UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I
SYSTEM

Board of Regents <bor@hawaii.edu>

April Testimony.

Christine Sorensen <sorens@hawaii.edu>   Tue, Apr 17, 2018 at 10:29 PM
To: Board of Regents <bor@hawaii.edu>

Testimony attached. See you Thursday!

--
Christine K. Sorensen Irvine
Professor, Learning Design and Technology
College of Education
University of Hawaii at Manoa

2 attachments

10. April 2018 BOR Testimony .docx
18K

HR Functional Areas.pdf
210K

Board of Regents Testimony - April 2018
Christine Sorensen Irvine
Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee

First, we would like to thank the Board of Regents Personnel Affairs and Board Governance Committee for inviting the UH Mānoa Senate Executive Committee Chair to participate in their discussion of shared governance on April 5. During that discussion and in my written response I indicated that there are times when faculty must point out to administration the areas where faculty have primary responsibility and demand to participate in decisions. Misunderstandings have more commonly occurred at system level rather than campus levels related to consultation and shared governance. I noted that there seem to be more issues when the administrators do not have an academic background or limited knowledge about how higher education institutions are different from other types of organizations (e.g. businesses). I also suggested that more communication needs to occur, particularly when faculty advice is overruled, so that all understand the reasons why.

We understand that there is no one model for shared governance. We understand that it does not mean that faculty participate at every level and must be involved in every decision. We recognize that accountability for decisions resides with the administration and ultimately, with this Board. I noted at the retreat, good shared governance cannot occur without good communication – frequent, open and honest communication. Good shared governance cannot occur without consultation in good faith. Good shared governance cannot exist without trust. I also noted that on the Mānoa campus, that trust, at least from the faculty perspective, has been violated and must be rebuilt. In particular, the Mānoa faculty trust in System Administration has been seriously broken.

I left the meeting on April 5 feeling hopeful that there could be a rebuilding of trust between the Mānoa faculty and the System. Unfortunately, I then went to my next meeting of the day with the Committee on Administration and Budget, a committee of the Mānoa Faculty Senate who have the responsibility to review and provide feedback on reorganization proposals that impact faculty. For discussion at that meeting was a reorganization proposal received from System on March 14 to merge Mānoa Human Resources with System Human Resources (HR). The final statement on the email was, "If we do not hear from you by March 30, 2018, we will assume that you have no objections to the proposed revisions and will implement the reorganization." So, two weeks to review a major proposal (while normally we have at least 45 days and often longer) and those two weeks included Spring Break for faculty.

We noted that the proposal itself had no evidence to support its many claims and lacked many of the details we normally expect in a reorganization proposal. What made things worse, when we began looking into the situation, we discovered that the merger seems to be a foregone conclusion - - people have already been physically moved from the Mānoa HR offices to System offices. The merger has functionally already begun. This is what we would call "fake" consultation. There is no serious intent to listen to or consider what faculty might think. In fact in our research we discovered that much thought had been given to this issue by the very people who it impacts on our campus and a detailed analysis was completed in 2015 (see attachment) all of which was ignored. We are continuing to gather data to provide feedback,

but we are wondering what is the point of spending our time doing that if anything we say will be (in fact already has been) ignored.

The Senate Executive Committee has discussed this latest action. In addition, we invited System HR administrators to attend an SEC meeting to discuss the proposal. We appreciate that they took the time on April 16th to do that. We expressed our concerns over the process. We also discussed the need for defining the problem they are trying to fix and provide evidence that this merger will fix it. The reasons given for the merger, primarily to improve consistency and reduce duplication in reviews, are things we can see a need to do. But these same issues occur on other campuses. There are HR issues in terms of consistency and duplication at West Oahu and Hilo as well. But we do not see their HR offices in the reorganization plan. It seems when there are issues such as inconsistencies in processes and policy application at Mānoa, the solution is to merge us with System. When the same issues occur on other campuses, the solution is more training. We appreciate that those present indicated they would do better in the future, but we have heard that before.

We wish we could say that this was the first time actions of System administration have left us feeling unheard and that our opinions are not really valued, that true consultation is not the goal. But it is not. Over the last few years, it has happened repeatedly - - with our research office, with communications, with facilities, and with planning. Yes, we admit there were issues that needed to be resolved. But it does not appear all options are considered. There seems to be one hammer to solve every problem at Mānoa.

