

Public Testimony Form - University of Hawaii Board of Regents

Please provide your testimony on this form for the next University of Hawaii Board of Regents meeting. Make sure you include all the requested information so that the Board of Regents is able to clearly understand the testimony provided.

*****All written testimony submitted are public documents. Therefore, any testimony submitted is public information and will be posted on the board's website.***

Your Name (required) *

Prof Peter H Hoffenberg

Your Organization (optional)

Department of History, U H Manoa

Your e-mail address (in case we need to reach you) *

peterh@hawaii.edu

Board of Regents Agenda Item (required) *

Other

Your Position (required) *

Comments Only

Your Testimony/Comments

Re. The Middle East and the University

Complex issues are being taught in the U H system by folks who are not informed on the topics, resulting in opinions and ideological claims, not education. At the very least, students

and colleagues should be encouraged to ask questions about such opinions and ideological claims, as well as of all analyses. That would be expected of any topic addressed in the

classroom, including the politics and history of the Middle East.

Those supporting Israel and Jews, whether or not Jews themselves, are being silenced, ignored and intimidated in classrooms and social media associated with University student groups.

Public U H employees have publicly celebrated as "heroic resistance" the rape, execution, and kidnapping of civilians.

In many instances, the wall separating criticism of Israel as a government and nation on one side and antisemitism on the other has been breached. We can ask three questions among

many about the two sides of the wall: Is criticism of Israel and Jews fueled by a Double-Standard, Demonization and Delegitimization. The answer to that trinity is more often than not "yes"

on today's campus.

Has the University taken a strong enough stand opposing these expressions of hatred and if not, would it have done so if the targets of such bile were members of a different group?

Respectfully submitted,

Prof Peter H Hoffenberg
Department of History
U H Manoa

[Your Testimony \(pdf or word\)](#)

No file attached

Public Testimony Form - University of Hawaii Board of Regents

Please provide your testimony on this form for the next University of Hawaii Board of Regents meeting. Make sure you include all the requested information so that the Board of Regents is able to clearly understand the testimony provided.

*****All written testimony submitted are public documents. Therefore, any testimony submitted is public information and will be posted on the board's website.***

Your Name (required) *

Daphne Desser

Your Organization (optional)

University of Hawaii at Manoa

Your e-mail address (in case we need to reach you) *

desser@hawaii.edu

Board of Regents Agenda Item (required) *

Other

Your Position (required) *

Comments Only

Your Testimony/Comments

Regarding "UH and the Mideast:" Research, teaching, and DEI initiatives need to include legitimate research on anti-semitism. Departments in social sciences and the humanities that study various forms of oppression need to include units on anti-semitism by respected scholars in the field. DEI initiatives need to include training and information about how faculty, staff, and students can recognize and respond to anti-semitism. To effectively enable this, we need to hire experts in this field. We also need to hire in the areas of Jewish Studies and Israel Studies. In a campus climate in which many departments in the social sciences and the humanities have embraced BDS, and thus have disallowed perspectives they disagree with, these actions are all the more crucial to maintaining the university's mission as a place where competing perspectives can be aired, discussed, and contended with—not disallowed and silenced.

Your Testimony (pdf or word)

No file attached

Public Testimony Form - University of Hawaii Board of Regents

Please provide your testimony on this form for the next University of Hawaii Board of Regents meeting. Make sure you include all the requested information so that the Board of Regents is able to clearly understand the testimony provided.

*****All written testimony submitted are public documents. Therefore, any testimony submitted is public information and will be posted on the board's website.***

Your Name (required) *

Jaret KC Leong, UH Staff Council Chair

Your Organization (optional)

UH Staff Council (UHSC)

Your e-mail address (in case we need to reach you) *

uhsc@hawaii.edu

Board of Regents Agenda Item (required) *

BOR - VI.C. Report of the Presidential Selection Process Permitted Interaction Group established on October 19, 2023 pursuant to Section 92-2.5(b), Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) (For Information Only – No Board Deliberation or action will occur at this meeting pursuant to Section 92-2.5(b), HRS. Deliberation and decision-making will occur at the December 7, 2023 Special Board Meeting.)

Your Position (required) *

Comments Only

Your Testimony/Comments

Please see the attached testimonial.

Thank you.

