ATTENDANCE

Senate Chairs:
Paul Briggs (Windward Community College); Bob Cooney (UH Manoa Faculty Senate, Chair); Tom Craven (UH Manoa – Arts & Sciences); Gigi Drent (Kauai Community College); Paul Loccoco (Leeward Community College); Bonnyjean Manini (UH Manoa Faculty Senate, Vice Chair); Nick Ordway (Shidler College of Business); Gwen Sinclair (UH Manoa – Library Services); Dennis Vanairsdale (Kapiolani Community College); Elaine Yamashita (UH-Maui College).

Guests:
Rockne Freitas (VP for Student Affairs and University and Community Relations); M.R.C. Greenwood (UH President); Brenna Hashimoto (System Director of Human Resources); David Lonborg (Executive Assistant to President), Jo-Anne Itano (Director of Academic Affairs);

MINUTES

1. Administrative Salaries (Brenna Hashimoto, System Director of Human Resources)

Brenna Hashimoto provided an overview of executive and managerial salary information, including data comparing 2006 & 2011 headcounts, in order to help identify how salaries have increased over that time period. Salaries for all categories have risen – except for civil service, as a result of the hiring freeze. Mean and median salaries have also increased – with faculty outpacing all other groups by 15% in terms of the mean. The mean salary information was broken down by rank so that we can see how the different groups of faculty compare to executive salaries.

Q: This data does not include any RCUH positions and there may be a substantial number of administrative RCUH employees who are not included.
A (Hashimoto): RCUH is a separate employer and UH does not have access to their data.

Hashimoto then shared the most recent AAUP faculty salary figures. AAUP’s latest figures will be released in late March or early April. The AAUP data offers a historical perspective of faculty salaries at the campus-level and shows how faculty salaries compare to campuses nation-wide. Full Professors at Manoa are lagging behind compared to their peers, but the UH Community Colleges and UH-Hilo are around the average. Other campuses across the nation have been subject to furlough, but their base pay is still reported at the full rate – so the newest figures may be more accurate since they will reflect the reduced furlough rate of pay.

Q: How does AAUP define peer or benchmark groups?
A (Hashimoto): AAUP classifies peer and benchmark groups based on Carnegie classifications.
Q: As far as peer groups are concerned, UH Manoa is a dual entity. In terms of research, Manoa is among the top of its peers, but it may not compare in other ways, which may skew the data.
A (Hashimoto): AAUP’s faculty salary figures include only full-time instructional faculty and do not include research agents, librarians, extension agents, and medical school faculty.

Hashimoto answered a few questions about interpreting the data.

Hashimoto then explained that UH uses CUPA-HR (College and University Professional Association of Human Resources) data to make executive compensation determinations. CUPA-HR conducts a comprehensive survey
of university salaries across the nation, which includes 150 campuses nation-wide and surveys over 250 jobs, and 7,800 positions, which makes it the most comprehensive salary survey of university executive personnel. CUPA-HR reports data by Carnegie classification and their budget quartile. For each position within the University, UH matches the duties to a CUPA-HR position. For example, UH-Manoa is in CUPA-HR’s doctoral quartile 3 – so UH refers to that respective table to discern salary for Manoa executives. Each executive position is assigned to 1 of 5 grades that are defined by more traditional classification methods in terms of where it is positioned within this system and what the market is bearing for the type of position. UH then breaks these grades down into a range of 1-3 that is basically high, medium and low and is determined by the median reported by the CUPA-HR salary survey each year. These grade-levels allow UH to account for the market as defined by the CUPA-HR data. The control point is determined by averaging the medians of the jobs in that particular range and this “average of an average” becomes the control point. The median isn’t “one size fits all,” which is why UH breaks it down into the three grade levels or categories. Hiring above or below the control point allows UH to remain competitive in attracting highly qualified executives.

Q: When you negotiate pay with a new employee, how is that process carried out and how does UH determine if the individual is worth the money?
A (Hashimoto): Each executive makes a recommendation to the next higher-up individual for approval based on the CUPA-HR data. The Chancellor and Vice Presidents are delegated authority to approve compensation actions up to the CUPA-HR control point and, if the salary request exceeds the control point, the President must approve it.

Q: What criteria does the President use to determine whether to approve a salary request that is beyond the control point?
A (Hashimoto): It is generally flexible and depends on things the candidate brings in and whether they can take a pay cut.

