charges:** Increase charges in increments of no less than five cents in order to minimize complexity in the fee collection process. An annual adjustment of 4% results in a five-cent increase in 2001-2002 and again in 2005-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:**

Following an analysis of the testimonies received at the various campus tuition hearings, it is recommended that we submit the tuition proposal in its current form to the Board of Regents for their approval. This means that approximately 75% of CC students will not have a tuition increase for the next two years, and that all students will pay the same total tuition when they complete the established degree requirements for identical degrees.

**Issues Considered in Making the Final Recommendation:**

The original proposal was designed to generate approximately $500,000 to $1,000,000 in additional revenue, while keeping the community college tuition as low as possible for the greatest number of students. This could only be accomplished by either increasing the tuition for all students by $2 per credit, by increasing the tuition for selected high-cost programs, or by eliminating the practice of providing a subsidy to those students who enrolled for more than 12 credits.

During a typical fall semester, about 76% of our students enroll in 12 or fewer credits. In addition, in that same term, enrolled students take courses that generate approximately 230,000 Student Semester Hours (SSH). Of these, only about 16,000 SSH (7%) are taken by students enrolling in more than 12 credits. Of those students who enroll in more than 12 credits, 40.6% are enrolled in 13 credits, 16.0% are enrolled for 14 credits, and 19.4% are enrolled for 15 credits (see Attachment 1 for a distribution analysis by campus).

There are a limited number of programs that require students to enroll for more than 12 credits during one or more semesters. These programs are detailed in Table 1. In fall 1999, Those students without either
financial aid, a tuition waiver, or a scholarship will be expected to pay an additional $43, 86$ or $129$ respectively per semester.

Of those students who enroll in more than 12 credits, only 309 are enrolled in programs that require them to do so. These include:

Table 1
Enrollment in Programs Requiring Students to Register for More Then 12 Credits by Campus and Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus/Program</th>
<th>Required Credits</th>
<th>Enrollment &gt;12 Credits</th>
<th>% w/Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haw CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACN</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO</td>
<td>14+</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARP</td>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSME</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kap CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kau CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSER</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETRON</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVPRO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSER</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mau CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(None)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>391</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our campuses recognize that this change in policy may have a significant impact on a small number of students who are needy, but don't qualify for financial aid, tuition waivers, scholarships, or HOPE tax credits. We are committed to address their individual situations through the use of partial tuition waivers.
# Students Enrolled for More Than 12 Credits by Campus

**Fall 1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Haw</th>
<th>Hon</th>
<th>Kap</th>
<th>Kau</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Mau</th>
<th>Win</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>6179</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: February 19, 2001

MEMO TO: University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly

COPIES TO: Community Colleges Faculty Senate Chairs

FROM: Leslie Munro, Ed.D., Professor-CC of English (Composition and Reading), Leadership Studies, Intercultural Communications, and Speech Language Arts Division, Leeward Community College

SUBJECT: CONCERNS ABOUT UNETHICAL AND INEQUITABLE PRACTICES RELATED TO TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEES

During the 1998-99 academic year and again during the 2000-01 academic year, I indicated to various members of the Community Colleges administration (the Chancellor and the provosts on campuses on which specific TPRCs were scheduled) that I no longer chose to participate in the tenure/promotion review process. I have serious reservations about the process and so feel that my participation might compromise any deliberations of such committees. Thus, for me to continue to participate would be, in my opinion, unethical, especially since recommendations made by these committees can influence decisions made about people’s jobs. I value my integrity and always attempt to hold myself to the highest ethical standards.

My intent was to make a private, personal, confidential, and ethical choice not to participate, making my decision only after much soul-searching and extended thought—and after approximately twenty years of willing participation. However, the administration has deemed my decision to be contrary to my professional obligations and has indicated that future nonparticipation would result in disciplinary action. As a result, I am compelled to advance my concerns as a public issue and ask for open discussion and evaluation of the process.