Your Testimony (pdf or word)

UH Staff Council Testimonial (November 14, 2023).pdf (687.7 kB)



UH Staff Council (UHSC)

UH Staff Council (UHSC)
Executive Board

Tuesday, November 14, 2023

TO: Board of Regents
University of Hawai'i

FROM: Jaret KC Leong, Chair
UH Staff Council (UHSC)

Referencing the Board of Regents report: **BOR - VI.C. Report of the Presidential Selection Process Permitted Interaction Group established on October 19, 2023 pursuant to Section 92-2.5(b), Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS).**

Before commenting on the report, I would like to introduce the UH Staff Council (UHSC) to the UH Board of Regents - which President Lassner recently approved.

The UHSC is a collection of staff representatives/delegates from all 11 UH campuses (System is regarded as a "campus" within the UHSC with its own staff representatives/delegates). The UH Staff Council serves in an equivalent capacity as similarly recognized UH advisory groups such as the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC), Student Caucus, and Pūko'a Council.

The UHSC Executive Board feels strongly that staff should be included in the UH Presidential Selection Process - and from an early stage. Additionally, we emphasize the importance of continuing the well-established shared governance process at this University.

UH Staff Council | University of Hawai'i
Email | uhsc@hawaii.edu

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution



UH Staff Council (UHSC)

UH Staff Council (UHSC)
Executive Board

We understand that discussion on this topic will only occur at the special BOR meeting on December 7, 2023. However, we wanted to take this opportunity to introduce the UHSC to the BOR and emphasize our commitment to representing the staff at UH. For the December 7th meeting, we anticipate submitting a testimonial that speaks directly to the recommendations by the PIG. Additionally, I have encouraged our campus Staff Senates/Councils to consider submitting their own testimonials at that meeting.

Please feel free to contact me at uhsc@hawaii.edu if you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Aloha,

Jaret KC Leong
UH Staff Council Chair

Attachment | UHSC Charter

UH Staff Council | University of Hawai'i
Email | uhsc@hawaii.edu

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

CHARTER OF THE UH STAFF COUNCIL (UHSC) UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

PREAMBLE

The UH Staff Council (UHSC) of the University of Hawai'i (UH) promotes the system of shared governance grounded in the pursuit of collegiality and transparency.

The UHSC is committed to the betterment of the university and is responsible for collaborating with the Administration in the development, review, and implementation of university policies and operations that impact and concern UH staff.

In recognition of the importance of Staff Senates throughout the University of Hawai'i in promoting shared governance and cooperative relationships among the staff, faculty, students, administration, and Board of Regents, the Staff Senates hereby establish the University of Hawai'i UH Staff Council (UHSC).

ARTICLE I PURPOSE AND FUNCTION OF THE UHSC

Section 1. Purpose

In sharing responsibility with the Administration, faculty, and students to attain the mission and goals of UH, the UHSC shall:

- Serve as the formal and independent voice for all UH staff members;
- Provide a platform for the exchange and coordination of information between staff, administrators, faculty, and students;
- Seek updates from administrators on a regular basis regarding matters that impact UH staff;
- Make recommendations and lend expertise to the UH President, UH Vice Presidents, and Staff Senates on institutional matters of direct staff concern;
- Cooperatively recommend staff representatives to serve on UH System-wide committees; and
- Foster a culture of respect and community among all employees at UH.

Section 2. Function

The Council shall serve as a channel of communication between UH staff and administrators on procedural and operational issues of UH-wide concern that may be raised by either the Senate or the Administration.

The Council shall serve in an equivalent capacity as similarly recognized UH System advisory groups such as the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs, Student Caucus, and Pūko'a Council.

Communications between the UHSC, UH Administration, and/or the Board of Regents shall be conducted through the UHSC Co-Chairs. The UHSC Co-Chairs shall serve on advisory groups to the UH President and senior leadership and as the official Senate representative to the Administration.

The primary responsibility for policy recommendations resides in individual Senates; therefore, recommendations of the UHSC shall not supersede policies of the individual Campus Staff Senates and consultation with the UHSC shall not of itself obviate the need for the Administration to consult with the individual Staff Senates.

In carrying out the aforementioned functions and responsibilities, the UHSC shall amend its Charter and Bylaws as it may deem necessary.

ARTICLE II ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF HRS CHAPTER 89

Section 1. The UHSC, as a group or as a senator, shall not act as the exclusive representatives for any UHSC employment group or assume any responsibilities provided for under Hawai'i Revised Statutes (HRS) Chapter 89 when participating in any University business.

