

## Committee on Administration & Budget

### Meeting Minutes

**Meeting Date** 30 March 2022  
**Meeting time** 3:00 PM - 4:30 PM

#### Attendance

#### Members

Name	Role	Attendance
<b>Healani</b> Chang	Member	Present
<b>Roy</b> Gal	Member	Present
<b>Erik</b> Guentner	Chair	Present
<b>Lilikala</b> Kame'eleihiwa	Member	Excused
<b>Robert</b> Paull	Vice-Chair	Present
<b>Ann</b> Sakaguchi	Member	Present
<b>Carolyn</b> Stephenson	Member	Present
<b>Alex</b> Stokes	Member	Present
<b>Mark</b> Thorne	Member	Excused
<b>Andrew</b> Wertheimer	Secretary	Present
<b>Christine</b> Sorensen Irvine	SEC Liaison	Present

#### Guests

Name	Role	Time
None		

Subject	Discussion/Information	Action / Strategy / Responsible Person
<b>Call to Order</b>		Call to Order at 3.05 p.m..
<b>Review of Minutes</b>	1. Review of 3 Mar. 2022 Minutes	<i>Approved by acclamation .</i>
<b>SEC Liaison Report</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change to travel advance policy withdrawn and committees being formed to discuss potential changes moving forward.</li> <li>2. Talked to the Provost about the reorganization process. Provost is interested in exploring the creation of a Senate task force to improve the reorganization process. SEC requested the liaison to discuss further with CAB ways to improve the process. SEC also discussed past practices of CAB.</li> <li>3. Testimony to BOR on 3/17 regarding EM appointments and referring to the two CAB resolutions..</li> <li>4. There will be another round of strategic investment competitions</li> <li>5. SEC discussed and decided that a reasonable time to post minutes is five days after approval of those minutes, as is current practice. There is no rule on posting of agendas.</li> <li>6. Nominees forwarded for the Summer General Education Institute II.</li> </ol>	

	<p>7. Plans are underway to restart 360 reviews of administrators. There may be a rotating schedule to ensure all EM's are reviewed on a regular basis. Not clear yet how many faculty will be asked to provide reviews.</p> <p>8. Discussed ways to improve processes in MFS to ensure issues move through the committees expeditiously.</p> <p>9. CEE asking for any updates on the governance document.</p> <p>10. Graduate Council: Master in School Counseling and Modification to add a track in Nursing Education &amp; Leadership to the Master in Nursing approved.</p>	
<b>ONGOING BUSINESS</b>	<p><b>1. CALL Reorg Proposal:</b> Erik completed a checklist for the <b>CALL Reorg</b> Proposal. We'd like to get this to the April MFS meeting with our decision. Erik wrote Arnade, and received requested information, such as the positive impact of the merger on workload. UHPA was asking the same questions, such as converting the Secretary II position to permanent and if the degrees will be approved. The answer was its degree approved, position proposed. CALL also sent requests for approval from GSO, ASUH and others.</p> <p><b>2. CEE Governing Documents</b> An adhoc CAB working group revised the most recent <b>CEE governing documents</b>. The changes were (1) punctuation, and (2) explanation of regular senate members (introduced last year's bylaws), and (3) an improved historical "whereas."</p>	<p><b>1. CALL Reorg Proposal:</b> Robert called for a vote to approve the Reorg. Andrew seconded. CAB voted unanimously in support. We will vote on the final checklist and a resolution (which Andrew will draft) at our next meeting so that MFS could vote on this at the April meeting.</p> <p><b>2. CEE Governing Documents:</b> Erik will email CEE and ask them to consider our request to appoint faculty senators as Chair and Vice Chair. He will bring their reply to our next faculty meeting.</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3. CSS SCI Reorg Proposal</b></p> <p>Erik summarized the <b>SCI CSS Reorg Proposal</b>. There are some small concerns and one major one, per our draft checklist. The major problem is that some areas have not yet been finalized in an MOU. Our fear is that MOUs should be agreed on before a proposal is implemented.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4. JABSOM Reorganization</b></p> <p>CAB previously produced a resolution with a list of problems and requested more documentation, but the response seems more obfuscatory than replies to specific questions. Alex worked with them to try to find out if they acted on our questions. The situation seems to be that the disputed issues are now operational. The question is how should CAB respond.</p> <p>There was discussion on the key difference between CAB's role as consulting rather than approving of reorganizations. Reflecting this, the consensus was to post a resolution that CAB does not approve of their actions due to the lack of their responses. There does not seem to be any value in our continuing consulting if JABSOM is not taking the exercise seriously.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5. General Education</b></p> <p>Discussed inviting Provost Bruno to get his understanding regarding our problems with the <b>general education requirements</b>. We could invite him to the final CAB meeting, if we agree to this. We will discuss this at the next meeting.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6. GEO/GEC Governing Documents</b></p> <p>Discussed briefly the GEC governing</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3. CSS SCI Reorg Proposal</b></p> <p>Erik will contact Dean Konan to solicit copies of the MOU and the UHPA consultation letter. We would at least like to see finalized drafts by the time of a CAB vote.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4. JABSOM reorganization</b></p> <p>An ad hoc group will write up a resolution for vote at our next meeting. The resolution will also include dates showing that it is JABSOM that has not been an appropriate partner in the consultation process.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5. General Education</b></p> <p>No actions/decisions</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6. GEO/GEC Governing Documents</b></p> <p>No actions/decisions</p>
--	--	--

	document. The problem is the amount of rewrites needed and the short amount of time possible. Might also invite the Chair and Vice Chair of GEC in order to address their questions since they will have to revise their documentation. No discussion on this beyond the comment on the above.	
<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>1. Responding to Criticism of CAB Responsiveness</b></p> <p>This was not a formal discussion item, but throughout the meeting, we discussed how we could respond to some perceptions that MFS and CAB is slowing down re-organizations, that are in some cases faculty driven. Informal discussion on this led to a few suggestions: 1) Admin. should do a better job of explaining the reorg processes and the role of MFS, better distributing the checklist and making it prominent on websites; 2) Our communication with faculty could be more informal to help them understand that we want faculty-led reorgs to succeed; 3) We need to think of better ways of communicating what we do and why; 4) Clearing up problematic proposals like JABSOM (where they are not responding to our requests for continued consultation) also would be a way of responding to this problem. It was suggested giving some thought to this topic in our final report at the end of the year after we address pressing issues.</p>	
<b>Guest(s)</b>		None.
<b>Committee Reports</b>		None.
<b>Other</b>		None.

<b>Adjournment</b>	The next meeting of the Committee on Administration & Budget Wednesday, 4/6/2022 at 3:00 p.m.	Meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.
--------------------	---	--------------------------------

*Respectfully submitted by Andrew Wertheimer Secretary*  
*Approved unanimously on 6 April 2022.*