I have three specific concerns: (1) the selection of people to serve is inequitable; (2) the methods used for selection of TPRC committee members has been unethical; and (3) the lack of clear criteria for recommending or denying tenure and/or promotion results in inequitable application of the inadequate guidelines provided. Let me address each of these concerns separately, using primarily my own experiences to explicate my concerns.

Selection of TPRC Committee Members

In advising me of his position relative to my decision, Leeward Community College Interim Provost Mark Silliman in his memo of January 5, 2001, referenced Article XIV, “Faculty Personnel Panel,” of the 1995-1999 Agreement between the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents. Article XIV, Section B indicates that membership on the Faculty Personnel Panel includes “all tenured Faculty at Ranks 3, 4, and 5 at the Community
Colleges,” and Article XIV, Section D indicates that TPRC membership shall be comprised of those on the Faculty Personnel Panel.¹

Inequitable Selection of Participants.

Given the large number of people on the Faculty Personnel Panel and Interim Provost Silliman’s assertion that the language of the Agreement might be interpreted as requiring participation, then it follows that EVERY MEMBER of the Faculty Personnel Panel should participate equally. Yet I know of two people who have been at Leeward Community College as long as or longer than I who have never been asked to participate. Another person, who has been at Leeward Community College since 1980, has only recently been asked to participate. Others are rarely asked or asked only intermittently. At the same time, some people are asked to participate every year, and some are asked to participate in more than one TPRC per year. One of my colleagues is on three TPRCs this year while two colleagues who meet the same demographics were not asked to participate.

Considering the large number of faculty on the Faculty Personnel Panel and the average number of annual applications for tenure and/or promotion, equitable distribution of participation appointments would result in participation, at most, of three or four out of every five years. Never should anyone have to participate in more than one TPRC in any given year.

Unethical Methods of Selecting Participants.

In an open meeting, one provost told Leeward Community College faculty about the process for selecting faculty to participate in TPRCs. In essence, the person said, the provosts meet together and exchange people, sort of a grab bag approach. This catch-as-catch-can approach leads not only to the inequitable selection of participants, it also provides opportunity for “stacking” TPRCs. Three different provosts, one on each of three different campuses, have told me that I was especially selected for a particular TPRC because of anticipated problems. I question that I am any more qualified to deal with sensitive TPRCs than anyone else (the Agreement definition of membership gives every faculty member equal status). Indeed, the assumption of my special qualifications is an insult to my colleagues, who are perfectly capable of making objective recommendations based on the evidence given by applicants in their narratives and documentation.

Thus the question is raised: Are TPRCs stacked to influence either denial or award of tenure and/or promotion? Certainly the comments made to me indicate and the current method of assigning faculty to various TPRCs, inherently non-objective but rather specifically selective, leaves open the possibility of stacking TPRCs.

¹ As an aside, I should like to point out that neither Article XIV of the Agreement or the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Faculty Classification Plan, also referenced by Interim Provost Silliman, indicates that participation on a TPRC is a required duty. Indeed, the Classification Plan, although it does specify that faculty will do campus, system, and community service, also clearly indicates that it is expected that, over time, faculty choices for campus, system, and community service will change. Thus, after my having participated in the TPRC process for numerous years, it is not unreasonable for an individual to be able to choose to focus his or her energies elsewhere.
Inequitable Application of Classification Criteria

In addition to the printed criteria for tenure and/or promotion, apparently applicants are also judged on hidden criteria that appear to be somewhat capricious and that serve the administration but not the faculty. To illustrate, let me recall three specific cases.

Case #1: For instance, an English teacher may be denied tenure and/or promotion (and has been so denied) based on whether the person’s document is fully edited for correctness. Since every faculty member must be able to write course outlines, handouts, and other material for students as well as reports and documents for colleagues and administration, then the same standards of correctness should apply to every faculty member equally. If a specific level of correctness is to be applied to faculty from one discipline as opposed to others, then those criteria should be spelled out clearly in the guidelines.\(^2\)

But not even the printed criteria are applied equally.