Section 2. Any agreement negotiated by the University of Hawai'i, Board of Regents (BOR) with a duly authorized bargaining agent under Chapter 89 of the Hawai'i Revised Statutes and statutes administrative regulation, policies and procedures of the State of Hawai'i, BOR, UH System, shall supercede any conflicting provisions of this Charter.

ARTICLE III
AMENDMENTS & RATIFICATION TO THE CHARTER

Section 1. UHSC Chair shall give a 30-day notice to the UHSC membership of the proposed amendment and meeting date.

Section 2. There shall be a quorum at this meeting and the proposed amendment shall pass by a two-thirds vote.

Section 3. UHSC Co-Chairs shall send the pending approval amendment to the President of the University of Hawai'i for approval. Upon approval, the President of the University of Hawai'i shall notify the UHSC Co-Chairs in writing regarding the decision on the pending approval amendment.

APPROVED: David Lassner 2 June 2023
David Lassner, Ph.D. Date
President, University of Hawai'i



testimony from Kapi'olani Community College

S Pope <spope@hawaii.edu>
To: bor.testimony@hawaii.edu
Cc: Cheryl Miyahara <cherylmi@hawaii.edu>

Tue, Nov 14, 2023 at 2:17 PM

Testimony from the Staff Council at Kapi'olani Community College is attached.

Mahalo e Malama pono

2 attachments

 **signedTestimony_StaffCouncil_11-16-2023.pdf**
71K

 **Testimony_StaffCouncil_11-16-2023.pdf**
38K



UNIVERSITY of HAWAII®
KAPI'OLANI
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Engage. Learn. Achieve.

Staff Council
SENT ELECTRONICALLY:
BOR.TESTIMONY@HAWAII.EDU

November 14, 2023

University of Hawai'i Board of Regents
2444 Dole Street, Bachman Hall, Room 209
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822

Testimony Regarding Staff Participation in the Executive Search for the University of
Hawai'i President

Dear Char Nahale-a, Vice Chair Lee, Vice Chair Wilson, and Board of Regents Members,

The Kapi'olani Community College Staff Council is the authorized governance organization representing over 150 staff members, including clerical, auxiliary services, and administrative, professional, and technical (APT) staff. We were founded in 2000 to represent the staff voice on governance matters, including the hiring process for executive managerial employees.

Kapi'olani Community College's Staff Council encourages the Permitted Interaction Group spearheading the search for candidates for the University of Hawaii President to include staff representatives in the forthcoming executive search committee. Staff are among the four recognized constituents in the University of Hawaii's shared governance and is represented by the systemwide UH Staff Council, who is urging staff representatives from the ten campuses to testify in support of the inclusion of staff in the search for the next leader for our University.

We also encourage you to include representatives from the community colleges, as we comprise seven of the ten UH campuses serving over 24,000 (more than half) students enrolled statewide. Our academic mission and purpose are aligned with the University's strategic directions and have unique needs and contributions given the geographic diversity of the populations we serve.

Thank you for your consideration.

S. Pope



Cheryl Miyahara
Chair, Staff Council
Kapi'olani Community College

4303 Diamond Head Road, Kalia 101
Honolulu Hawai'i 96816-4221
Telephone: (808) 734-9365
Email: askstaff@hawaii.edu

Public Testimony Form - University of Hawaii Board of Regents

Please provide your testimony on this form for the next University of Hawaii Board of Regents meeting. Make sure you include all the requested information so that the Board of Regents is able to clearly understand the testimony provided.

*****All written testimony submitted are public documents. Therefore, any testimony submitted is public information and will be posted on the board's website.***

Your Name (required) *

Hannah Manshel

Your Organization (optional)

UH Manoa

Your e-mail address (in case we need to reach you) *

hmanshel@hawaii.edu

Board of Regents Agenda Item (required) *

BOR - VI.D. Recommendation to Approve Amendments to Board of Regents Policy (RP) 9.202 Classification Plans and Compensation Schedules, RP 9.213 Evaluation of Board of Regents' Appointees, and RP 9.214 Teaching Assignments for Instructional Faculty to Address the Administration's Recommendations in Response to Hawaii's State Legislature's Senate Concurrent Resolution 201 SD1 HD1

Your Position (required) *

Oppose

Your Testimony/Comments

***The proposals to amend the policies go well beyond the scope that was requested by [the joint Senate and House resolution SCR 201 SD1 HD1](#). The changes in policies restructure our work, formalize jobs with no tenure, and attack tenure under the cover of SCR 201 and public accountability.**

***The sweeping changes proposed by RP 9.202 (Reclassification of faculty), RP 213 (Teaching and workload assignments), and RP 9.214 (Evaluation of BOR appointees with drastic changes to periodic reviews of tenured faculty)**

were not requested by the joint senate and house resolution.

