September 16, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kenneth Hon
    Chair and Associate Professor, Geology Department

FROM: Stephen Hora
      Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
         Geology Department Program Review

Attached is the Memorandum of Understanding for the 2005 Program Review for the Geology Department.

Please review and sign the MOU and route it to other tenured and tenure-track faculty in your department. The MOU was written in the Spring 2005 semester and reflects the titles of faculty during that time.

Thank you for your assistance.

Attachment

C: Randy Hirokawa, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
   Don Hemmes, Natural Sciences Division Chair
Memorandum of Understanding  
2005 Program Review  
Geology Department  
College of Arts and Sciences  
May 5, 2005

Members of the Geology faculty, the Division Director of Natural Sciences, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences met with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on May 5, 2005, to review and discuss issues resulting from the Geology Department program review of Fall 2002-Spring 2003. The self-study report by the Geology Department (on file) and the report by the external reviewer (on file) were the basis for the discussion. Summary points and an action plan for the Geology Department follow:

Part I. Summary Points
The Geology faculty is a vibrant group of scholars and teachers who work cooperatively to attain the mission of the department. Communication among faculty is a strength of the department and enables cohesion and adaptation to change. Members actively support each other in their professional teaching and research efforts.

Facilities are a mix of strengths and weaknesses. For the most part facilities meet the needs of the department. One exception is the need for more computers either within classroom settings or within a laboratory dedicated for majors but possibly one that could be used by students in introductory classes as well. Students find access to computers too limited. This situation has been alleviated somewhat, but not completely, by the purchase of new computers through department budget allocations over the past two years.

The department is challenged constantly by improvements in technology which require subsequent changes in curricula to teach students not only geology content, but also technical skills. The balance between these two content areas is an ongoing point of discussion for faculty when reviewing course content within the department.

Clarity of the partnership role the department maintains with the Center for the Study of Active Volcanoes has eroded some since its founding. Clarifying of the relationship between the department and CVAC needs to be addressed in order to optimize student instruction and learning experiences.

Student assessment, i.e. tracking outcomes of students and incorporating these outcomes into departmental planning, is at a novice stage. No widely-used assessment of geological sciences exists currently since ETS quit offering its Major Field Test in geological sciences in 1995. Follow-up with Geology graduates has been sporadic. Faculty agree that this area is one that needs strengthening.

The department decided to become home for the Natural Science program in order to assure its continuation. Department faculty now advise the Natural Science majors, many of whom go on to teach in middle schools, junior high schools, and high schools upon
graduation. This group of students creates about 10% more students for the department to oversee.

The department faces the reality of low numbers of majors. Course offerings for Geology majors reflect these numbers by being offered mostly on an alternate year basis. This alternate year system causes problems for students trying to juggle other academic commitments around these courses so as to graduate on time. This situation is particularly vexing for transfer students.

Library offerings in geology are somewhat disappointing, with the major exception of GeoRef, an essential acquisition without which research in geology would be nearly impossible. Acquisition of other major journals would benefit the department’s research and research opportunities for students.

Problems that transfer students into geology have with interpretation of their past credits is not just a Geology Department problem, but rather a university problem and needs to be addressed at the university level, not just the department level.

Trips with students to the Mainland to visit geological areas of interest are an important part of the Department’s learning experiences. Effort needs to be invested to create a plan for funding these trips and supporting faculty to facilitate the learning.

Part II. Plan of Action/Recommendations
The Department needs to re-visit the partnership with the Center for the Study of Active Volcanoes collaboratively with its director. This collaboration has potential to increase visibility and the quality of scholarship within both the Department and the Center.

The Department needs to communicate with the Mookini Library the needs they and their students have for greater numbers of acquisitions in the area of geology. At the same time they need to reiterate the positive impact GeoRef has had on geological research at the university in order to insure its continuation.

The Department needs to recruit more majors, with a goal of 50 majors (about double the number currently) as an optimum number. Increased numbers can help address the issue of alternate year course offerings and lend more viability to requests for new positions. At the same time the department needs to analyze the impact of the new B.A. program in Geology on numbers of majors.

The Department must create a plan for the assessment of student outcomes, one that gives usable data helpful to Department review and planning.