Case #2: On one of my more recent TPRCs (and the one that convinced me that I could no longer in good conscience participate in this seriously flawed process), the committee had a difficult time coming to a decision. The applicant for tenure and promotion had many fine attributes, but the application was poorly presented. It was not clear how the person taught or how the person maintained academic standards (student evaluations commented more on how much “fun” the course was than on how much they learned or were challenged). Although the person did some excellent community service, campus service was virtually non-existent. Nor did the applicant present any evidence that campus service would be a priority for the future. The applicant’s Division Personnel Committee also seemed ambivalent about the applicant’s qualifications for tenure and promotion.

The TPRC provided a list of specific questions for the applicant to answer because the committee wanted to give the person every opportunity to show the person’s qualifications for tenure and promotion. The reply was, in essence, a dismissal of our questions because of the “lack of time” for providing the requested information.

In the end, the TPRC vote was split; I voted “no” because, under the criteria given in the Classification Plan, I could not determine the person’s teaching ability (our primary duty); nor could I anticipate that this person would be a contributing member of the campus. This person was tenured but has not become more involved on campus. Indeed, as a test, I have mentioned the person’s name to about 15 people representing various units on campus; not one person recognized the applicant’s name.

Contrast of Case #1 and Case #2: Thus, a person who contributes in a wide variety of ways to the campus, holds many leadership roles, serves the community in significant roles, and is an exemplary teacher—all fully documented—is denied promotion from Rank 3 to Rank 4 (although the person is performing at the level of Rank 5) because of an poorly edited document.

\(^2\) One of my colleagues who writes quite well has submitted promotion documents that contained errors and has been denied promotion based on that fact since no one questioned her teaching competence or her many contributions to the College and the System. She faced another problem in producing her documents: she is from a local culture that abhors self-promotion, so lauding her accomplishments in writing was particularly difficult for her, causing her to procrastinate in writing her narrative. In an era that touts diversity, the system needs to take into consideration such cultural taboos.
At the same time, a person who does not provide sufficient documentation and who has minimal involvement on the campus is given tenure and thus a license to continue to give minimum effort.

Nor does the administration feel that it is under any obligation to honor the TPRC recommendations. Many faculty members report administrative decisions for or against tenure and/or promotion directly contrary to unanimous recommendations by the TPRC, the Division Chair, and the Division Personnel Committee.

Case #3: One of my colleagues, who wrote a beautiful narrative and provided substantial documentation, was denied promotion several times despite unanimous recommendations by the Division Personnel Committee, the Division Chair, and the Tenure/Promotion Review Committee for promotion. What hidden but perhaps administratively self-serving criteria are being applied that have not been revealed to the faculty?

This inequitable application of the criteria in the Tenure and/or Promotion Guidelines and in the Classification Plan indicates that, in the final analysis, tenure and/or promotion are given to those applicants the administration wants to reward and denied those the administration chooses to punish. Forced faculty participation in this unethical process simply puts the faculty on the firing line in the event of grievances and protects an administration that is subverting the process for its own purposes.

Recommendations

1. That the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly conduct a survey to determine whether or not frequency of participation on TPRCs is equitably distributed among all faculty on the Faculty Personnel Panel. Such a survey might be conducted in partnership with the various Faculty Senates.

2. That the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly monitor the methods used by the Community Colleges administration to ensure equitable participation of faculty and ethical selection of TPRC participants.

3. That a system of rotating participation be instituted to give everyone equal opportunity and to prevent situations in which a faculty member participates in more than one TPRC in a year. To balance the work load for those in smaller disciplines, when the provosts decide on their annual recommendations to the Chancellor, the provosts can first provide participation opportunities for those who represent smaller disciplines in order to ensure that these people are not asked to participate more than those in larger disciplines.

4. That the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly work with the Community Colleges administration to ensure equitable application of criteria to all applicants for tenure and/or promotion.