In all the cases mentioned above (and more), any concerns we had were ignored. It appeared to us that the decisions were already made, long before any feedback was sought from faculty or staff at Mānoa. The most cynical think the re-merger of System and Mānoa has been the plan since prior to the WICHE report in 2015. Hence the term we hear on campus "System takeover." Mānoa is already being administered from Bachman Hall and not Hawaii Hall.

This behavior by System is also why we no longer think it is possible to have an autonomous Mānoa with an independent Chancellor. We have, in essence, given up on having our autonomy as an academic institution. You asked at the last meeting why we changed our mind about having a separate Chancellor. We really haven't. We just think it futile and that it will lead to a constant merry-go-round of administrators on our campus and extremely short terms for any Chancellor who dares take the job. And no, we do not think it is a matter of who is in the position. We think it is because of a fundamental problem in the relationship between System and Mānoa that we see no way forward to correct. And right now, we believe Mānoa needs stability - stability that has been missing for some time. If merging the two is the only way to get that stability, then so be it. But let's be honest about what is happening.

As I said earlier – the trust between System and Mānoa has been seriously damaged and continuing to behave in ways that are similar to our earlier experiences with lack of good faith consultation will be unlikely to improve it. If you want to strengthen shared governance, then early, open, honest, and continuous communication and genuine consultation on the part of System administration regarding actions that impact Mānoa might be a place to start.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Mānoa Human Resources
ASSESSMENT OF FUNCTIONAL AREAS
October 2015

FUNCTIONAL AREA: LABOR RELATIONS

	FACT FINDING, INVESTIGATIONS, GRIEVANCES – Conducting fact-finding/investigations, hearing grievances and providing advice/assistance to campus unit personnel officers and administrators who deal in such matters.	
	GOAL: To ensure thorough and professional investigations resulting in fair and consistent decisions, with minimal impact on current scope of services provided to the campus.	
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Campus units receive direct assistance from campus experts with knowledge of issues and history • Campus experts provide advice and strategies to prevent escalation of issues • Multiple levels of review ensure objectivity in decision-making	• Inconsistency across campuses in actions taken
System	• Would lead to greater consistency of actions taken across campuses	• Levels of review would collapse, leading to perception of a lack of due process and objectivity in both the decision-making and grievance processes • Elimination of checks and balances can result in cases unnecessarily moving to arbitration
	RECOMMENDATION: Retain function at campus level, with enhancements: **1) Create a pool of skilled investigators on Mānoa campus; and** **2) Create a system-wide database of decisions which is accessible to all campuses, to ensure consistent decision-making.**	

	DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING - System OHR provides MHR with a listing of employees subject to drug testing. MHR then advises select units to provide notice to applicable employee.	
	GOAL: Confidential and efficient processes.	
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa		• Addition of unnecessary step to process
System	• Fewer staff involved allows for greater confidentiality and efficiency	
	RECOMMENDATION: Move function to System OHR to ensure higher degree of confidentiality and efficiency through working directly with the College/School.	

FUNCTIONAL AREA: CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION

BROADBAND - Classifying and defining APT positions within the campus, and recognizing staff's value and contributions by awarding compensation in the form of Special Compensation Adjustments (i.e. In-Grade Adjustments, Performance Award, etc.) and Reband. Mānoa has implemented a process to delegate authority for certain actions to Deans/Directors via a certification program for AO/PO's.		
GOAL: To ensure timely review and consistent decisions across the campus.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Delegation to HR Certified AO/POs has increased timeliness for units • Delegation to HR Certified AO/POs has reduced number of desk audits for class/comp • Campus experts' awareness of unit needs and historical knowledge of units helps streamline review process	• Delegation to HR Certified AO/POs has decreased consistency across campus • Deans/Directors not aware of the campus-wide impact of their decisions • Delegation process does not currently include review of/consequences for questionable actions

Other Considerations:
  • Consider revising delegation to apply only within designated steps versus entire range (current scenario)
  • Consider recertifying AO/PO's on a periodic basis		