The Department needs to investigate grants to help support Mainland trips over the summer to cover expenses of both students and faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jene Michaud, Chair and Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Anderson, Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Hon, Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Jolly, Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lundblad, Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hemmes, Natural Sciences Division Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Hirokawa, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>August 13, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hora, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum of Understanding
2003 Program Review
Geology Department
College of Arts and Sciences
Revised January 13, 2006

Two members of the Geology faculty met with the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Assistant to the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on January 13, 2006, to review a draft of the Memorandum of Understanding of May 5, 2005. A revised set of Summary Points and an Action Plan for the Geology Department follow.

Part I. Summary Points

1. The mission and goals of the Geology Department are appropriate. In addition, Geology has expanded its mission by agreeing to oversee the Natural Sciences program. In doing so, it has added to its mission support for secondary science education and professional workforce development. At the current time, the Geology Department is largely succeeding in meeting its mission and goals.

2. The Geology faculty is a vibrant group of scholars and teachers who work cooperatively to attain the mission of the department. Communication is a strong force for both cohesion and change in the department. Members actively support each other in their professional efforts.

3. Facilities for the most part have been meeting the needs of the department. One exception is the need for more computers either within classroom settings or within a dedicated laboratory for majors and possibly for students in introductory classes as well. Students find access to computers a bit limiting. This situation has been alleviated some by the recent purchase of new computers through department budget allocations.

4. The department is challenged by rapid improvements in technology which require subsequent changes in curricula to teach students not only geology content but also technical skills. The balance between these two is an ongoing point of conversation for faculty particularly when considering course content within the department.

5. Student assessment, i.e. tracking outcomes of students and incorporating these outcomes into departmental planning, is at an early stage. Since ETS quit offering its Major Field Test in geological sciences in 1995, no widely-used assessment of geological sciences exists. Follow-up with graduates happens but has been sporadic rather than a planned effort.
6. Clarity of the partnership role the department maintains with the Center for the Study of Active Volcanoes has changed since its founding.

7. The department decided to become home for the Natural Science program in order to assure its continuation. Department faculty now advise the Natural Science majors, many of whom go on to teach in middle schools, and high schools upon graduation.

8. The department acknowledges the reality of low numbers of majors. Course offerings for Geology majors reflect these numbers by being offered mostly on an alternate year basis. This alternate year system can be trying for students who juggle other academic commitments around these courses so as not to miss when they are offered. The department has created a B.A. program in geology which has helped with this issue because it is more flexible in its requirements for graduation.

9. Library offerings in geology have diminished over the past decade. Still among the library’s holdings, however, is GeoRef, an essential acquisition without which research in geology would be nearly impossible. Acquisition of other major journals would benefit the department’s research and the research opportunities for students.

10. The problems transfer students into geology have with interpretation of their past credits is not just a Geology Department problem, but rather a university problem and needs to be addressed at the university level.

Part II. Plan of Action

1. The Department will initiate discussions to clarify the collaborative partnership with the Center for the Study of Active Volcanoes. This collaboration has the potential to continue to be a vibrant one, a collaboration which increases visibility and the quality of scholarship within both the Center and the Department.

2. The Department will continue to communicate with the Mookini Library the needs they and their students have for greater numbers of acquisitions in the area of geology. At the same time they will reiterate the positive impact GeoRef has had on geological research at the university.

3. The Department will develop a plan to recruit more majors, with a goal of 50 as an optimum number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Hon</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. Anderson</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Jolly</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jene Michaud</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hemmes</td>
<td>Professor, Natural Sciences Division Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Hirokawa</td>
<td>Dean of College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hora, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>May 5, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum of Understanding
2003 Program Review
Geology Department
College of Arts and Sciences
Revised January 13, 2006

Two members of the Geology faculty met with the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Assistant to the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on January 13, 2006, to review a draft of the Memorandum of Understanding of May 5, 2005 revised set of Summary Points and an Action Plan for the Geology Department follow.

Part I. Summary Points

1. The mission and goals of the Geology Department are appropriate. In addition, Geology has expanded its mission by agreeing to oversee the Natural Sciences program. In doing so, it has added to its mission support for secondary science education and professional workforce development. At the current time, the Geology Department is largely succeeding in meeting its mission and goals.

2. The Geology faculty is a vibrant group of scholars and teachers who work cooperatively to attain the mission of the department. Communication is a strong force for both cohesion and change in the department. Members actively support each other in their professional efforts.

3. Facilities for the most part have been meeting the needs of the department. One exception is the need for more computers either within classroom settings or within a dedicated laboratory for majors and possibly for students in introductory classes as well. Students find access to computers a bit limiting. This situation has been alleviated some by the recent purchase of new computers through department budget allocations.

