

2014-2015 FACULTY SENATE BUDGET & PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

May 6, 2015

The Faculty Senate has an important role to play in ensuring greater transparency and greater accountability in the budgeting process at Leeward Community College. The Faculty Senate cannot fulfill its role of helping to set campus priorities if it cannot provide input into the budget. Where the money goes is the truest indicator of the college's priorities and there needs to be a much better understanding within the campus community about what those priorities are.

There is a long history of shared governance between faculty and administration at the university level. Unfortunately in recent years there has been a steady erosion in shared governance, partly due to a lack of vigilance by faculty. This has occurred against a backdrop of some disturbing trends in higher education including soaring tuition costs, the move towards replacing tenured instructors with adjunct faculty, and the dramatic increase in administrative costs. Faculty needs to take its shared governance duties seriously.

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 where 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 the 2013-2014 academic year. The committee will investigate the reasons why BOR policy has not been followed.

The committee has met resistance from administration on several occasions concerning whether the Faculty Senate is allowed to provide direct input into the campus budget. The committee feels strongly that the Board of Regents Policy and the recent Memorandum of Agreement Regarding the Roles and Consultation Protocols Involving UH Management, UH Professional Assembly, and UH Faculty Senates give faculty senates this role:

Board of Regents Policy Chapter 1

Section 1-10: Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development.

b. Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development

It is the policy of the University to maintain and strengthen organized and systematic involvement by faculty in academic decision-making and policy development.

2. The duly authorized organization specified by each charter shall have the responsibility to speak for the faculty on academic policy matters such as:

b. budget planning and implementation

5. The role of the faculty as set forth herein shall not be delegated to any other entity by the faculty organization established pursuant to this policy.

Memorandum of Agreement Regarding the Roles and Consultation Protocols Involving UH Management, UH Professional Assembly, and UH Faculty Senates Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senates on each campus shall have responsibility for deliberation and providing advice to administration on

7) Review of the University and/or campus mission, strategic planning directions and goals, and related budget and assessment decisions. This responsibility may be exercised through campus budget and/or planning committees that may include additional shared governance entities.

In discussion with J.N. Musto, Executive Director of UHPA, during his February 19 visit to Leeward CC, he was adamant that the Faculty Senate had the right to review and provide input into the entire campus budget. The rights of the Faculty Senate in this respect are tied to the collective bargaining agreement by the MOA. If the administration does not abide by the MOA, such a violation would be grievable.

The loss of the Faculty Senate's role in the budgeting process is a cautionary tale. The original justification was that the Campus Council would be more inclusive of all campus constituencies. Faculty Senate would have two representatives on the Campus Council. 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 Memorandum of Agreement it appears there is strong support to bring the entire budget back into the Senate for review and input.

The dynamics are very different between the Campus Council and the Faculty Senate. Faculty Senators are elected by their peers to represent them on issues that come before the Senate. Meetings of the Campus Council generally consist of reports delivered by administrators; it is very rare that there are the spirited discussions of issues that typify discourse in the Faculty Senate.

At the March 18, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Senate Stanley May, the FS Budget and Planning Committee Chair, introduced the following motion: "On behalf of the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee I would like to make a motion to request that the entire campus budget come to the Faculty Senate for review and input." The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimously in favor of the motion.

Thanks to the cooperation of Mark Lane, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, at the April 15, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Senate the planning lists for the first time in many years passed through the Faculty Senate for input and a vote before proceeding on to the Campus Council.

In reviewing the Institutional Priorities List and in discussion with faculty members, 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. The FS Budget and Planning Committee feels strongly that there needs to be notification to the campus community about what was funded and what was not funded on the planning lists each year. A lot of people on this campus were very surprised to hear that nothing had been funded in the last three years.

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.

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.

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? One body on campus at least should be conducting a formal review of the entire budget, not just the planning lists. It is difficult to be a good steward of resources without knowledge of the entire budget.

In the coming academic year the FS Budget and Planning Committee will 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 no doubt be very interested in the progress that Leeward CC has made thanks to the UHPA Memorandum of Agreement. 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.