Q: Can ACCFSC have access to the CUPA-HR executive compensation schedule used to determine executive salaries? We’d like to see where the executives are falling across the system.
A (Hashimoto): Since CUPA-HR includes both public and private University salaries – UH filters out religious and private colleges using an electronic data position. UH may have to pay to generate such a report, and we need to be sure to consider copyright regulations. UH may be able to run a report and Hashimoto will follow up to discern whether we can do so without infringing copyright.

Q: When UH advertises for executive and managerial positions – does it do so locally and/or nationally?
A (Hashimoto): For faculty, the Board of Regents policy requires national recruiting. The only requirement for administrators is that UH attempt to hire locally.

2. Q&A with President M.R.C. Greenwood
The President noted that she had to catch a plane and asked if there were any questions she could answer. The group asked the President if she had anything to address.

The President noticed that there was some discussion about the appropriate comparison groups for computing administrative salaries, which may be a little less controversial at Manoa since there is a clear definition of R1 universities. Peer groups for UH-Hilo and UH-West Oahu are a little less clear because they are transitioning into different categories and have different programs. Like UH-Manoa, Community Colleges are stable and the comparison institutions are more easily identified. In terms of executive positions – especially the higher-paid executives that are often questioned, UH hires around the 50th percentile, except in a few cases for those in the 75th percentile.

Q: What is the half-life for an administrator compared to a faculty member?
A (President): In some ways, I think they are reasonably comparable. Right now, Chancellors and Presidents are about 6-7 years on the average, but statistics are unclear since it includes someone who has been here for 20
years and those who have only been here for 3 years. The age of Presidents has risen significantly and incidents of sequential presidencies have also increased. The question of a half-life for administrators may not be answerable generally and you’d have to separate public and private universities. In the private universities, the Board determines the length of administrators’ terms, while public universities also must consider the legislature, faculty and student concerns.

Q: There is a perception that administrators who move positions are paid more than administrators who remain in the same position for a longer period of time. Is this true?
A (President): I don’t think its true that administrators do this more often than other groups. This strategy for increased compensation seems to have been employed across professions. It is difficult to transition from Provost to Chancellor or President, since these positions require tough decisions and may render those serving in the positions unpopular. Mid-level administrators may stay forever.

3. Minutes
   - Minutes of January 20, 2012 were approved unanimously.

4. Overview of System Student Affairs and University and Community Relations (Rockne Freitas, VP for Student Affairs and University and Community Relations)

VP Freitas was welcomed to the meeting and was asked to provide a general description of his job responsibilities.

Freitas identified his job description as including:
   - Hawaiian affairs special projects;
   - Media relations;
   - Government affairs;
   - Licensing;
   - Student affairs requirements;
   - West Oahu campus (System lead);
   - Indigenous Land Strategic Plan (Chair).
   - Committee on TMT.

Q: How often do you meet with Campus VC’s for Student Affairs?
A (Freitas): Once a month. One of two Associate VP’s may attend.

Q: How do you distribute workload between the Campus VC’s and your system office?
A (Freitas): The System office is more of a coordination entity. We consult with the campuses and formulate policy in all aspects of student affairs. For example, we coordinated the testimony for the recent housing increase that was passed by the Board of Regents. We are constantly in contact with the campuses.

Q: What was the change in student housing fees at UH Hilo and UH Manoa?
A (Freitas): The BOR passed up to 5% increase for Manoa and UH Hilo Student Housing.

Q: What is your office’s budget? Does it include G-funds? How many employees are there?
A (Freitas): Previously, there was VP for Student Affairs and a separate VP for University Relations. I don’t know the exact budget – but about 90% is generated from G-funds and about 5% is generated from licensing (but only for the logos – not the merchandise itself, since the campuses do merchandizing). Licensing generates a small amount that varies from year-to-year – in the Sugar Bowl year, licensing generated about $80,000, but last year it only generated about $40,000, which pays for transportation and flights to neighbor Islands and materials.

Q: What is your biggest challenge?
A (Freitas): Keeping up with the President.

Q: Can you tell us about the indigenous strategic plan?


A (Freitas): The genesis of the plan came in the last session. Legislator Clayton Hee put through a bill for a University within a University at UH-Hilo. This is a content measure – an activity, but we didn’t have the context for the activity, so the legislature killed the bill. In its place, we had to do a plan for a model indigenous serving institution. UH took a year to do this and presented it yesterday to the BOR. It was well received and the President must now sign-off on the plan. The plan has also been vetted to the Chancellors, since the Chancellors must implement the plan. While this is a system plan, the Chancellors must come up with additional funding to implement it.

Q: Can you give us an example of an operational item that Chancellors will be looking at?

A (Freitas): Continuing our participation in Achieving the Dream.