RP 9.202 Classification Plans and Compensation Schedules

Object to III E

*The proposed EP based on the proposed RP creates tenure-eligible and non-tenure eligible faculty. The EP lists positions that do not appear in the UHPA-BOR 2021-2025 CBA Article XII, which lists those appointments not eligible for tenure. The RP opens the door to institutionalize precarious non-tenure track jobs, including I2B-D (proposed in the new 4-year faculty classification)

*The combination of diverse faculty endeavors at UHM in the name of aligning them with other 4-year universities is ill-conceived. It abolished S-faculty and shows no understanding of the richness that S-faculty bring to the university.

RP 9.213 Evaluation of BOR Appointees

Object to III B

The disturbing changes proposed are the directives to conduct periodic review of tenured faculty.

*The proposal for conducting periodic reviews and enacting remedial measures is a huge overreach. These measures trend toward eroding tenure and strengthening the power of management.

*Currently, tenured faculty are evaluated by chairs, and the EPs propose detailed steps that are tantamount to administrators making personnel policy.

*The proposal centralizes the administrator's authority, seriously undermining the authority of units and chairs to develop personnel policies that govern peer review and evaluation of tenured colleagues. This top-down process will mean that units will have to revise the language in their existing T&P criteria (last approved by UHPA in 2015).

*The UHPA-BOR CBA lays out the amendment of procedures in Article X D. There is a chain that ends with union review and approval for amendments.

*The BOR is out of step with these established procedures. We as faculty formulate personnel policies that then go up the chain.

FYI Here is the RP language:

"In alignment with EP 9.203, each campus will develop a written protocol for addressing declining faculty performance that involves a process whereby faculty whose performance is declining will be provided with an opportunity to improve performance leading into the periodic review process."

RP 9.214 Teaching and Workload Assignments

*Both the conceptual framework for workload equivalencies and the actual authorization of equivalencies have been moved to the Provost level. This is a gross centralization of authority and a departure from the precedent of Chair-level authority.

*These policies must be developed at the unit level since the assignment of teaching, research, and service varies by unit.

*None of the administrators could articulate "measurements" of "productivity" across faculty and departments would achieve for the multidimensional and complex work faculty at UHM does. This work cannot be siloed in the ways that have been proposed. The way in which workload equivalencies are being imagined by administrators and abetted by the BOR will certainly weaken UHM, and we have evidence of that from the Australian academy.

Demand that BOR adopt the existing language in the “[Joint Statement of the University of Hawai‘i \(UH\) and the University of Hawai‘i Professional Assembly \(UHPA\) on systemwide guidance for the promulgation of workload policies and workload assignments.](#)”

Object to III C

***There are no guardrails that protect units and faculty that may be seen as “underperforming” given the way in which the administrators, authorized by the proposed RP, are developing workload and work equivalency.**

Object to III D

***UHPA-BOR CBA UHPA CBA Article IV B. 3 has clear language on the authority of the chair to determine workload and work assignment with faculty. The BOR proposal impacts the CBA.**

FYI here is the language:

“Campuses are required to have clear designations for teaching equivalencies for non-teaching activities and for any teaching that occurs beyond credit-bearing courses.”

11-month appointments: your workload will be measured at 30 semester credit hours per academic year at the University of Hawai‘i Mānoa. Please search for MFS SCR 201 to access the google drive folder for details on this.

SCR 201 was directed at non-instructional faculty and researchers. The administration and the BOR are widening this to all of us.

[Your Testimony \(pdf or word\)](#)

No file attached



Testimony - BOR Agenda dated 11/16/23 - Item VI.D

1 message

Sarah Yap <sarahyap@hawaii.edu>
To: bor.testimony@hawaii.edu

Mon, Nov 13, 2023 at 12:52 PM

Hello - Please see attached testimony for the BOR meeting on 11/16/23. Thanks.