4. The department is challenged by rapid improvements in technology which require subsequent changes in curricula to teach students not only geology content but also technical skills. The balance between these two is an ongoing point of conversation for faculty particularly when considering course content within the department.

5. Student assessment, i.e. tracking outcomes of students and incorporating these outcomes into departmental planning, is at an early stage. Since ETS quit offering its Major Field Test in geological sciences in 1995, no widely-used assessment of geological sciences exists. Follow-up with graduates happens but has been sporadic rather than a planned effort.
6. Clarity of the partnership role the department maintains with the Center for the Study of Active Volcanoes has changed since its founding. 

7. The department decided to become home for the Natural Science program in order to assure its continuation. Department faculty now advise the Natural Science majors, many of whom go on to teach in middle schools, and high schools upon graduation. 

8. The department acknowledges the reality of low numbers of majors. Course offerings for Geology majors reflect these numbers by being offered mostly on an alternate year basis. This alternate year system can be trying for students who juggle other academic commitments around these courses so as not to miss when they are offered. The department has created a B.A. program in geology which has helped with this issue because it is more flexible in its requirements for graduation. 

9. Library offerings in geology have diminished over the past decade. Still among the library's holdings, however, is GeoRef, an essential acquisition without which research in geology would be nearly impossible. Acquisition of other major journals would benefit the department's research and the research opportunities for students. 

10. The problems transfer students into geology have with interpretation of their past credits is not just a Geology Department problem, but rather a university problem and needs to be addressed at the university level. 

Part II. Plan of Action 

1. The Department will initiate discussions to clarify the collaborative partnership with the Center for the Study of Active Volcanoes. This collaboration has the potential to continue to be a vibrant one, a collaboration which increases visibility and the quality of scholarship within both the Center and the Department. 

2. The Department will continue to communicate with the Mookini Library the needs they and their students have for greater numbers of acquisitions in the area of geology. At the same time they will reiterate the positive impact GeoRef has had on geological research at the university. 

3. The Department will develop a plan to recruit more majors, with a goal of 50 as an optimum number.
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Aloha, Ken. Generally speaking, the procedure is for you to circulate the SIGNED copy of the MOU to the department. Doris sends you the copy that has been signed by Steve before any other signatures are obtained. I thought that we had agreed on the wording changes in our second MOU meeting, but I guess I misunderstood that. Having explained that, though, I think that the changes you and Jene made are not substantial enough to change the spirit of the document, so I will recommend to Steve that he go ahead and sign it if he was comfortable with the revised version I sent him.

I don't think we should change this document any more than it is already, but just for future reference, middle schools and junior high schools are not the same thing. In Hawaii we have both, as most states do. That is why I included both of them. Not a big deal, though. We'll just keep it the way it has been changed.

Once the faculty and Don Hemmes have signed this MOU, you route this document through DORIS CHANG, Steve's secretary. She will send it to Randy for signature. She keeps track of the comings and goings of all the program reviews, so do not send it to me. She will keep the final copy and archive it in the Library and on the web site. She also will notify April Komenaka of its completion, since April is coordinating assessment for the college.

Hope this information helps. Thanks for all your work on this. And thank Jene, too. Mahalo. Ann

--- Original Message ----

To: Ann Miser ; Doris Chang
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2006 10:25 AM
Subject: Re: Geology MOU

Aloha Ann,

Jene and I sat down and made a few minor wording changes to the MOU. I'm sending you two word copies. The one that ends with Printed, is the printed version that incorporates all of our editing changes. I'm getting signatures on the signature page and will send this to you. The second document that ends in revisions still has all the changes in red from the track changes tool. The only substantial change is at the end of paragraph 1 where we added a line about whether we were or weren't meeting our goals (at the time of the review).

The mission and goals of the Geology Department are appropriate. In addition, Geology has expanded its mission by agreeing to oversee the Natural Sciences program. In doing so, it has added to its mission support for secondary science education and professional workforce development. At the current time, the Geology Department is largely succeeding in meeting it's mission and goals.

I will send the signed copy in the mail. If you need to make any more changes, we can just replace the current copy with the new version. One last question: How should I route this after I get the Dept. signatures and the Division chair? Do you want me to send it to Randy or to you for the last two signatures?

