REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE BUDGET & PLANNING COMMITTEE

April 15, 2015

The Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee had the following comments based on review of the Institutional Priorities List:

There seems to be a feeling that the resource list becomes a "black hole" after it leaves the divisions and no one is quite sure about the process after that. There appears to be unease on the campus regarding how the resources list is generated and vetted. Do the various constituencies on campus feel that they have adequate input into the development of the Institutional Prioritized Resource Request List? There is also a feeling that the whole request list is meaningless when year after year the lists are not funded, however, people feel compelled to create the lists because they are told that if their request isn't on the list it can't be funded. There needs to be notification to the campus community about what was funded and what was not funded on the planning lists. A lot of people were very surprised to hear that nothing had been funded in the last three years.

Do the planning lists represent all changes in spending as compared to the prior year? Are there any changes in spending occurring from year to year that are not reflected in the planning lists? Planning lists are for future funding and do not represent any spending compared to the prior years, so having items funded that are not on the list would be very important to identify. Following is Mark Lane's response to this question:

> The planning lists are requests for additional funds or positions only above and beyond the existing expenditure base (or budget) that the divisions or units presently receive. The planning lists do not represent a financial analysis of revenues, expenditures, cash balances, etc. or a comparison of prior year's performance to the current year. That kind of information and resource-justification should be discussed at the division or unit level before rising to the level of being incorporated into the institution's planning list.

Because only the top five priorities from each division are considered, the process is strongly skewed towards big ticket items; that is why something very worthwhile like Turnitin.com falls through the cracks.

Approving planning lists annually has a cumulative effect over time on the total budget. The college seem to focus only on the planning lists in a current year but not how they may be changing the relative proportions in the total budget over time. What is the cumulative impact over time? Some body on campus needs to review the entire budget, not just the planning lists. It is difficult to be a good steward of resources without knowledge of the entire budget.

The committee expressed concerns about the #1 priority on the All Personnel tab in the Institutional Priorities spreadsheet, the Title IX Compliance Officer.   President Lassner has stressed the need for more of a systems approach rather than an individual campus approach to realize greater efficiencies. There are vast differences in size between campuses; is each campus, going to have a separate Title IX Compliance Officer? It seems like such a critical, highly skilled position, comparable to an in-house counsel. There is always the threat of liability for the University. Would this function be better centralized at the University level for a more consistent, better coordinated approach? Following is Mark Lane's response:

> The "Compliance Officer" position being recommended in our planning list comprises not only Title IX responsibilities which are many and varied, but also VAWA - violence against women's act, Clery Act - campus crime reporting and policies, ADA 504 - americans with disabilities act and accommodation, etc. It is not strictly a Title IX position compliance position - although that would be one of the position's primary responsibilities. All of these federal mandates and responsibilities have been added on to existing administrative and staff positions and their workloads. The best practice models being used in higher education are having a dedicated professional (usually someone with a law degree or equivalent) knowledgeable or an expert in these emerging fields, handle these responsibilities at the campus level. The risk of non-compliance is simply too great of a liability for the campuses to assume without having adequate levels of professional staff to manage these programs. Other UH campuses are addressing this issue with "professionalizing" their staff. For instance, UHWO just hired a "compliance position" and UH-Manoa has requested additional resources from the legislature to do the same. The seven community college chancellors are all on board with this need as well.

> While I concur with some points about the system level responsibilities and accountability - the fact of the matter is that the "system" is not a campus or an institution...the "system" is not an accredited body...and the "system" is not responsible for dealing directly with Title IX cases or Clery reporting or timely warning notifications should something terribly go wrong on one of our campuses. The "system" approach is helpful in ensuring that some general guidance, direction, and consistency is applied across the 10-campus system - usually in the policy development arena - but beyond that, the accountability and responsibility lies entirely at the campus level for compliance. And without adequate staffing to fulfill our federal mandated responsibilities, the liability of non-compliance is too great to ignore. Recognizing that my arguments thus far have been strictly related to our compliance responsibilities, we have a greater campus community responsibility in ensuring that our students, faculty, and staff; 1) are safe, 2) are educated, 3) are supported, and 4) are given

the resources necessary should they be a victim or accused of victimizing others.

The committee feels that the Faculty Senate has a strong role to play in ensuring greater transparency and greater accountability in the budgeting process at Leeward CC. Originally the entire campus budget passed through the Faculty Senate for review and a vote. This is the process specified in the BOR policy. Over time the role of the Faculty Senate became severely eroded to the point last academic year where Mike Pecsok stated that the Faculty Senate could have no direct input into the budgeting process. This was in response to the Faculty Senate's request for funding for Turnitin.com in 2013/2014. The committee will investigate why the BOR policy has not been followed.

The Faculty Senate's two votes on the Campus Council represent a drastic reduction in faculty input into the budget as compared to the earlier process. With the UHPA MOA it appears there is strong support to bring the budget back into the Senate for review and input. One body on campus at least should be conducting a formal review of the entire budget, not just the planning lists.

The committee would like to coordinate with other campuses in the system as work continues to expand the Faculty Senate's role in the budgeting process. Other campuses face the same challenges as the Leeward CC campus and would be very interested in the progress that Leeward CC has made thanks to the UHPA MOA. The committee will also investigate the process that is followed by the faculty senates that still review their campus budgets. Shared governance should not be a buzzword, but an actual action that we should all strive towards.