System	• Centralizing Broad Band Actions will provide greater consistency • IT Salary Matrix works • Broad Band system increased timeliness of actions versus hard copy centralized review	• Not holding campuses across the system accountable for their decisions • Consistency across all campuses will not increase if only one campus is moved to OHR

Other Considerations:
  • Broad Band System is outdated
    o Application has not evolved over time
    o Defects in application were not corrected from initial roll-out
    o Consider developing salary matrix for all career groups (similar to IT Matrix)
  • 95% of all hires are now exceptions
    o Consider developing additional bands
  • Moving function to System will require update of AP A9.210 to change delegation of authority (Chancellor to System)
  • AP recently reviewed by joint employer/union committee; consider annual review and update
  • Revisit QA for IT Matrix for further clarification		

RECOMMENDATION (Broad Band): Retain function at campus level, with enhancements: **1) MHR to seek increased consistency across campus units for APT classification and compensation by rescinding or minimizing delegation to HR certified AO/PO's;** **2) Revisit campus delegation process, including an annual recertification requirement; and** **3) Update System APM to address Other Considerations listed above.**		

	Strengths	Weaknesses
EXECUTIVE, MANAGERIAL - Classifying and defining E/M positions within the campus; assisting with recruitment and salary negotiations.		
GOAL: To ensure timely review and consistent decisions across the campus.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**

Mānoa	• Campus experts' awareness of unit needs and historical knowledge of units helps streamline recruitment and salary negotiation process
	• Campus experts have knowledge of issues unique to UHM:
	  o Flagship campus offering the most varied disciplines and specialties
	  o High demand disciplines not comparable to other campuses
		• Too many levels of review before action is forwarded to President/BOR

System	• Greater awareness of BOR and System administration concerns	• May not be aware of recruitment and salary negotiation issues since not directly involved
RECOMMENDATION (Executive/Managerial): Retain function at the campus level – consistent with operations at other campuses.		

	Strengths	Weaknesses
COACHES – Classifying and defining coach positions; assisting with negotiation of Employment Agreements.		
GOAL: To ensure timely review and appropriate terms and conditions in Employment Agreements.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**

Mānoa	• Established Employment Agreement (EA) templates available
	• Procedures and processes have been established with UHM Athletics personnel
	• Campus experts' historical knowledge of Athletics and awareness of unique needs help streamline recruitment and salary negotiation process
		• EAs are not always consistent from one coach to another
		• Contracts for high profile coaches do not follow established template
		  o Require many levels of review
		  o Increased lag time due to levels of review

System	• Establish consistency with UH Hilo and UHM	
Other Considerations: • Need to revisit process for review of EAs not on template and update current EA templates.		
RECOMMENDATION (Coaches): 1) **Retain actions involving standardized templates at campus level;** 2) **Establish updated EA templates for Asst/Assoc and Head Coaches; and** 3) **Move actions for high-profile coaches to System OHR and establish a process for review by relevant system offices.**		

FUNCTIONAL AREA: EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AND BENEFITS

MCO/OVCAFO/OVCAA HR FUNCTIONS - Providing HR services to Chancellor and Vice Chancellor offices.		
GOAL: To provide excellent customer service to employees and to ensure HR actions are processed in an accurate, efficient, and timely manner with minimal impact on current scope of services provided to the units.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Direct and timely attention to employee HR needs • Units receive assistance from PO with knowledge of unit, issues, and history	
System		• Organizationally removed from units; reduces employee access to HR assistance • Inconsistent with operations at other campuses
RECOMMENDATION: Maintain function at Mānoa with HR Specialist(s) that resides in the respective offices.		

E/M EVALUATIONS – Conducting Executive & Managerial (E/M) evaluations.		
GOAL: To ensure E/M evaluations are processed timely and accurately, ensuring confidentiality throughout the process.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Evaluations are customized to type of position and to the needs of the college/unit • Evaluations are more comprehensive • Evaluations sent out to a larger audience of evaluators (all faculty/staff in the college/unit)	• Evaluations are normally conducted every 3-4 years, unless a performance issue arises • Evaluation content and process not consistent across UH system
System	• Current evaluations processed through system are done on an annual basis	• Evaluation questions are generic across all types of positions
Other Considerations: • All campuses would benefit from using an evaluation format that incorporates Mānoa's customized model using a larger audience of evaluators. • Support to Mānoa campus units and leadership will be impacted if current Mānoa-developed process is discontinued.		
RECOMMENDATION: Move function to System OHR, incorporating customized questions and broader audience of evaluators.		

