

January 29, 2009 DRAFT

To: Manoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee
University of Hawaii at Manoa

From: Susan Hippensteele, Chair
Committee on Academic Planning and Policy

RE: **Shared Governance**

The Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP) has been asked to respond to growing faculty concern over administrative decision-making at Manoa. Discussion among faculty appears to have crystallized around hiring of key academic leadership positions and attempts to reorganize academic units as a means of improving certain educational indices among students and improving the quality of academic programming within the Arts and Sciences (A&S) and School of Pacific Asian Studies (SPAS).

As a starting point for addressing expressed faculty concerns, CAPP references Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development (Chpt. 1, Sec. 10) (attached), Executive Policy E1.201 Faculty Involvement in Academic Policy (II, Sec. 1 and 8) , and Administrative Procedure A3.101 University of Hawaii Organizational and Functional Changes (attached). Read together, these documents outline expected practices that ensure shared governance in effective academic and organizational decision-making and function.

In sum, many among the faculty are concerned that the current administration has failed to comply with not only the spirit but the letter of principles of shared governance. To wit, search(es) for a permanent VCAA have appeared tainted as faculty calls for prompt resolution and transparency remain unmet, attempts to reorganize A&S and SPAS have failed to follow established BOR policy that would ensure meaningful consultation with faculty and other affected constituencies, and recent and pending strategic planning exercises for the campus are emerging as non-inclusive, top-down exercises that merely nod toward meaningful faculty and campus participation. In short, the faculty has observed multiple instances of decision-making by administrative fiat while ostensibly inclusive consultative and decision-making processes have been ongoing, through the Manoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The faculty has provided advice and recommendations to administration aimed at restoring true transparency of decision-making processes, yet transparent and effective decision-making at Manoa remains elusive.

Facts and Events in support of the faculty position are as follows:

1. VCAA Hire. The status of the position of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) is of crucial import to faculty. The VCAA serves as chief academic officer for the campus and is the administrative point person for communication on matters pertaining to academic policy and planning. The Manoa campus has been without stable leadership in the VCAA office for more than a year and a half. The impact of the institution's failure to hire a permanent replacement VCAA since 2007 has been felt throughout campus as functioning of the VCAA office has, at times, appeared to cease altogether, communication with other facets of the campus has been stalled, and engagement in academic policy and planning activities have become sporadic and at times ill-informed and unpredictable.

The 2007-2008 VCAA hiring process that ended in a "failed search" was followed immediately by an attempt by the Chancellor to usurp established hiring protocol and basic principles of transparency by appointing the co-chair of the VCAA search committee to the position. This action was of such concern to faculty that the Manoa Faculty Senate (Senate) was compelled to draft a Resolution demanding transparency for future hiring processes. But for loss of quorum, that Resolution would have been passed at the May 2008 meeting with overwhelming majority support of the Senate.

The subsequent decision to appoint, on an interim basis, one of the VCAA candidates short-listed during the "failed search" process while waiting five (5) months before reopening the VCAA position left Manoa floundering for academic administration leadership. Thus, faculty welcomed the Chancellor's call for nominations to the VCAA position in December 2008. Following this call, new qualified candidates were nominated but were not contacted by any entity related to the hiring process and so, their application materials have not been considered. Instead, a former candidate from the "failed search" who previously "withdrew" from active consideration was allowed to reactivate his application with supplementary materials (dated January 5, 2009) and was being brought to campus for an interview. It is of note that, to date, all four finalists for the VCAA position have been Caucasian. In sum, these developments leave the strong impression that the hiring process remains tainted, and that established policies and protocol for hiring are being usurped and may border on illegality.

A&S Reorganization. Administrative Policy A3.101 (Rev 3/08) establishes precise requirements for the reorganization of any unit(s) within the University. It outlines the vetting and approval process and proposal requirements that must be followed before any reorganization can be completed. Calls from faculty for the administration to comply with A3.101 have been completely ignored. Speculative debate on campus has been animated around issues of academic justification for the reorganization, goals and objectives, and costs and benefit. Had A3.101 been followed, these debates could have been substantive since the questions and concerns faculty raised would have necessarily been addressed in the required proposal. Absent a reorganization proposal that complies with A3.101, meaningful

consultation is not even an option. Moreover, a December memo from the Acting Chair of the A&S Senate Executive Committee (A&S SEC) informing administration that a faculty survey pertaining to the proposed “hybrid” model outlined in the Transition Team Report had been conducted, providing a link to data showing faculty overwhelmingly oppose the reorganization, and announcing a meeting of the full A&S Senate to discuss the matter in late January 2009, was immediately followed by an announcement from the Chancellor that the administration was pressing forward to complete the reorganization as quickly as possible. The day after the first informational meeting held by the A&S SEC and one week before a scheduled meeting of the entire A&S and SPAS faculty to vote on a pair of resolutions pertaining to the proposed reorganization, the Chancellor once again published a campus-wide memo reaffirming her plans to accept the “hybrid” model and move forward post haste with reorganization efforts. The timing of the Chancellor’s announcements provides further evidence that meaningful consultation with campus constituencies is not a priority and faculty concerns are being ignored.