Aloha,
Aloha, Doris and Ken. After receiving a question from Doris about the Geology MOU, I researched it. It looks like I sent a revised copy to someone, but I am not sure if I sent it to Ken or to Steve. So, here is the revised Geology MOU from our January, 2006 meeting. I don't know where the previous one I sent is residing, so thought I would clean this up a bit, re-send it, have Steve sign it, and have Ken get signatures right away so he can return it to Steve. Hope this helps in getting the "missing" document resolved before the end of this semester. Ann
Ken Hon, 10:25 AM 4/25/2006 -1000, Re: Geology MOU

Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 10:25:22 -1000
From: Ken Hon <kenhon@hawaii.edu>
Subject: Re: Geology MOU
To: Ann Miser <annmiser@hawaii.edu>, Doris Chang <dorischa@hawaii.edu>
X-**ailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2900.2869
X . MX-Version: 5.1.2.240295, Antispam-Engine: 2.3.0.1,
Antispam-Data: 2006.4.25.130605
X-Perlmx-Spam: Gauge=IIIIIII, Probability=7%, Report='__C230066_P5 0, __CT 0,
__CTYPE_HAS_BOUNDARY 0, __CTYPE_MULTIPART 0, __HAS_MSGID 0,
__HAS_MSMAIL_PRI 0, __HAS_X_MAILER 0, __HAS_X_PRIORITY 0, __MIME_HTML 0,
__MIME_VERSION 0, __SANE_MSGID 0, __TAG_EXISTS_HTML 0'

Aloha Ann,

Jene and I sat down and made a few minor wording changes to the MOU. I'm sending you two word copies. The one that ends with Printed, is the printed version that incorporates all of our editing changes. I'm getting signatures on the signature page and will send this to you. The second document that ends in revisions still has all the changes in red from the track changes tool. The only substantial change is at the end of paragraph 1 where we added a line about whether we were or weren't meeting our goals (at the time of the review).

The mission and goals of the Geology Department are appropriate. In addition, Geology has expanded its mission by agreeing to oversee the Natural Sciences program. In doing so, it has added to its mission support for secondary science education and professional workforce development. At the current time, the Geology Department is largely succeeding in meeting its mission and goals.

I will send the signed copy in the mail. If you need to make any more changes, we can just replace the current copy with the new version. One last question: How should I route this after I get the Dept. signatures and the Division chair? Do you want me to send it to Randy or to you for the last two signatures?

Alona,

Ken

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Ann Miser
To: Doris Chang
Cc: Ken Hon
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 10:56 AM
Subject: Geology MOU

Aloha, Doris and Ken. After receiving a question from Doris about the Geology MOU, I researched it. It looks like I sent a revised copy to someone, but I am not sure if I sent it to Ken or to Steve. So, here is the revised Geology MOU from our January, 2006 meeting. I don't know where the previous one I sent is residing, so thought I would clean this up a bit, re-send it, have Steve sign it, and have Ken get signatures right away so he can return it to Steve. Hope this helps in getting the "missing" document resolved before the end of this semester. Ann

Ann B. Miser, Ed.D.
Academic Assistant to Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs
University of Hawaii at Hilo
200 W. Kawili Street
Hilo, HI 96720
808-974-7707
annmiser@hawaii.edu
Revised Geology MOU Jan06 April06 revisions.doc

Revised Geology MOU Jan06 April06 revisions Printed.doc
Subject: Re: Geology MOU
To: Doris Chang <dorisch@hawaii.edu>

Hooray #2!!!!!!!!!!! I am still working on the Art MOU. I am going to have to call Wayne to answer some questions. Will let you know when I know more. Ann

-- Original Message ----- From: "Doris Chang" <dorisch@hawaii.edu>
To: "Ann Miser" <annmiser@hawaii.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 28, 2006 8:46 AM
Subject: Re: Geology MOU

Ann,

I got the signed Geology MOU. It still needs Randy’s and Steve’s signature. Hooray!!!

Doris

At 08:06 AM 4/27/2006 -1000, you wrote:
Yes. They are not significant. I talked to Ken Hon again yesterday. He was not clear about the process and was very apologetic. I told him no big deal. I will just put Ken’s new MOU into my file and call it done. Yeal!!! As for Art, I have printed out Wayne’s changes, but have not had time to check them against the original. My plan is to do it today or tomorrow. Thanks for keeping track of all of this, Doris. Ann P.S. I hate to ask, but any word on Hawaiian Lang MOU????????????????????????

----- Original Message ----- From: "Doris Chang" <dorisch@hawaii.edu>
To: "Ann Miser" <annmiser@hawaii.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 7:11 PM
Subject: Re: Geology MOU

Ann,

Shall I have Steve read and sign the proposed changes to the MOU?

Doris