5. That the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly advise faculty of whether the language of Article XIV of the 1995-1999 Agreement between the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents and of the "University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Faculty Classification Plan" requires that faculty participate in TPRCs.
RESOLUTION OF UH COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY TO SOLICIT UH COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR REDUCED WORKLOAD AND EXPANDED FACULTY DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

WHEREAS, University of Hawaii Community College Faculty carry workloads of fifteen credit hours per semester (or the equivalent) which was daunting even at the inception of UH Community Colleges, and;

WHEREAS, the dramatic modifications of tenure and promotion criteria that resulted from tenure/promotion policy changes in the late 1970's added significantly to faculty workloads by shifting away from a years and credits/degrees promotion basis to a teaching/college & community service/professional development/leadership assessment basis, and;

WHEREAS, class size modifications that resulted from the budget cuts of the early 1990's have boosted student enrollments in some classes by as much as 40% - dramatically increasing our instructional workloads, and;

WHEREAS, revolutionary technological changes (computers, e-mail, voice-mail, distance education, web-based research, multimedia) have placed heavy additional demands upon all of us (learning these new technologies, constantly updating and changing the curriculum, and integrating these innovations into our work lives), and;

WHEREAS, writing across the curriculum and writing intensive initiatives coupled with learning-focused education all require additional faculty effort and time, and;

WHEREAS, articulation and community focused efforts launched during the past thirty years require that we now spend considerable time coordinating our curriculum development activities with colleagues throughout the system, providing consultation and assistance to the community and businesses, forming educational partnerships, and developing educational training programs for new or changing occupations, and;

WHEREAS, given the national decline of public educational standards coupled with mandates to more effectively serve those with an array of physical and emotional disabilities, community college educators now deal with more needy and academically under prepared students during a period when remedial and developmental community college efforts have been reduced, and;

WHEREAS, programs like Service Learning and Student Internships that link our students to their communities and future careers have grown exponentially and require considerable additional faculty involvement with students and placement sites, and;

WHEREAS, the evolving emphasis on student retention, transfer, and job placement has caused faculty to become more involved in student orientation, advising, registration, and career preparation, all during a period of budget tightening when we have to do more with less, and;

WHEREAS, opportunities for renewal, maintenance of professional currency, and development of innovative skills and techniques have been dramatically curtailed by budget restrictions that have virtually eliminated one semester sabbatical leave opportunities;

THEREFORE, be it resolved by the faculty of the UH Community Colleges that:

We will actively seek and expect the prioritized, public support of our Chancellor, Provosts, Deans, and other Community College Administrators in a joint effort to modify UH Community College Faculty Workload requirements to shift from an increasingly archaic 20th Century workload model to one that accurately reflects the demands of the Information Age and the actual work performed by faculty, to expand faculty development funding, and to reinstitute single semester sabbatical leave opportunities.
DATE: February 19, 2001

MEMO TO: University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly

COPIES TO: Community Colleges Faculty Senate Chairs

FROM: Leslie Munro, Ed.D., Professor-CC of English (Composition and Reading), Leadership Studies, Intercultural Communications, and Speech Language Arts Division, Leeward Community College

SUBJECT: CONCERNS ABOUT UNETHICAL AND INEQUITABLE PRACTICES RELATED TO TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEES

During the 1998-99 academic year and again during the 2000-01 academic year, I indicated to various members of the Community Colleges administration (the Chancellor and the provosts on campuses on which specific TPRCs were scheduled) that I no longer chose to participate in the tenure/promotion review process. I have serious reservations about the process and so feel that my participation might compromise any deliberations of such committees. Thus, for me to continue to participate would be, in my opinion, unethical, especially since recommendations made by these committees can influence decisions made about people's jobs. I value my integrity and always attempt to hold myself to the highest ethical standards.

My intent was to make a private, personal, confidential, and ethical choice not to participate, making my decision only after much soul-searching and extended thought—and after approximately twenty years of willing participation. However, the administration has deemed my decision to be contrary to my professional obligations and has indicated that future nonparticipation would result in disciplinary action. As a result, I am compelled to advance my concerns as a public issue and ask for open discussion and evaluation of the process.

