**COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND BUDGET**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Date:** 13 April 2017

**Location:** St. John 104

**Attendance:** [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused; L=late]

| **MEMBERS** | | **MEMBERS** | | **MEMBERS** | | **VISITORS** | **TIME** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Brian Glazer (BG), Chair | P | Ann Sakaguchi (AS) | P | Garrett Apuzen-Ito (GI), Secretary | P | John Casken and Hector Valenzuela | 2:45 |
| Adrian Franke (AF) | P | Kara Miller (KM) | E | Douglas Vincent (DV) | P |  |  |
| Ruth Hsu (RH) | P | Robert Paull (RP) | P | Sarita Rai (SR)--SEC Liason | P |  |  |
| Judith Inazu (JI) | P | Hyoung-June Park (HP) | E | Robert Cooney, (RC) | P |  |  |

| **SUBJECT** | **DISCUSSION / INFORMATION** | **ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CALL TO ORDER** | 2:04 |  |
| **APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES** | Minutes for 4/5/17 approved (vote: 9 for, 1 abstention) |  |
| **Announcements**  **Suggested revisions to the MFS By Laws, draft circulated by DV**  **Hector Valenzuela (HV)**  **John Caskins (JC)**  **CPM around 2:45 pm** | BG refers us to an email exchange where CPM members request information on the motion of no confidence for the former SEC chair. The questions sent to CAB by Hector Valenzuela who is on CPM are as follows:   * *Timeline of events. When did this first become an issue (problems with SEC Chair management style), and discussed within CAB and other FS committees?* * *Where there any early or ongoing efforts at mediation, and where they communicated with the SEC and with the FS?* * *Do you have copies of recent CAB meeting minutes for Jan. 3rd, Feb. 17, March 9 and 15th (2017).*      * *Do you have additional background information to support the cases or specific items/bullet-points raised in the Motion for a Vote of no Confidence that CAB moved forward at the March 15th FS meeting?*   The chair of CPM, the vice-chair, John Casken (SEC liason to CPM) and Hector Valenzuela (CPM member) were invited to the CAB meeting.  M. Bruno is enthusiastic about meeting with CAB again before the end of the semester to discuss academic re-orgs.  DV suggested changes to the Bylaws to primarily address readability; they did not incorporate suggestions sent to CAB by the SEC that CAB voted to not include. Per the bylaws, the proposed amendments will be presented for a first reading to the Senate this Spring semester, the second reading and vote would occur at the first Senate meeting in Fall 2017 and Congress would vote electronically after presentation at the Congress in Fall 2017.  RP Section V Duties, (4). Need to state the appointment of members to both permanent committees and standing committees. Article IV. Section 2(b) Do you want to change “duties” to “charge” when describing ad hoc committees? Section 3 specify “permanent” next to “Committee”. Need we a minimum number of votes to be elected? SR need at least one. RC We need to clarify language of how to fill unexpected vacancies on the SEC and Senate. This pertains to Article VI, Sections 2a and 2d. CFS has made the recommendation that the vacated position should be filled by an individual from the most recent election. RC interpreted the bylaws should come from the election that filled the vacant seat, but recognizes that the list may contain individuals that may no longer be senators. JI agrees with this view. Discussion was presented about the advantages of CFS’s recommendation and there was consensus on the CFS recommendations. RC What about when a vacancy occurs over the summer before the new SEC begins serving, i.e. September 1 (Section 2d)? CFS recommends that if an SEC resigns in the last three months of his/her term, the vacancy shall remain unfilled. CAB agrees.  BG other recommendations by CFS (quoting text from their email)  “3. *If an SEC alternate is offered the opportunity to serve a remaining term on the SEC, but refuses to serve, the alternate is permanently removed from the list.*” (and thus will not be considered if future vacancies occur). ← We disagree with this change  “4. *Outgoing senators in their 2nd consecutive term are not eligible to serve on the SEC”*. We disagree.  “*5. To be eligible to fill a vacancy on the SEC that person must be a senator.*” ←We agree.  “*6. For further clarity, the CFS recommends that vacancies in the MFS should be filled by procedures different from those used to fill SEC vacancies and proposes the following order for identifying an alternate MFS senator: (1) current election list; (2) previous year’s election list; (3) appointment by the constituency’s senate, if available; and (4) special election. Note: Option 2 requires that lists of MFS alternates be kept at least for two years. Justification: There is an urgent need to appoint alternate senators from an election list to fill vacancies on standing committees and options 3 and 4 would be more lengthy procedures.”*  ←We disagree  “*7. It should be included in the Bylaws that elections for senators who serve a 2-year term are held annually even though not all constituents have vacant seats to be filled.*” ←We disagree  RC MAC has decided to change their name to Committee on Education Effectiveness (CEE), and that will be coming to CAB for review.  DV Article III. Section 3c was changed to indicate that standing committee meeting minutes will be posted on the MFS website (not the library as it formerly was recorded).  AS What do you think about having a formal confirmation of the newly elected SEC at the beginning of the year? DV as prior member of the SEC he would be against this, because there’s quite a bit of work to be done over the summer; and so it would not be desirable for their active service to be in limbo over the summer. RC the SEC must report on their summer activities.  RH What qualifications are required to serve on the SEC? DV and SR willingness to serve, knowledge, good organizational skills, and leadership. RH should selection of SEC officers consider the number of votes they received when first elected to the SEC? RC the SEC gets to know each other well and in practice can make wise decisions of who should be the officers.  **Vote to incorporate suggested changes to the By Laws and forward to the Senate for consideration** **(1st reading this Spring)**. 10 for, 0 abstentions, 0 against.  Hector Valenzuela (HV): CPM was surprised at the motion of no-confidence in the SEC chair on the March 15 Senate meeting. CPM is interested in knowing about the timeline, processes and procedures that took place leading up to CAB’s motion, based on allegations. He is interested in promoting civil dialogue between Senators in future issues. What processes and events led to the writing and presentation of the motion? What was the timeline of events?  BG Numerous members of the Senate’s standing committees’, permanent committees’ and the UHM administration voiced concerns to BG and DV starting in Sept 2016 through March 15 2017.  RH CPM duties pertain to academic freedom. How does the issue raised fall within your committee’s responsibilities? What was the SEC liason’s advice to you about raising this issue? How many CPM committee members attended the March 15 Senate meeting? HV Roles are broader than academic freedom and extend to professional engagement. GI appreciates need for civil dialogue and that this discourse should not be restricted only based on formal committee roles or MFS procedures. RC there should be a fair and civil process around the discussion of no-confidence, but that may not have occurred during the March 15 Senate meeting. He feels that if a committee were going to address this issue then CPM is appropriate. RC feels that the questions raised by CPM are valid. DV and BG there was strong support expressed at the March 15 meeting for the no-confidence measure including suspending the rules which were approved by a ¾ vote. . DV emphasizes that the motion was called to table the discussion until a later date but that was voted down.  HV again what was the timeline and process and was there an investigation done to check the validity of the statements? BG CAB did not conduct an investigation. The information came to CAB; CAB was contacted by individuals  RH expresses concern that HV did not provide satisfactory answers to her questions about how this inquiry got started, and how it fits within the designated responsibilities of CPM. GI as a committee in the Senate, CPM is impacted by the change in leadership and so has a right to have an open discussion. BG yes and that is why CAB has invited HV and JC to this meeting. RH is not arguing that this discussion should not happen, which is what GI is suggesting. My questions are about why CPM is asking questions that do not pertain directly to its duties.  JI HV is not an officer (e.g. Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary) and so are you representing CPM’s interest? HV yes, CPM asked for volunteers to speak with CAB and HV volunteered with CPM’s support. The interest in this investigation grew organically within CPM.  John Casken (JC) states that CPM at its meeting of 3/17 expressed concern about collegiality at the March 15 meeting. There was no talk about a resolution or … CPM is not concerned about the content of CAB’s motion but more about the discussion that followed, and promoting more civil dialogue during Senate meetings in dealing with future conflicts. CPM deals with professional matters, can we improve collegiality. BG why then ask about the timeline of the investigation leading up to the motion? RC concern may be related to the sudden creation of the motion and few people had time to consider. DV but the 2/3-3/4 vote in support of the motion to suspend the rules is evidence for wide concern about M. Butler across the Senate. If it was felt that the motion was premature then that would have been raised. But again the motion to table the discussion was voted down. RC A no-confidence motion should be brought up if there is a concern. But if the discussion turns to personal attacks or inappropriate assertions then that is detrimental. The motion was presented to CAB members at the emergency meeting soon after 2:30 pm.  HV the issue was very important but it was brought up about 7 minutes prior to the end of the meeting and that may have contributed to the lack of thorough discussion. JI CAB is not responsible for managing the discussion in the Senate that ensued. GI Why was there an emergency meeting? BG There was a significant threat from the SEC that they would go-around CAB and push their recommended changes to the By Laws. RH the questions asked in HV’s email to CAB are flawed and arise from an already preconceived opinion about wrong-doing by CAB. Your questions contain pre-judgement. RC it’s inappropriate for RH to prescribe the intent of HV’s questions.  HV when did CAB recognize this as an issue? DV re-iterates that the urgency was motivated by the threat by the SEC to push the By Laws. BG lists numerous Senate committees that have contacted committee members in CAB. HV were there any formal letters of complaint? RH the way your questions are phrased indicate a particular intention. Your questions ascribe guilt to CAB for not following certain procedures. If we are going to have a discussion then we must be honest about real the intent of the discussion. HV When this problem was recognized, was there a letter or voice of concern presented to the Senate or mediation attempted? DV CAB followed Senate procedures correctly when introducing the motion as new business. HV Was Chair Butler informed of issues with her leadership? GI The answer is “no”. Is that right? AS and BG. I don’t believe it is true that she was not informed. She has been told so during the year by various individuals. BG and DV We are convinced that we followed procedure correctly, apparently the Senate was convinced too that procedures were followed correctly (during March 15).  HV thanks CAB for its time and said would follow up with a few more questions over email. BG states that they will be forwarded to CAB members.. | **BG will circulate an email to arrange a time to meet with the VCR/iVCAA**  **DV will incorporate comments and circulate a revised draft of the By Laws**  **Once approved by CAB, BG will forward to the SEC (who will present to the Senate)** |
| **NEXT MEETING** | TBD |  |
| **ADJOURNMENT** | 4:15 |  |

Respectfully submitted by Garrett Apuzen-Ito, Secretary

Approved on 5/9/17 with 7 votes in favor of approval, 1 abstention and 0 against.