A (Itano): One example is an AA in Hawaiian Studies. Four campuses have developed a framework for this and will bring it to Chief AA in March.

Q: You have two hats – one that is internal and the other that is external. How much of your time is spent on Student Affairs and how much is spent on external relations and lobbying?

A (Freitas): I have an AVP for Student Affairs and the office has line-authority on student affairs policy. Lynn Waters is responsible for media responses. I spend maybe ¼ of my time working with Lynn on coordinating responses and about ¼ of my time on proactive messages like social media. Waters wants to create a newsroom at the system level so we can upload videos to the website and send them to television stations. We have a dream of owning our own TV channel like Brigham Young - but that is in the future. I spend ½ of my time during these months presenting testimony and going to the legislature. I am still the lead on the Palama Nui Campus – a new campus that I negotiated the deal for when I was Chancellor at Hawaii Community College. It is a public/private deal. Our partner is Palama Nui Development. We have the money from the public partners to build phase 1 and I spend a lot of time on that. I am now shifting gears to spend a lot of time on the design permits and contracts. This includes paying attention to the decision markers like County Council. Hawaii Island is divided – east and west. That is this month’s focus. I also advised the Chancellor on conference realignment. We had to do the deal with the Big West before jumping to the Mountain West.

Q: Why can’t athletics decisions be handled at the Manoa-level?

A (Freitas): I have many lives and relationships built on trust and experience. I could contribute to Manoa’s effectiveness in this regard and the President asked me to step in. I’m closely aligned with Oregon State University and the former President. I asked him what he is going to be evaluated on and he said enrollment, discretionary giving, and morale. How he was going to do this was to win football games. He took 10 million from the academic sector, paid down the athletics debt and, the next season, the football team went to their first bowl and the discretionary giving in the academic sector doubled in the first quarter for the following year.

Q: Did that happen here when we went to the Sugar Bowl?

A (Freitas): I don’t know. Ticket sales are going through the roof, I understand, so it is a very good start.

Q: Should faculty and students have a roll in that process?

A (Freitas): In that moment, we were on vacation and it was critical to get a coach on Board for recruiting purposes. Universities across the nation have a full-blown search when it has time, others are a one-person committee and they put names into the Board and contact them after prioritizing. I am all for transparency and inclusion.

Q: … except in this case because of expediency?

A (Freitas): We didn’t think we could find a student or faculty member who was knowledgeable enough.

Q: You didn’t make that attempt.

A (Freitas): I was a member of the committee.

Q: What about the authority to the Chancellor of all decisions regarding athletics? Under the NCAA standard, the Chancellor must have final determination.

A (Freitas): I have not read that document.

Q: I just received it yesterday and will make it available to you. FAR is concerned with how the NCAA will view this process.

A (Freitas): I didn’t receive the report – but I know people who did and the NCAA report was good.

A (Freitas): If you can read the Knight Report – the recommendation is that the Chief Executive has authority over all programs and that the AD should report to the Chief Executives.
Q: What about at the California system?
A (Freitas): Athletics at UCLA is handled by UCLA and not the system.
Q: Who appointed the football coach search committee?
A (Freitas): The President.

The group thanked VP Freitas for his time and he left the meeting.

5. Discussion of Guest Presentations

A Senator apologized for the focus on what may be perceived as Manoa issues and explained that defining the role of the UH System is crucial for all campuses. The Senator provided some examples of confusion or complication of Manoa and System responsibilities – such as the proposed closure of the Pacific Biosciences Research Center (PBRC) that was voted down by the BOR since, the system now says that the decision must be made by the Chancellor, while the Chancellor says that the decision must be made by the President.

There was some discussion of the paid sabbatical year of $350,000 that the BOR approved for outgoing Chancellor Virginia Hinshaw.

6. Faculty Distance Learning Advisory Committee (Truc Nguyen, Lead)

Truc Nguyen, as ACCFSC lead of the F-DLAC, provided an update. F-DLAC is actually the “Faculty Distance Learning Committee”, not “Advisory.” We are the parallel faculty D-L Committee to D-LAC. We are in the process of revising the committee’s charge to include an advisory function. There was confusion about whether the members of the D-L Committee are supposed to be Senators, since the charge said that members were to be appointed from campus Senates. The group is also trying to define what “curricular matters” includes. Nguyen will send out revised charge to the ACCFSC listserv.

D-L Committee member would like appointment letters, and Jo-Anne Itano agreed to write the letters for their faculty dossiers.