3. Process Committee Report. A Process Committee formed to address the anticipated departure of a large portion of the faculty eligible for retirement was tasked, in mid Fall 2008, with developing a process for accommodating the impending budget shortfall. The subsequent report the Process Committee produced included a timeline that precludes meaningful consultation with affected constituencies, completely ignored established protocol for consultation with the Manoa Faculty Senate (MFS), and called for vertical rather than across-the-board cuts.

The MFS passed a Motion on January 21, calling for the necessary consultation, as well for expanding the review of programs to include all athletic and administrative units up to, and including, the Office of the Chancellor. The Motion further called for ongoing review and revision of the process and placed on the agenda for the February 18 meeting of the Faculty Congress a parallel Resolution that will be sent to the President and Board of Regents should the faculty be dissatisfied with the Chancellor’s response to the January 21 Motion. On January 22, the Chancellor published a memo to the campus asserting her support for the process and failing to acknowledge any existence of faculty concerns regarding lack of consultation.

The faculty is well aware of the need to trim the budget in anticipation of possibly deep budget cuts likely to affect the campus beginning with the next fiscal cycle, if not sooner. However, since it is not possible for vertical cuts to be imposed in such a short timeframe, faculty are unconvinced of the urgency for accepting the recommended process, or of the need to forego established protocol for consultation. Faculty should be actively involved in all decisions that will affect the academic integrity of Manoa, including those decisions that must be made quickly in order to address immediate budget restrictions, and will continue to resist efforts by the Chancellor and her administration to bypass meaningful consultation under these or any other circumstances.

4. Matters Affecting Academic Operations. As Manoa responds to state level fiscal exigency that could threaten overall operation of the campus, Manoa faculty are expressing growing concern that administrative decision making has not prioritized maintaining academic operations of the campus. A recent AAUP report suggests that colleges and universities must resist calls for downsizing and other cost-saving measures that will negatively impact academic operations since maintaining capacity will be key to an institution's ability to meet what is expected to be a growing demand for higher education over the next several years. Yet at Manoa, recent Green Days shut down entire buildings during a period when faculty and staff traditionally 'catch-up' on work they have been unable to complete during the semester. The Green Days for Manoa appears to have been a decision made without planning or forethought whereby staff were asked to use their annual leave on a voluntary basis, work from home, or relocate to other offices on campus if their original offices were in "green days closed buildings". There was no prior consultation with offices to determine what the impact of the imposed vacations and/or work options might be. How much money was actually saved?

The call by the Chancellor for an international strategic plan resulted in an effort by the Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for International and Exchange Programs (IAVCI EP) to create a task force by creating a list of names that were submitted to the Chancellor for appointment with no input from the Senate Executive Committee. The appointment of the IAVCI EP is, in and of itself, an example of the disregard the Chancellor has shown for process and faculty input, as it was met with broad opposition and viewed by faculty and others as a purely redundant appointment to accommodate system personnel at Manoa. The IAVCI EP is now asking units involved in international programming to present before this Chancellor appointed taskforce in a version of strategic planning that does not have Faculty Senate representation, fails to comply with established planning protocols, does not appear focused on existing academic priorities, and is in conflict with other ongoing processes. It is of note that the international programs themselves are not represented on the international strategic plan task force.

In sum, faculty are becoming increasingly concerned with Manoa leadership which has appeared unwilling or unable to engage in shared governance to help ensure faculty can meaningfully contribute to the future of the campus and continue to focus on the academic mission of Manoa.

Please feel free to contact me if you have questions or would like additional information regarding the content of CAPP discussions on this matter.

1. In order to implement the Regents Policy [E1.201] in the spirit with which it was adopted, each Chancellor and Provost shall seek the advice of the campus faculty organizations (CFO) early in the development of general academic policy and prior to recommending a new or revised academic policy to the President of the University. Within an allowable time and mutually agreed upon time frame, advice should also be obtained prior to the issuance of a new interpretation of a current major academic policy.

8. If at any time the CFO or the means by which CFO input is regularly secured becomes ineffective or if the spirit and letter of the Regents Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision Making and Academic Policy Development should appear to be inoperative, the CFO or the respective Unit or campus administration shall first attempt to resolve the problem at the campus, or Unit level. If resolution is not obtained, either party may request a review and evaluation. Such requests may be made directly to the President with a full disclosure of reasons for the request, and copies provided to the other party. A request for review, however, must deal only with the ineffectiveness of and/or non-conformance with this policy and shall not be utilized as an appeal for operational and transactional decisions.