SERVICE AWARDS – Overseeing process and coordinating provision of services awards to campus employees.		
GOAL: To ensure that faculty/staff are provided their service awards in a timely manner.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Awards sent out timely	
System	• Type of award will be consistent	• High volume of service awards
Other Considerations: • Provide employees with consistent type of award.		
RECOMMENDATION: Either office could be responsible for service awards.		

NEW HIRE ORIENTATION – Developing/updating new hire orientation materials and processes.		
GOAL: To ensure new faculty/staff are provided the proper information for successful employment.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Customized to meet the needs of the campus	
System	• Orientation will be available system-wide	
<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>: **Move function to System OHR; add customization for campus information.**		

ADVISORY SERVICES – Providing HR support to colleges/units.		
GOAL: To ensure accurate, consistent, and timely advice to campus units with minimal impact on services currently provided to campus units.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Campus experts have knowledge of issues/problems within college/units • Campus experts are generalists and can provide assistance in multiple areas	• Advice provided may not be consistent with advice provided at other campuses • Advice may not be consistent with advice provided by OHR
System	• Advice would be consistent across all campuses	• OHR experts are currently specialized; multiple experts may need to be consulted for advice on broad ranging questions
<u>Other Considerations:</u> • Support to campus units may be impacted if assistance is provided by specialists instead of generalists cross-trained in multiple areas.		
<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>: **Retain function at Mānoa for optimal customer service, providing comprehensive guidance to help prevent issues from escalating to higher levels.**		

ANNUAL ORG CHART REVIEW & REORG REVIEW – Reviewing campus unit annual org chart updates and reorg requests.		
GOAL: To ensure timely and consistency review across the campus, with minimal impact on services currently provided to the campus.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Campus experts have historical knowledge of units and can provide pertinent advice • Timely review and quick turnaround – coordinated process to provide review at all functional levels (budget, classification and functions)	
System	• Consistency across UH System if all review done at the System level • Eliminate duplicate levels of review	• Need to expand staff relationships with respective units to gain a better understanding and historical knowledge of units • Consistence across all campuses will not increase if only one campus is moved to OHR
Other Considerations: • Review of organization charts should be conducted by the same office that performs classification review of positions, in order to ensure full understanding of the issues and requested changes. • Seek increased consistency across all campuses for annual organization chart review and reorganization review. • Create a system for oversight and accountability to ensure consistency of review.		
RECOMMENDATION: Retain functions at the campus level.		

FUNCTIONAL AREA: STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNICATION

TRAINING - Developing, coordinating and presenting training seminars.		
GOAL: To provide a wide array of engaging and highly informational seminars to campus unit staff.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Full range of trainings developed and regularly provided to Mānoa units • Consistent message to Mānoa Campus • Newly established mentoring program for new Band A HR Specialists • Trainings on non-HR topics (such as campus security, environmental health and safety, Title IX) coordinated for campus • Customized trainings designed and implemented for campus units	• MHR trainings not available to other campuses • Possible duplication of effort in development of training
System	• Consistency in message to all campuses • Efficient use of resources • Eliminates any duplication of effort	
RECOMMENDATION: Move function to System OHR to ensure comprehensive system-wide trainings; retain specific campus-related trainings at Mānoa.		

WEBSITE – Providing HR information to AO/PO and employees		
GOAL: To provide a user-friendly resource to employees and AO/PO's and to meet resource needs via a "self service" format.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Campus experts are aware of campus unit needs • Consolidation of information to address campus-specific concerns and solutions	• Some duplication of effort and information (same information on both campus and system websites)
System	• Ensures consistency of information provided • Shared resources across all campuses	• Consistence across all campuses will not increase if only one campus is moved to OHR
Other Considerations: • Consider creating an on-line electronic transactions system for employee-initiated actions (i.e. change of address).		
RECOMMENDATION: 1) **Move function to System OHR to share resources across all campuses;** 2) **Include tabs on system web page for individual campus pages to post campus-specific information (such as Mānoa Green Days schedule); and** 3) **Incorporate existing campus designs to create all-in-one website that is user friendly, up-to-date, and accessible to all levels (e.g. public, employee, supervisor, HR staff, etc.).**		

