

Committee on Administration & Budget

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date 4 May 2022
Meeting time 3:00 PM - 4:30 PM
Location

Attendance

Members

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

Guests

Name	Role	Time
Scott Rowland	GEC Vice Chair	3:15

Subject	Discussion/Information	Action / Strategy / Responsible Person
Call to Order		Call to Order at 3.03 p.m..
Review of Minutes	1. Review of <u>27 April 2022 Minutes</u>	Approved by acclamation.
SEC Liaison Report	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invited Shannon Oshiro to the ad hoc committee on reorganization with Kat Tagaca as the alternate. 2. Reviewed SEC election results (59% of Senators voted) 3. Referred Graduate Council nominees to CFS. 4. Approved MFS agenda. 	
ONGOING BUSINESS	<p>1. SCI/CSS Reorganization : Resolution and Checklist</p> <p>Andrew gave an update about the state of the MOUs and other information from the CSI Design Team. The dean has offered to cover funds for signs and business cards. There was no update on the signing of the MOUs or on compliance with UHPA expectations of stipends and other benefits to encourage service and retention of Program Chairs.</p> <p>Robert moved, Ann seconded a vote for the Resolution to Endorse with Reservations. Passed unanimously.</p> <p>2. GEO/GEC Governing Documents</p> <p><i>GEC Vice Chair Scott Rowland joined CAB in a discussion over their concerns.</i></p> <p>Chair Guetner reviewed some of the concerns regarding the GEO/GEC</p>	<p>1. <u>Resolution to Support with Reservations the Reorganization that would create the School of Communication and Information (SCI) within the College of Social Sciences (CSS)</u> approved unanimously. Erik will forward it to John Kinder and Brent Sipes.</p>

governing documents. These will be arranged around a few key areas:

Issues that seem to be in conflict with the Bylaws:

(CAB asks that in the future, items should be clearly numbered, so as to better facilitate discussion).

Summary bullet (6) (in the bulleted list on p.14, unnumbered) **is not in alignment with MFS bylaws regarding the service period**, as one could be a Senator for 2 years, whereas GEC members, according to this, serve for four years. This is not problematic as long as their service continues beyond MFS service.

MFS cannot understand why GEC should be exempted on the basis of the problem of lack of historical experience, as this is common for most MFS committees.

There is some confusion as to whether the bylaws' duration apply for both MFS and non-MFS members. **CAB believes the bylaws should differentiate between the MFS appointees and others.** Rowland agreed this is a valid point that should be addressed.

Rowland explained that there is a year-long learning curve to be useful to the committee. The plan to keep people on for 3 or 4 years is to preserve this institutional memory. Recently a GEC Chair was someone who had no experience on GEC. That can make it hard for GEC to operate.

It should be made clear on **summary bullet (2)** that MFS bylaws are primary rather than suggesting that GEC can operate instead by its own governing document. Rowland will have it rewritten since it is not their intent to supplement MFS Bylaws.

While not in conflict with the bylaws, CAB is troubled by the following:

(Bullet point .4) **Director as ex officio** was also troubling as GEO Director is an appointed officer. This makes them an administrator. This parallels the issue with the CEE where the assessment coordinator is *ex officio* on CEE. Rowland defended this, but then said that it could be revised.

(.5) GEC Chair and Vice Chair as elected by committee rather than MFS appointment. CAB is troubled by this as MFS committees should be governed by MFS senators. Another committee was grandfathered into their old practice, but CAB does not believe this should be a working model for GEC.

(.1)The **Org Chart is confusing** and is not clear why the GEO is in this document for a MFS committee. Rowland agreed that the VCAA (which should be renamed) and dash to GEC should be removed in a MFS Committee as there is no authority. We understand that GEC is involved in the GEO Search and evaluation of the GEO Director. This should be a communication line rather than a reporting one.

This is not clear in the document and the org chart.

The GEC is not a “standing committee,” but is a “continuing committee.” This should be revised to match the updated MFS language.

There was debate among CAB members as to how to advise GEC on how they can work as a MFS continuing committee with the two MFS appointed senators, especially if the appointed senators do not have experience with General Education. We may have to come back to this issue.

Rowland asked that CAB should generate a written report on GEC Governance Documents, and the GEC will take these comments to the Provost who will then reply to GEC, and will then go to the full MFS.

CAB asked why the provost has a role in this. Rowland agreed that he did not understand why the Provost has a role on this MFS issue.