I have three specific concerns: (1) the selection of people to serve is inequitable; (2) the methods used for selection of TPRC committee members has been unethical; and (3) the lack of clear criteria for recommending or denying tenure and/or promotion results in inequitable application of the inadequate guidelines provided. Let me address each of these concerns separately, using primarily my own experiences to explicate my concerns.

Selection of TPRC Committee Members

In advising me of his position relative to my decision, Leeward Community College Interim Provost Mark Silliman in his memo of January 5, 2001, referenced Article XIV, "Faculty Personnel Panel," of the 1995-1999 Agreement between the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents. Article XIV, Section B indicates that membership on the Faculty Personnel Panel includes "all tenured Faculty at Ranks 3, 4, and 5 at the Community
Inequitable Selection of Participants.

Given the large number of people on the Faculty Personnel Panel and Interim Provost Silliman's assertion that the language of the Agreement might be interpreted as requiring participation, then it follows that EVERY MEMBER of the Faculty Personnel Panel should participate equally. Yet I know of two people who have been at Leeward Community College as long as or longer than I who have never been asked to participate. Another person, who has been at Leeward Community College since 1980, has only recently been asked to participate. Others are rarely asked or asked only intermittently. At the same time, some people are asked to participate every year, and some are asked to participate in more than one TPRC per year. One of my colleagues is on three TPRCs this year while two colleagues who meet the same demographics were not asked to participate.

Considering the large number of faculty on the Faculty Personnel Panel and the average number of annual applications for tenure and/or promotion, equitable distribution of participation appointments would result in participation, at most, of three or four out of every five years. Never should anyone have to participate in more than one TPRC in any given year.

Unethical Methods of Selecting Participants.

In an open meeting, one provost told Leeward Community College faculty about the process for selecting faculty to participate in TPRCs. In essence, the person said, the provosts meet together and exchange people, sort of a grab bag approach. This catch-as-catch-can approach leads not only to the inequitable selection of participants, it also provides opportunity for "stacking" TPRCs. Three different provosts, one on each of three different campuses, have told me that I was especially selected for a particular TPRC because of anticipated problems. I question that I am any more qualified to deal with sensitive TPRCs than anyone else (the Agreement definition of membership gives every faculty member equal status). Indeed, the assumption of my special qualifications is an insult to my colleagues, who are perfectly capable of making objective recommendations based on the evidence given by applicants in their narratives and documentation.

Thus the question is raised: Are TPRCs stacked to influence either denial or award of tenure and/or promotion? Certainly the comments made to me indicate and the current method of assigning faculty to various TPRCs, inherently non-objective but rather specifically selective, leaves open the possibility of stacking TPRCs.

---

As an aside, I should like to point out that neither Article XIV of the Agreement or the University of Hawaii Community Colleges Faculty Classification Plan, also referenced by Interim Provost Silliman, indicates that participation on a TPRC is a required duty. Indeed, the Classification Plan, although it does specify that faculty will do campus, system, and community service, also clearly indicates that it is expected that, over time, faculty choices for campus, system, and community service will change. Thus, after my having participated in the TPRC process for numerous years, it is not unreasonable for an individual to be able to choose to focus his or her energies elsewhere.
Inequitable Application of Classification Criteria

In addition to the printed criteria for tenure and/or promotion, apparently applicants are also judged on hidden criteria that appear to be somewhat capricious and that serve the administration but not the faculty. To illustrate, let me recall three specific cases.

Case #1: For instance, an English teacher may be denied tenure and/or promotion (and has been so denied) based on whether the person's document is fully edited for correctness. Since every faculty member must be able to write course outlines, handouts, and other material for students as well as reports and documents for colleagues and administration, then the same standards of correctness should apply to every faculty member equally. If a specific level of correctness is to be applied to faculty from one discipline as opposed to others, then those criteria should be spelled out clearly in the guidelines.2

But not even the printed criteria are applied equally.