--

Sarah Yap
Director of Student Events and Campus Life Services
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Office of Student Life and Development
[2465 Campus Road](#), CC208
Honolulu, HI 96822

(808)956-4832

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this email and any attachments may be privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure. Any disclosure, distribution or copying of this email or any attachments by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the message and deleting this email and any attachments from your system. Thank you for your cooperation.



Testimony for BOR Meeting November 23 -.docx

13K

November 13, 2023

Sarah Yap
Faculty Specialist

RE: Testimony against BOR Agenda Item VI; D – Approval of Amendments to Board of Regents Policy (RP) 9.202 Classification Plans and Compensation Schedules

To Honorable Members of the Board of Regents,

I am opposed to the recommendations for revision of RP 9.202 Classification Plans and Compensation Schedules because it clearly overlooks the work and contribution of S-Faculty in this institution. Firstly, it demeans the work of non-classroom teaching even though, in its definition of “teaching”, the out of classroom or non-traditional teaching appears to meet this definition. S-Faculty work is completely eliminated even within the non-tenure track specifications. Other non-tenure track positions that have less teaching specificities are included in this reclassification and are provided “exemptions”. It is demeaning and disheartening because this institution has chosen to silence the work of S-faculty in meeting the University’s mission to educate students. These reclassifications revisions do not even attempt to recognize how S-Faculty work embodies developing and readying students beyond their University pursuits.

Please reconsider these sweeping changes.

Thank you for your consideration.



Testimony on BOR AGENDA ITEM IV D

1 message

S. Shankar <sshankarwriter@gmail.com>
To: bor.testimony@hawaii.edu

Mon, Nov 13, 2023 at 2:58 PM

Dear BOR of UH:

I am faculty at UHM and write to object to the amendments to the Regents Policy at multiple levels. These policies aimed at faculty classifications, post-tenure review and other aspects of faculty work will erode tenure and casualize academic labor at UH. A university is an instructional as well as knowledge producing institution--both activities are strong when you have stable and secure employment conditions. Employer certainly has the right and the duty to ensure that faculty are performing but this is best done by establishing accountability procedures that empower members of academic disciplines (who know those disciplines best) rather than management, most of whom have never taught or researched or are many years removed from any knowledge of teaching or research.

In brief, the proposals to amend the policies go well beyond the scope of what was requested by [the joint Senate and House resolution SCR 201 SD1 HD1](#). The changes in policies restructure our work, formalize jobs with no tenure, and attack tenure under the cover of SCR 201 and public accountability.

The sweeping changes proposed by RP 9.202 (Reclassification of faculty), RP 213 (Teaching and workload assignments), and RP 9.214 (Evaluation of BOR appointees with drastic changes to periodic reviews of tenured faculty) were not requested by the joint senate and house resolution.

If enacted, the sum total of the proposed changes will be to gut UH as a premier institution of instruction and research. We will not be able to attract and retain talented faculty and will be severely compromised in our ability to not only prepare workers for the workforce but citizens for a free and thoughtful society. These proposed changes are extremely short sighted. They are a grab for power by management, when great universities thrive in a proper balance of power that includes robust faculty governance. Please reject these changes.

Thank you for reading.

-Shankar

S. Shankar
sshankar.net



Testimony opposing RP 9.202, 9.213 and 9.214

1 message

Monisha Das Gupta <dasgupta@hawaii.edu>
To: bor.testimony@hawaii.edu

Mon, Nov 13, 2023 at 3:47 PM

Dear Regents, I am writing to express my opposition to the following numbered items in RP 9.202, 9.213, and 9.214.

Overall, The proposals to amend the policies go well beyond the scope of the joint [Senate and House resolution SCR 201 SD1 HD1](#). The changes in the policies a) restructure academic work, b) formalize jobs with no tenure, thereby further casualizing academic labor, and c) attack tenure in the form of new administrator-driven measures for periodic review of tenured faculty. The policies transfer and concentrate power in the hands of administrators to erode faculty governance. They also profoundly impact the UHPA-BOR 2021-2025 Collective Bargaining Agreement (henceforth CBA).

The most generous interpretation of your and President Lassner's efforts is that you are buckling under the political pressure of a handful of legislators in the name of transparency and public accountability. Regretfully, I see that these larger goals of restructuring the university in ways that undermine it and our academic functions have endured since I submitted testimony on these issues in 2021 and since the appointment of a new cast of regents. The changes you wish to execute remain sweeping and damaging. They harm UHM's ability, as the only R1 university in the state, to attract and retain faculty.