Regarding the Provost, Rowland reported that per SEC, the Provost wants to look at this. Our own SEC liaison however explained that she was unaware of the need for the Provost to review the GEC documents. The Provost wants to review the governance structure over the GEO, but not the GEC.

CAB also did not agree to provide a formal report on the points, but welcomed continued discussion.

On a related note, the document has a signature line for someone from the Provost's office. That is not required for an MFS Committee. Also, board chairs also should not be part of the MOU.

Chair Guetner looked at the MFS Bylaws and suggested that an alternative might be to ask for more than two MFS representatives to GEC so that there is more possibility that a senator would be qualified and interested in being GEC Chair or Vice Chair. However, others pointed out that it is often difficult to secure even two MFS members given the required expertise and time required for this service, especially as senators select their service role.

CAB was also concerned with several internal issues in the GEC governing documents.

	<p>Delegation is common in MFS committees, but we don't see why GEC delegates voting authority to subcommittees / boards.</p> <p>Rowland explained that this is because boards have expertise in specific topics like how the HAP Board reviews relevant proposals. The exception is when a course has more than two designations. In those cases the entire GEC makes a final decision. Boards do consult with the GEC when there are questions or internal conflicts as well as working with the internal proposing chair/faculty.</p> <p>Chair Guetner asked if there is an appeal procedure with GEC that goes above the Board? Rowland did not know of such an appeal procedure.</p> <p>There also was some discussion as to the actual qualifications of the boards. In the past the GEC finalized decisions and this became a de facto appeal procedure. It also was a faculty decision.</p> <p>Rowland agreed to take CAB comments back to GEC. A member asked why GEC no longer has GEC supervision over Board decisions. CAB added that it makes sense for multiple people to review any proposal.</p> <p>CAB is concerned that MFS committees do not have the authority to delegate decisions.</p> <p>CAB does not intend to have a full list of issues, and looks forward to discussing this with GEC. Rowland said they can't act until CAB issues a formal response.</p> <p>3. Reorganization review procedures.</p> <p>CAB briefly discussed some suggestions, including some raised on our 30 March meeting, including:</p>	<p>3. Chair Guetner and Robert Paull will serve on a committee with the Provost to improve reorganization review procedures</p>
--	--	---

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>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;</p> <p>2) On one hand, our communication with faculty could be more informal at an early stage to help faculty in units understand that we want faculty-led reorgs to succeed;</p> <p>3) We need to think of better ways of communicating what we do and why. Perhaps we could have a YouTube video explaining the work on our end, why we do it, and how long it can take. This should help to make it a more collegial review, as it is intended;</p> <p>4) Both sides need to do a better job of clearing up problematic proposals in which the relevant proposing administrators are not responding to our requests for continued consultation (JABSOM, for example).</p> <p>5) We should get informal input earlier in the process which could be helpful to units.</p> <p>6) Another problem is the lack of documentation of consultation with faculty. There could be an FAQ or form to guide this, and to encourage communication with CAB before review.</p> <p>7) Proposing units should be given a more reasonable timeline by deans and the provost for having a proposal successfully reviewed by CAB and MFS. Some units have been giving an incredibly tight timeline and start counting once they submit documents to their dean. They need to understand that the timeline agreed with the Provost begins only when CAB receives the set and assumes that all documentation is received and the reorg is a simple one.</p> | |
|---|--|

8) UHPA writes very formal reviews, and CAB may consider something similar.

9) Once formal consultation begins, it would be helpful if units with reorganization proposals could adopt some best practices, such as

- a) All documents should be dated and have page numbers, numbered bullet items and the like. This makes it much easier to discuss specific points.
- b) Proposers should treat comments as they would peer review article resubmissions with a brief note demonstrating how they are responding to specific CAB points. For example, in response to CAB question 5, please see the document dated 5/11/21, p. 3, section 7 where we XXX.).
- c) CAB should have specific points of contact from the proposing units. Sometimes we have multiple people sending different undated and inconsistent documents. This makes it very confusing and hard to follow-up on when CAB is reviewing multiple proposals.

CAB members are invited to email Erik and Robert their suggestions.

It was suggested giving some thought to this topic in our final report at the end of the year after we address pressing issues, as it would be good if CAB could be proactive on dealing with issues like budget rather than being completely occupied by reviewing reorganization proposals.

Chair Guetner thanked CAB members for their service during this very complex

	year. CAB members praised Erik and everyone for a job well done.	
New Business	1.	None.
Guest(s)		None.
Committee Reports		None.
Other		None.
Adjournment	Final Meeting	Meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Wertheimer Secretary
Approved unanimously on 7 October 2022.