September 17, 2013

TO: David Ericson, Chair
    Mānoa Faculty Senate

    David Chin, Chair
    Mānoa Faculty Senate,
    Committee on Administration & Budget

FROM: Bonnyjean Manini, Chair
      OSA Faculty Senate

RE: Proposed Reorganization of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Students

Aloha!

During the summer of 2013, the OSA Faculty Senate, led by our colleague Teresa Bill, received a request from the Mānoa Faculty Senate regarding the Proposed Reorganization of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Students. Similar to the Mānoa Faculty Congress, the OSA Faculty Senate includes all faculty members (tenured, probationary and non-tenured) in OSA who have a minimum of a .5 FTE appointment (half-time). Currently, this includes 53 faculty members.

The 2012-13 OSA Faculty Senate Executive Committee (OSA-SEC) comprised of 5 elected faculty members opened the item up for discussion and input from all OSA faculty members, all of whom have 11-month appointments and work throughout the summer months. Input was initially received from OSA faculty members through a public meeting on June 27, 2013 and through emails sent to our former Chair, Teresa Bill, from June 18-July 3, 2013.

In the start of the fall, the 2013-14 OSA-SEC decided to run a poll and take a vote of the OSA Faculty Senate on the item, using the input gathered by Teresa in the design of the ballot.

Due to the time-sensitive faculty consultation process defined in M3:101- Mānoa Reorganization Process, as well as the time over the summer when the OSA faculty were able to provide input on this item, the poll ballot was sent out for one week (7 calendar days,
August 29-September 5, 2013) and included three possible responses, I support the reorganization of OSA, I have reservations about the reorganization of OSA, and I do not support the reorganization of OSA. The items (listed below and on the ballot) under each response came from input received directly from faculty members during the public meeting and email input process over the summer.

Poll Ballot Content

I support the reorganization of OSA.

*For more specific input, check any of the statements below or write in additional thoughts.
I support the reorganization because:
   ___ the VCS will be able to focus on big picture issues facing campus administration.
   ___ the creation of Associate VC for Diversity sends a message of diversity's importance on this campus.
   ___ many other universities have a diversity administrator similar to proposed AVC for Diversity.
   ___ these reporting lines are already in place and working well.
   ___ other; please specify: ____________________________

I have reservations about the reorganization.

*For more specific input regarding your reservations, check any of the statements below or write in additional thoughts.
I have reservations about the reorganization because:
   ___ resulting reclassifications (i.e., Director of SEED to become Associate VC for Diversity and Assistant VC for Students to become Associate VC for Students) will lead to salary increases which will negatively impact OSA budget.
   ___ it will create additional administrative layer(s) between OSA departments and VCS.
   ___ it is being driven by “personalities” currently in these positions rather than organizational rationale.
   ___ other; please specify: ____________________________

I am against the reorganization.

*For more specific input on being against it, check any of the statements below or write in additional thoughts.
I am against the reorganization because:
   ___ resulting reclassifications (i.e., Director of SEED to become Associate VC for Diversity and Assistant VC for Students to become Associate VC for Students) will lead to salary increases which will negatively impact OSA budget.
   ___ it will create additional administrative layer(s) between OSA departments and VCS.
   ___ it is being driven by "personalities" currently in these positions rather than organizational rationale.
   ___ other; please specify: ____________________________

14 ballots were received from OSA Faculty members during a period of 1 week. This is a 26.4% response rate. Of the 14 responses, 6 members support the reorganization (42.85%), 4 members have reservations about the reorganization (28.57%), 4 members are against the reorganization (28.57%).
For OSA faculty members who **support the reorganization** (6 of 14 responses), the primary reason (3 of 6 responses) is agreement with the creation of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity. A secondary reason (2 of 6 responses) is agreement with the reporting lines already in place and working well. 1 of 6 responses added support for there to be 3 Associate Vice Chancellors under the Vice Chancellor for Students. 1 of 6 responses in support of the reorganization added written concern about the layers of administration between departments in OSA and the VCS.

For OSA faculty members who **have reservations about the reorganization** (4 of 14), the primary reason (4 of 4 responses) was the additional administrative layers between OSA departments and the VCS. The secondary concern (2 of 4 responses) was the reclassification of executives that will lead to salary increases and negatively impact the OSA budget. Finally, (1 of 4 responses) said that the reorganization was being driven by “personalities” currently in positions rather than organizational rationale.

For OSA faculty members who are **against the reorganization** (4 of 14 responses), the primary reason (4 of 4 responses) was the additional administrative layers between OSA departments and the VCS. There were 2 secondary concerns (3 of 4 responses) 1- the reclassification of executives that will lead to salary increases and the potential for negative impact on the OSA budget and 2- that the reorganization may be being driven by “personalities” of individual currently in positions rather than organizational rationale. Additional concerns were: it [the reorganization] is missing essential pieces that make it appear illogical, reporting lines are in place but not working well because it cuts off regular access to the VCS and distances the VCS from department leadership and faculty, VCS was hired to lead division with Assistants and Associates to assist but not be layers in between the departments and the senior executive, concern with proposing to increase executive pay while budget cuts are underway, justifying increase in pay for AVC without decreasing VCS pay (hired to do the work being proposed to be re-assigned to one or more AVCs), and VCS has announced plan to step down at end of the academic year which suggests a divisional reorganization should wait for new leadership to decide on appropriate structure for the division.

In conclusion, less than half of the faculty members from OSA chose to provide input on this item from June 18 through September 5, 2013. The OSA-SEC discussed briefly why input did not come from more faculty members and could think of three possible reasons 1) OSA faculty members are primarily ok with the proposed reorganization, 2) OSA faculty members may not feel comfortable speaking up against the reorganization, or 3) OSA faculty members may not feel providing input will actually influence the final decision or make a difference. There may be other reasons we did not consider.

As the Mānoa Faculty Senate considers the proposed reorganization of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Students, below is a summary of the input that was received with numbers from the last poll included,

- 3 of 14 support the creation of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity;
- 1 of 14 supports having 3 Associate Vice Chancellors under the Vice Chancellor for Students;
• 2 of 14 support and agree that the reporting lines already in place and working well, while on a related item 9 of 14 do not support additional administrative layers between OSA departments and the VCS;
• 7 of 14 do not support reclassification of executives that will lead to salary increase(es) and negatively impact the OSA budget;
• 4 of 14 expressed concern that the reorganization is being driven by "personalities" currently in positions rather than organizational rationale.

Additional concerns with the proposed reorganization are:

• It [the reorganization] is missing essential pieces that make it appear illogical;
• Reporting lines are in place but not working well because it cuts off regular access to the VCS and distances the VCS from department leadership and faculty;
• [The] VCS was hired to lead division with Assistants and Associates to assist but not be layers in between the departments and the senior executive;
• Concern with increase of executive pay while budget cuts are underway;
• Concern with justifying increase in pay for AVC without decreasing VCS pay (hired to do the work being proposed to be re-assigned to one or more AVCs); and
• [The] VCS has announced a plan to step down at end of the academic year which suggests a divisional reorganization should wait for new leadership to decide on appropriate structure for the division.

I am available to provide clarification on any items that do not seem clear.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this item.