Committee on Administration & Budget

Minutes

Meeting DateNov. 2, 2023Meeting time1:00PM - 2:00PMLocationVirtual meeting

Attendance

Members

Name	Role	Attendance
Dan Blackaby	Vice-Chair	Present
Roy Gal	Chair	<u>Present</u>
Albert Kim	Member	<u>Present</u> (1:30-)
Eugene Magnier	Member	Present
Laura O'Rourke	Member	<u>Present</u>
Robert Paull	Member	Present
Thomas Pearson	Member	Present
Sarita Rai	Member	<u>Present</u>
Mark Thorne	Member	<u>Present</u>
Andrew Wertheimer	Member	<u>Present</u>
Carolyn Stephenson	SEC Liaison	Present

Guests

1:45PM Thao Le (Chair, Department of Family and Consumer Sciences)

ubject	Discussion/Information	Action / Strategy / Responsible Person
Call to Order	Roy began the meeting at 1:00.	
Review of Minutes	Minutes from Oct. 5	Minutes approved by unanimous consent.
SEC Liaison Report	 Only one hour SEC meeting with few updates. Charter and Bylaws amendment poll went out. Very low response rate so far. Leadership retreat 10/30 attended by most chairs and reviewed regular slides. Discussed the meaning of shared governance and asked if faculty members understand what that means. 	Encourage our colleagues to vote on the Congress (meaning all faculty) on the bylaws. Carolyn should secure SEC to appoint a replacement member, ideally someone with CAB experience.
Ongoing Business	 Endorse/ Endorse with Reservations/ Oppose/ Returned without recommendation One difference now is that we have official records showing that the positions have been requested We unanimously voted to "endorse with reservations." We will update the checklist. We will try to have a proposal for the December meeting. The deadline to have this ready would be TBD 	1. ISR: We unanimously voted to Endorse with Reservations and will present this at the Dec, MFS meeting. Roy will notify April and Maken that we will bring this to the Dec meeting. Our ISR Subcommittee will compup with Resolutions and the checklist. We can also confer with Makena.
	The old checklist is <u>here</u> . We also need to make a resolution and can use previous resolutions from the shared drive.	 Roy, Sarita Andrew Gene Magnier

1. Reorganization of the Center on the Family

Questions from CoF Subcommittee Discussion with Guest Thao Le

Thao Le joined us with questions about the Reorg. We presented her with QUESTIONS:

1. Do you believe this Unit transfer has equal benefits for both CTAHR (FCS) and CSS (SSRI)? If not and CTAHR is the loser, how can this be addressed for instruction, research and extension needs by CTAHR in general, and FCS directly?

Not in terms of fairness or benefits. We've maintained this argument, but have not been heard. The benefits are mostly for CSS, with little to CTAHR or FCS. The 6 positions with instruction, only one or two I2 positions are not equal. This won't help CTAHR.

CTAHR Faculty Senate resolution in May called attention to the problem of losing areas of expertise and 6 positions (at least 1 I2, 1 I3, 2 S3s) and retain the space.

2. Do you see this move as having an adverse impact on FCS's instructional program and the creation of a graduate program by FCS?

Absolutely. We keep repeating this. Not only the number, but the breadth of the expertise.

3. What are the current research and extension collaborations between CoF, SSRI and CSS? The proposal does not indicate the type and number of current projects, other than graduate students. Will this merger

- 5. Roy Gal
- 6. Gene Magnier

then impact interactions with the College of Education?

I'm also not clear. CoF has some contracts.
One faculty may have connections with public health, but I don't know more about collaborations.

4. If CoF Faculty are 11-month faculty (Specialists, etc.) and most faculty in CSS are 9-month, should the two-month summer salary for CoF faculty be retained by CTAHR and CSS be required to fund this cost?

Yes.

- 5. Do you see this space transfer from CoF to CSS continuing poor space availability for FCS faculty and staff? Why is this space issue not being considered until after the proposal is approved?
- 6. Statements have been made that two non-tenure track I2 will be approved by the Provost, yet the proposal (2023 August 18) only mentions one non-tenure I2. Which is correct?

This is in the verbal offer, but not the written offer and this is small consolation.

7. If two non-tenure track I2 are approved by the Provost, who is required to fund these positions?

I imagine this would be the Provost. It would be problematic if CTAHR would be responsible for this.

Follow up questions:

1) In addition to loss of positions, expertise, space, but the role of the university service to the state, do you see any pros for supporting making this an acceptable proposal?

A: This came out of a town hall. We expressed concerns, but there was no response to concerns. We have been expressing the same concerns. CTAHR does food, families and if we can't do that we fail in our land grant mission. CSS does not have a track record of doing families. Why make it weaker for UHM to study this and help the state?

2) If CoF moves to CSS, how does this impact extension work by CTAHR?

Only offers 4 courses. They have many contracts with DOE, DOH, and program evaluations for early childhood education. They are good with data science and evaluation. It is key for extension.

3) Can you describe how CoF fits within FCS. How does it impact teaching and extension

They contribute 6 Ft specialists who do a lot of extension work. They are major advocates for community resiliency and support. They are not "extension agents" but do a lot through 4H and other groups.

We will hear from guests in support of the Reorg at our next meeting (Nov 20) then revisit our checklist and see how we vote on this.

Context from one CAB member:

The original proposal came from the President/ Provost Budget committee 2 or 3 years ago. A former CTAHR dean told the unit that they were not welcome in CTAHR. Since the proposal from the Provost's Committee was to move them to CSS. One of the members was a member of SSRI. There is an element of the proposal coming in from the CoF. The CoF had been poorly treated by the college.

Another member added a different perspective. The CoF wanted to go to another unit. We will find out more at the next meeting.

As a committee we have to examine all of these complicated questions.

2. GEC governance document

Subcommittee review of GEC documents. There was a failed plan two years ago to rewrite policies, which was resisted by GEC. They tried to revise these. Most aspects from the previous CAB subcommittee were addressed except:

Originally proposed GEC procedures violated MFS Rules. This is no longer an issue.

GEC wanted a 4-year term for non-senators. This was in contradiction with MFS term limits.

They modified the GEC director (as requested).

They did not change options for changing chair and Vice Chair to senators, as CAB had requested.

The main question is if we can allow them to select a chair and Vice Chair from all members, including non-senators and if they can have extended terms.

	We could require that either the Chair or Vice Chair be a MFS. We did not reach a conclusion. We should read these in more detail and hope we can resolve this at our next meeting.	
	 3. SCR201 Our Resolution was read aloud at the BOR meetings word for word and was taken for discussion. 4. By-laws 	
New Business	Suggested resolution(s) from Tom Pearson	
Guest(s)		
Committee Reports		
Other		
Adjournment	Adjourned at 2:12pm	

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Wertheimer, Secretary Approved unanimously on 20 NOV. 2023.