HR NEWSLETTER – Providing regular communication updates on HR issues.		
GOAL: Provide AO/PO and employees a resource of current issues, updates, reminders, etc to increase communication at all levels.		
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**
Mānoa	• Awareness of campus-specific needs and concerns that can be addressed via newsletter and other avenues • Greater flexibility to provide campus-specific solutions/suggestions	
System	• Would ensure consistency of information provided • Shared resources across all campuses	• Current communication primarily via email
Other Considerations: • Consider implementing use of social media as a method of communicating with employees. • Consider creating two System newsletters, one for AO/PO's and one for employees.		
RECOMMENDATION: Move function to System OHR; incorporating campus-specific information.		

UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I
SYSTEM

Board of Regents <bor@hawaii.edu>

Submitting written testiomy

Rosiana (Nani) Azman <rosiana@hawaii.edu>   Wed, Apr 18, 2018 at 8:31 AM
To: bor@hawaii.edu

Aloha,

Attached please find my written testimony for the BOR meeting on April 19, 2018.

Mahalo,
  Nani Azman

--

*****

Rosiana (Nani) L. Azman, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Psychology
Chair, Academic Senate
University of Hawai'i Maui College
310 W. Ka'ahumanu Avenue
Kahului, HI 96732
808-984-3259
rosiana@hawaii.edu

📄 **Azman BOR testimony April 2018.docx**
150K

I would like to thank Vice-Chair Moore for inviting the co-chairs of the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs to attend the Board of Regents Committee on Personnel Affairs and Board Governance. In your discussion of shared governance, we feel it shows great understanding and respect to ask us to attend, in addition to the head of the UH Student Caucus, to contribute our thoughts on the topic.

As was discussed during the committee meeting, shared governance works best when there is a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved, when good communication occurs between all parties, and when the decision-making process is transparent. Several different levels of governance exist in the UH System: the Board of Regents, who hold the ultimate decision making authority, system administration, each campus's administration, the campus senates and staff councils, the unions, and student governments. We all travel together on this path to shared governance.

The faculty are fortunate to have two avenues through which they can discuss governance issues: campus senates and UHPA. On multiple occasions just this year as ACCFSC co-chair, I have cited both Regents' Policy 1.210 on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development, as well as Section R-20 of the UHPA Collective Bargaining Agreement, Roles and Consultation Protocols Involving UH Administration, UH Professional Assembly, and UH Faculty Senates, when explaining to administrators at different levels throughout the system, as well as faculty on different campuses, what responsibilities fall under the jurisdiction of the faculty and cannot be usurped by any other body.

At the moment, I am grateful that UHMC has a relatively functional model of shared governance. When Chancellor Hokoana first met with our academic senate shortly after he had been hired, he explained clearly that to him, shared governance doesn't mean he will simply do what the faculty tell him to do because ultimately, any decision regarding the campus is his responsibility. The chancellor and I meet monthly, sometimes more, to discuss issues that I bring to him from the faculty and staff. He also shares issues with me, some that he would like to have me bring to the senate, while at other times he tests the waters by asking what the faculty may think about hypothetical situations. He has made decisions despite faculty concerns on some occasions, as is his right as chancellor. Only in the rare times when full transparency did not exist or when consultation actually followed a decision that had already been made, did faculty get upset. On those rare occasions, I felt fortunate that I was free to express the faculty's frustrations, to which he listened and considered, without fear of retaliation.

I appreciated Chair Sullivan's suggestion at the committee meeting that she would like to formalize a position on the BOR that is meant to interact specifically with the faculty, much like the student regent does with the students. Most faculty feel distanced from the

regents. Having had a few opportunities to meet with regents one on one, I can see how any gesture that can bring faculty and regents together could help develop a sense of trust and respect that will ultimately help UH run more effectively.

As we plan the August retreat for the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs, I would also like to let the regents know that we would gratefully welcome regents attending our retreat.