Case #2: On one of my more recent TPRCs (and the one that convinced me that I could no longer in good conscience participate in this seriously flawed process), the committee had a difficult time coming to a decision. The applicant for tenure and promotion had many fine attributes, but the application was poorly presented. It was not clear how the person taught or how the person maintained academic standards (student evaluations commented more on how much “fun” the course was than on how much they learned or were challenged). Although the person did some excellent community service, campus service was virtually non-existent. Nor did the applicant present any evidence that campus service would be a priority for the future. The applicant’s Division Personnel Committee also seemed ambivalent about the applicant's qualifications for tenure and promotion.

The TPRC provided a list of specific questions for the applicant to answer because the committee wanted to give the person every opportunity to show the person’s qualifications for tenure and promotion. The reply was, in essence, a dismissal of our questions because of the “lack of time” for providing the requested information.

In the end, the TPRC vote was split; I voted “no” because, under the criteria given in the Classification Plan, I could not determine the person's teaching ability (our primary duty); nor could I anticipate that this person would be a contributing member of the campus. This person was tenured but has not become more involved on campus. Indeed, as a test, I have mentioned the person’s name to about 15 people representing various units on campus; not one person recognized the applicant’s name.

Contrast of Case #1 and Case #2: Thus, a person who contributes in a wide variety of ways to the campus, holds many leadership roles, serves the community in significant roles, and is an exemplary teacher—all fully documented—is denied promotion from Rank 3 to Rank 4 (although the person is performing at the level of Rank 5) because of an poorly edited document.

---

2 One of my colleagues who writes quite well has submitted promotion documents that contained errors and has been denied promotion based on that fact since no one questioned her teaching competence or her many contributions to the College and the System. She faced another problem in producing her documents: she is from a local culture that abhors self-promotion, so lauding her accomplishments in writing was particularly difficult for her, causing her to procrastinate in writing her narrative. In an era that touts diversity, the system needs to take into consideration such cultural taboos.
At the same time, a person who does not provide sufficient documentation and who has minimal involvement on the campus is given tenure and thus a license to continue to give minimum effort.

Nor does the administration feel that it is under any obligation to honor the TPRC recommendations. Many faculty members report administrative decisions for or against tenure and/or promotion directly contrary to unanimous recommendations by the TPRC, the Division Chair, and the Division Personnel Committee.

Case #3: One of my colleagues, who wrote a beautiful narrative and provided substantial documentation, was denied promotion several times despite unanimous recommendations by the Division Personnel Committee, the Division Chair, and the Tenure/Promotion Review Committee for promotion. What hidden but perhaps administratively self-serving criteria are being applied that have not been revealed to the faculty?

This inequitable application of the criteria in the Tenure and/or Promotion Guidelines and in the Classification Plan indicates that, in the final analysis, tenure and/or promotion are given to those applicants the administration wants to reward and denied those the administration chooses to punish. Forced faculty participation in this unethical process simply puts the faculty on the firing line in the event of grievances and protects an administration that is subverting the process for its own purposes.

Recommendations

1. That the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly conduct a survey to determine whether or not frequency of participation on TPRCs is equitably distributed among all faculty on the Faculty Personnel Panel. Such a survey might be conducted in partnership with the various Faculty Senates.

2. That the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly monitor the methods used by the Community Colleges administration to ensure equitable participation of faculty and ethical selection of TPRC participants.

3. That a system of rotating participation be instituted to give everyone equal opportunity and to prevent situations in which a faculty member participates in more than one TPRC in a year. To balance the work load for those in smaller disciplines, when the provosts decide on their annual recommendations to the Chancellor, the provosts can first provide participation opportunities for those who represent smaller disciplines in order to ensure that these people are not asked to participate more than those in larger disciplines.

4. That the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly work with the Community Colleges administration to ensure equitable application of criteria to all applicants for tenure and/or promotion.

5. That the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly advise faculty of whether the language of Article XIV of the 1995-1999 Agreement between the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly and the Board of Regents and of the "University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges Faculty Classification Plan" requires that faculty participate in TPRCs.