Please see my objections organized by policy.

RP 9.202 Classification Plans and Compensation Schedules

I object to III E

The RP opens the door to a host of positions now listed as non-tenure eligible faculty in the proposed EP. The EP lists positions that do not appear in the UHPA-BOR 2021-2025 CBA Article XII. It institutionalizes the precarity of I2B-D (proposed in the new 4-year faculty classification) by classifying them as non-tenure track. Administrators are increasingly pushing hires in these I2 classifications instead of securing t-track positions when tenure-track or tenured faculty resign or retire. The policy is obviously a cost-cutting measure aimed at creating contingent faculty to be renewed year to year (which also increases the service workload of the unit's personnel committee).

The combination of diverse faculty classifications at UHM in the name of aligning them with other 4-year universities in the state is ill-conceived. It abolishes S-faculty and shows no understanding of the richness that S-faculty bring to the university.

RP 9.213 Evaluation of BOR Appointees

I object to III B

The proposal for conducting periodic reviews and enacting remedial measures constitutes a stunning overreach. These measures centralize the power of management, seriously undermining the authority of units and chairs to develop personnel policies that govern the evaluation of tenured colleagues. Currently, tenured faculty are evaluated by chairs, and the EP in response to this proposed RP details steps that are tantamount to administrators making personnel policy instead of units. This sets a dangerous precedent and is not acceptable. The proposed policy change is out of step with the established procedures to make changes in personnel policies as outlined in the CBA Article X D.

RP 9.214 Teaching and Workload Assignments

My teaching, research, and service are already being measured at 24-semester credit hours per academic year as a 9-mo faculty member at the University of Hawai'i Mānoa in the form of a work assignment template filled out by my chairs in consultation with each faculty member.

Furthermore, we have a "[Joint Statement of the University of Hawai'i \(UH\) and the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly \(UHPA\) on systemwide guidance for the promulgation of workload policies and workload assignments.](#)"

The language proposed in the RP does not reflect this language or the spirit of this existing agreement. Instead, it has proposed a policy that is conceptually flawed and predictably, in a blatant centralization of power, proposes to move the actual authorization of the equivalencies to the Provost level at UHM. I urge the regents to return to the drawing board and incorporate the language in the statement.

None of those who have developed the new work equivalency template at the campus level could articulate what standardizing the "measurements" of "productivity" and non-instructional activities across faculty classifications and departments would achieve for the multidimensional and complex work faculty at UHM do. How workload equivalencies are imagined by administrators and the BOR will certainly weaken UHM, and we have evidence of that from the Australian academy. Please understand that my testimony is our instructional and non-instructional work transparent to the public but the authorization of equivalencies to the provost.

I object to III C

The requirement that the UH President's report should include, "at minimum, the percentage of the work assignment that is instruction and *the percentage of faculty who meet the work assignment requirements* [emphasis mine]" comes with no guardrails to protect faculty whose work is complex and cannot be fully captured by the proposed template.

I object to III D

The CBA Article IV B. 3 has clear language on the authority of the chair to determine workload and work assignment with faculty. The BOR proposal impacts the CBA.

As you consider voting on these policies, I would like you to answer the following questions:

1. Did you attend a publicly funded university?
2. Did you know the scope of faculty labor as an undergraduate and/or graduate student?

3. Did you know your professor also produced peer-reviewed research? Outside of the lab setting of hard sciences, did you know where or how they produced that research?
4. Were you aware of the types of university and professional service your professors performed?
5. How many deadbeat professors did you encounter in your undergraduate/ graduate education?
6. What were the demographics of the faculty at the higher education institution you attended? Are you aware of the current demographics of the faculty at UH?
7. Do you think your undergraduate education and graduate education (if you went for a postgraduate degree) have anything to do with your serving as a regent today?
8. Can you imagine the faculty you encountered in college/ university bean counting their work? Had they done that, would that have made them better professors, better researchers, and better citizens of the university?

Your undergraduate and graduate days may be hazy. And yes, higher education has changed since you attended college/university. But the crisis in higher education cannot be managed by policing and surveilling us and demeaning our work. Since we got the notification about the revised RPs and EPs on September 19, I have been teaching my wonderful group of undergraduate and graduate students with my usual dedication. I am advising undergraduate and graduate students. I finished my book and completed various tasks so that the book could go into production. I am serving on three faculty personnel committees in addition to my regular service load. In addition to all of this, I spent many additional hours researching these policies, their impact on our CBA, and most importantly, their impact on the future of the university.