The group wants to address the grievance process for distance learning students. At all 10 campuses, the grievance process is the same for students. In terms of distance learning students, there are provisions that need to be made, especially online, for self-disclosing that you need ADA accommodations. A lot of online students take courses at multiple campuses and they have to self-disclose at each campus, since the system cannot self-disclose on their behalf. Another issue is that not all campuses have a quality control mechanism for the DLAC courses. All have e-café and laulima feedback – but these do not address the quality of the online course.

Itano explained that a new Federal mandate requires universities to obtain permission from each state in which students who are taking UH-Manoa distance learning courses reside. States must now discern how to comply. The federal government has delayed the compliance date until 2014 and UH must show that they’ve made a good faith effort to comply. To do so, UH wrote letters to every state to inquire about their approval processes and has received responses from about 45 states. Each campus will have to decide since Hawaii has no authorizing body, UH has sent a standard response that the University of Hawaii does not have the authority to make the decision and refers them to the Business registry.

A Senator explained that e-café cannot identify online student - so all students receive the same standard questions. Faculty can add to e-café, but the common core questions cannot be taken out and some of these questions do not make sense for online courses.

Lastly, Nguyen explained that the D-L Committee wanted her to share the issue of paper-based exams for online courses so that faculty can determine how each campus administers exams for online courses. Some
testing centers have to print, collate and staple all of the proctored exams and then send them back to the professor, even though they may not have the recourses to do so and this may not be the best way to administer paper exams for online courses. F-DL will survey testing centers to discern the load and the frequency of this occurrence, but would appreciate feedback from ACCFSC members, as well.

7. Regents Candidate Advisory Council (Tom Ramsey, ACCFSC Appointee)

Ramsey noted that RCAC had a fairly successful season finding people to serve in the pool of BOR nominees, but has experienced difficulty soliciting nominees from Maui and Kauai. One of two nominees from Kauai, if selected, will be a former faculty member.

Q: Can a current UH-faculty member serve on the BOR?
A (Ramsey): There is nothing in the rules that say that is impossible – but the Council may view this as a conflict of interest.

Ramsey explained that RCAC has indirectly heard that the Hawaii Senate is unhappy about the regent’s selection process. The criticism used to be that RCAC did not send up enough women – but the first woman presented was rejected and, since then, RCAC has sent up a good number of women, who were rejected. What exactly they are unhappy about is unclear. I believe in the process, which is putting forth qualified and diverse nominees. The process is also political and the politicians do want to control it. Our own faculty union wants to abolish the RCAC, but they were opposed to the original Constitutional Amendment that created the RCAC, which they viewed as an attack on Governor Lingle, and they want to remain consistent with that position.

Q: Part of UHPA’s position is that there is too much political influence within the committee, as it is constituted now. Is that true?
A (Ramsey): There is less politics than ever before in the committee. They do not consider a person’s political affiliation, unless the applicant puts something in their application materials.

Q: What about other political affiliations?
A (Ramsey): I am fearful that we have not eliminated this. It is a small community – so it is impossible to find someone who isn’t connected in some way.

Q: How was Howard Karr appointed? I was displeased by his responses to the State Senate Committee and he seemed disconnected.
A (Ramsey): RCAC nominated Karr.

Q: I don’t sense that we’re any more connected with the Regents with the RCAC. Most seem more focused on the business side – and not the academic side.
A (Ramsey): We try to pick people who represent the community and, for better or worse, that is the community.

Some specific examples were provided of candidates. Unfortunately, the Governor may not choose some of these candidates.

Ramsey explained that the constitutional amendment could be voted on this Fall, but would take about 1-2 years to implement. The way the Amendment is written, the legislature decides what makes-up the committee – so they may change the composition of the committee. Right now, the Office of the President of the University of Hawaii manages the committee. There is a bill to move the administration of the committee to the Governor’s office. There are changes that could be made by law, and not constitutional amendment, that could significantly alter the committee. To me, the most striking difficulty of the committee is that we have to pick a certain number of people from all the Islands and that is difficult, especially for Maui and Kauai, – but is unlikely to change.
Q: What is your time commitment?
A (Ramsey): I’d say maybe two full weeks of the year or 10 working days. The most time consuming component is interviewing of applicants. The interviews take place in November and December. They all come to Oahu to interview and we do not pay their expenses. Regents don’t get travel expenses.

Q: What proportion of nominees are self nominated?
A (Ramsey): A high proportion – maybe 40% or more. We get about 60-70 applicants and, this time, we interviewed about 20.