You don't have to monitor my work or the work of my other equally dedicated and overextended colleagues. Unlike many other public universities, we have no incentives in the form of merit increases to labor in this fashion. And yet, we do.

I ask each regent to vote "No" on the items above.

Respectfully.

Dr. Monisha Das Gupta
Professor, Departments of Ethnic Studies and Women, Gender, & Sexuality Studies
306 George Hall
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
Pronouns in Bengali, my vernacular, are not gendered.
Pronouns in English: she/her



Testimony for BOR agenda item IV D

1 message

Cynthia Franklin <cfrankli@hawaii.edu>
To: BOR Testimony <bor.testimony@hawaii.edu>

Mon, Nov 13, 2023 at 5:34 PM

I am writing to contest the Amendments to Board of Regents Policy (RP)9.202 Classification Plans and Compensation Schedules, RP 9.213 Evaluation of Board of Regents' Appointees, and RP 9.214 Teaching Assignments for Instructional Faculty to Address the Administration's Recommendations in Response to Hawaii'i State Legislature's Senate Concurrent Resolution 201 SD1 HD1.

The proposals to amend the policies exceed the scope that was requested by [the joint Senate and House resolution SCR 201 SD1 HD1](#). The changes in policies restructure our work, formalize jobs with no tenure, and attack tenure under the cover of SCR 201 and public accountability.

Objection to III E

The RP opens the door to institutionalize precarious non-tenure track jobs, including I2B-D (proposed in the new 4-year faculty classification).
Abolishing S-faculty also impoverishes the university.

Objection to III B

The proposal for conducting periodic reviews and enacting remedial measures is a huge overreach, one that erodes faculty governance and tenure, while strengthening the power of management. Management lacks the understanding that Chairs have, and puts power in the hands of administrators who lack the knowledge or expertise to evaluate faculty.

RP 9.214 Teaching and Workload Assignments: this is again a huge overreach of administrative power and an assault on faculty governance as it departs from the precedent of Chair-level authority.

Workload policies vary unit by unit and should be developed by those who understand their units. A uniform and centralized approach will weaken the excellence of the university, creating an inability to assess the different work that different units engage in.

Instead, the BOR should adopt the existing language in the "[Joint Statement of the University of Hawai'i \(UH\) and the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly \(UHPA\) on systemwide guidance for the promulgation of workload policies and workload assignments](#)."

Objection to III C

IIIC affords no protections to units and faculty that may be seen as "underperforming" given the way in which the administrators, authorized by the proposed RP, are developing workload and work equivalency.

Objection to III D

UHPA-BOR CBA UHPA CBA Article IV B. 3 has clear language on the authority of the chair to determine workload and work assignment with faculty. The BOR proposal impacts the CBA.

SCR 201 was directed at non-instructional faculty and researchers. The administration and the BOR are widening this to all of us.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia Franklin

Cynthia Franklin (she/her)

Professor
Co-Editor, *Biography: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly*
Department of English (KUY 224)
University of Hawai'i
1733 [Donaghho Road](#)
[Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822](#)
cfrankli@hawaii.edu

Public Testimony Form - University of Hawaii Board of Regents

Please provide your testimony on this form for the next University of Hawaii Board of Regents meeting. Make sure you include all the requested information so that the Board of Regents is able to clearly understand the testimony provided.

*****All written testimony submitted are public documents. Therefore, any testimony submitted is public information and will be posted on the board's website.***

Your Name (required) *

Teresa Bill

Your Organization (optional)

Your e-mail address (in case we need to reach you) *

tbill@hawaii.edu

Board of Regents Agenda Item (required) *

BOR - VI.D. Recommendation to Approve Amendments to Board of Regents Policy (RP) 9.202 Classification Plans and Compensation Schedules, RP 9.213 Evaluation of Board of Regents' Appointees, and RP 9.214 Teaching Assignments for Instructional Faculty to Address the Administration's Recommendations in Response to Hawaii'i State Legislature's Senate Concurrent Resolution 201 SD1 HD1

Your Position (required) *

Oppose

Your Testimony/Comments

I, as an Assistant Faculty Specialist, OPPOSE the complete elimination of the Specialist Faculty classification. The consultation process has been flawed from the start without significant faculty nor specialist input.

This re-classification plan was designed to abolish Specialists, and it does - sending a clear message to non-classroom instructional colleagues that their "teaching" and engagement in student support services (my area) is not valued. Current Faculty Specialists are concerned about their future colleagues' opportunities, tenure protections and respect within the institution. Concerns regarding the disparate impact on under-represented faculty have not been addressed. The rationale of "aligning" with continental research universities is ill-conceived and denies a broad and diverse definition of teaching.

When an entire category of teaching colleagues (Faculty Specialists without PhD) are eliminated from a tenure option, the employers' ability to undermine tenure for all faculty is writ large.

I am pleased for my colleagues that Extension Agents and Librarians were able to avoid elimination, but their continued separate classification merely highlights that while differences are possible, "Specialists" are too different and were targeted. Completely subsuming Faculty Specialists into (F)aculty with a minimum degree of PhD

- 1) Eliminates tenure protections for a significant number of colleagues whose profession and teaching does not require a PhD. (e.g for Student Affairs, it is not realistic to require the EdD or PhD for entry-level student success when an MA is appropriate).
- 2) An MA as MQ with MA+30 for promotion, then EdD or PhD would parallel Extension Agents & Librarians' paths for advancement.

For continuing Specialists, I am concerned that with a singular (F)aculty classification, how will the faculty peer review process for tenure & promotion work to ensure that "Faculty" teaching in non-classroom / co-curricular settings be fairly evaluated?

[Your Testimony \(pdf or word\)](#)

No file attached

Public Testimony Form - University of Hawaii Board of Regents

Please provide your testimony on this form for the next University of Hawaii Board of Regents meeting. Make sure you include all the requested information so that the Board of Regents is able to clearly understand the testimony provided.

*****All written testimony submitted are public documents. Therefore, any testimony submitted is public information and will be posted on the board's website.***

Your Name (required) *

Heather Greenwood

Your Organization (optional)

CTAHR-Cooperative Extension

Your e-mail address (in case we need to reach you) *

heather8@hawaii.edu

Board of Regents Agenda Item (required) *

BOR - VI.D. Recommendation to Approve Amendments to Board of Regents Policy (RP) 9.202 Classification Plans and Compensation Schedules, RP 9.213 Evaluation of Board of Regents' Appointees, and RP 9.214 Teaching Assignments for Instructional Faculty to Address the Administration's Recommendations in Response to Hawaii's State Legislature's Senate Concurrent Resolution 201 SD1 HD1

Your Position (required) *

Oppose

Your Testimony/Comments

Your Testimony (pdf or word)

Greenwood BOR Testimony 11 15 2023.pdf (123.3 kB)

I am an Associate Extension Agent in the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources (CTAHR), and while the current proposed Faculty Classifications is a significant improvement from previous versions, there are significant problems that need to be addressed prior to approval by the Board of Regents. The following are only a few examples:

- Cooperative Extension Service on Page 3 should either have it's own category (Teaching, Research, Cooperative Extension, Service) OR be incorporated into the language of the "Teaching" and "Research" categories (Cooperative Extension is Non-Formal Teaching/Education AND Applied Research).
- Eliminate "Under general supervision of the County Administrator" under Duties and Responsibilities for A3 and A4 on page 8. County Administrators are Executive Management and do not supervise faculty.
- Eliminate "train volunteer leaders" that is currently listed in the Duties and Responsibilities of A3 faculty. Not all Extension Agent faculty work with volunteers and as such reference volunteers should ONLY be included in individual job descriptions.
- Change ALL "home economics" references to "family and consumer sciences" under Duties and Responsibilities for all Agent classification. Home Economics has not been a field of study in over 30 years.
- Make ALL policies and classifications gender inclusive.
- Completely re-write A5 Duties and Responsibilities so it is structured similarly to A3-A4 and set out commonalities across all subject matter and rely upon the position description to further clarify responsibilities.

It is critical that the Board of Regents of a Land-Grant Institution understand the legislatively mandated mission of Cooperative Extension and I recommend the Board to use an upcoming meeting to for this purpose by inviting representatives of CTAHR-Cooperative Extension and Sea Grant Extension to present on this topic.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Heather Greenwood".

Heather Greenwood