Q: With regard to Kauai, are you not getting applicants or suitable applicants?
A (Ramsey): Last time, we had a public meeting on the Kauai campus and it wasn’t something the public pays a lot of attention to. At that time, there was only one applicant and we had to give the government two names. I ended up phoning 30 civil organizations on Kauai to drum up nominees, which was difficult since it was only a chance to be selected. This time, there were 4 people who came forward and they were all interesting in different ways. The committee put two names forward and you could argue with that decision. I felt that we could have sent all 4 names, but the committee voted. For each position, there are 2-4 nominees and the Governor picks one for confirmation by the Senate. Internally, I don’t see corruption.

Q: Are there some or one candidate who the committee seems to be advocating for?
A (Ramsey): I think that happened twice. Overall, I’d argue that it is probably better than the old system. We have a judicial selection process that is very similar. I did protest the Union Boards testimony. Repealing the Constitutional amendment really looks bad, politically. On average, there should be 3 positions being filled in the Regents each year. Typically, nominations open in September and first screening is late October.

8. Common Course Numbering Proposal (Paul Briggs, ACCFSC Lead)

Briggs explained that the committee sent the Common Course Numbering Process Proposal to the ACCFSC listserv (it is also available on the ACCFSC webpage). At the last ACCFSC meeting, the committee was charged by this body with creating a statement of values that could be sent to campus senates for endorsement. Briggs provided an overview of the proposal and noted that it contains a process to prevent future discrepancies from arising. The next step is to have the campuses vote on it.

**Common Course Numbering Process**

The purpose of the following process of Common Course Numbering is to ensure smooth transfer of courses across the UH campuses in the best interest of the students.

Our goal as a UH System is that all lower division courses which are articulated within the UH System and meet the Foundation/Basic General Education requirement have the same course alpha, number, title, basic description, prerequisites, and common core course level outcomes (also known as Student Learning Outcomes).

In situations where 3 or fewer campuses differ with regard to course alpha; number; title; prerequisites; or Foundation GE designation, faculty representatives will work with their respective VCAA to review and make changes as appropriate.

When substantive differences occur, faculty representatives will meet at a face-to-face discipline meeting, which will be arranged by the Office of the Executive for Academic Affairs. The discipline groups will agree upon a solution, which will be administratively fast tracked via the individual campus curriculum process.

Decisions made by the individual campuses will be honored by the administration.

The curriculum committee(s) and the VCAA at each campus are responsible to ensure that a process is in place to prevent future differences for lower division UH Foundation courses.
Some suggestions and comments included:

- The language in the third paragraph may be unclear and may need to be rephrased: “If all except three campuses have substantially the same” and then defining “substantially.” Perhaps breaking this into three sentences. Some others did not find the paragraph confusing.
- Another Senate preliminary reviewed the proposal and agreed to it, but suggested clarification about the definition of a lower-division course. What is a common core of SLO?
- Phrasing of the faculty discipline group agreement was also discussed.
- One Senator noted that the last paragraph is critical, since we are committing to establish a process to ensure that future differences do not arise. This body should receive reports back from the campuses to ensure this is being implemented. Ultimately, we’re asking the VC’s to enforce it.
- Generally, the campus foundations board should not accept proposals for courses that do not align with the common course numbering process. Each campus monitors and approves its’ own foundations courses. At Kauai CC, the task is to ensure that the course meets the hallmarks and is not to consider what the course is titled, since this is outside of the scope of their charge and it goes back to curriculum committee.

Since some Senators do not meet before the next ACCFSC meeting, campus Senates are asked to respond in time for the April ACCFSC meeting.

A motion was made to approve the Proposal and to put it forth for approval of the campus senates. The vote was unanimous.

9. Library Resources (Sharon Cox, ACCFSC Lead)

Sharon Cox is unavailable, but will provide an update at the next meeting.

A Senator noted that the System-wide Library Council has decided that it is not subject to state “Sunshine laws” Sunshine laws apply to legislatively appointed bodies. The Council is making decisions to spend a significant amount of money – for example, $100,000/year for a tool called Primo – yet there is no transparency.

A Motion was made and approved unanimously to invite the Library Council Chair to address ACCFSC.

10. Miscellaneous Issues

There was some discussion about possibly of inviting Itano or the Chair of the Foundations Committee to explain the process at each of the campuses for classifying foundations courses. While Itano offered to share a historical perspective of the system, a suggestion was made to look into the F-Board campus charters.

It was noted that David Lassner & John Morton were the only two VPs who have not yet presented to the ACCFSC, and a suggestion was made to invite them each to do so in March and April.

The group agreed to invite David Lassner to the March ACCFSC meeting and John Morton to the April ACCFSC meeting.

11. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:45 am.