

FINAL REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE BUDGET & PLANNING COMMITTEE

May 7, 2020

The members currently on the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee have served on the committee since fall of 2014. The committee reports of these six years document the efforts by the committee to ensure greater accountability and transparency in budgeting on the Leeward CC campus.

Duties of the Budget and Planning Committee:

The duties of the Budget and Planning Committee are spelled out in the Faculty Senate's bylaws.

BYLAWS

ARTICLE V. Standing Committees

SECTION 3. Budget and Planning Committee

A. Functions

1. Consult with and advise the Administration on matters relating to projected budgets and current expenditure plans.
2. Consult with and advise the Administration on matters relating to future plans for programs, personnel, facilities, and equipment.
3. Work with the Administration to establish goals and monitor progress toward their attainment.
4. Review and make recommendations to the Senate concerning policy relating to campus resource allocation and use.
5. Review and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on the Campus Institutional Priorities (IP).

In addition to the functions listed above, the Budget and Planning Committee needs to safeguard the role of the Faculty Senate in the budgeting process as spelled out in Board of Regents (BOR) policy, the UHPA contract, shared governance documents and the Faculty Senate bylaws. The Faculty Senate can only advise on budgetary matters, administration has the final call. The Budget and Planning Committee needs to promote faculty engagement in the budgeting process by presenting the budget to the Faculty Senate each year and making sure the budget is presented in a way that is

understandable by faculty. The point of contact with administration is the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, currently Mark Lane.

Institutional Priorities List Spring 2020. The Institutional Priorities List has only been routed through the Senate within the last five years. This is an accomplishment that the FS can be proud of. This development has promoted FS engagement in the process. One of the earliest concerns that was shared with our committee was that administration was not communicating to the campus the outcome of the planning lists or the justification for choices made. This is now added to the annual budget. The FS can only rearrange the priorities of the items on the list. The FS cannot add anything. If there are any senators that feel an item should have a higher priority they could request a Senate vote on that item. However, the Budget and Planning Committee feels this planning list is dead on arrival, there won't be increased funding in the next year.

Concerns About the March 13 FS Meeting. The Budget and Planning Committee felt that the March 13 meeting violated the FS rules of order. The present process is to introduce a motion for consideration at one meeting and then vote on it in the next meeting. The idea is to give senators the time to reflect and check with their constituencies. The vote to table the motion should have been made at the following meeting in April, not the March meeting. The special rules of order (under supporting documents) clearly states

As much as possible, motions and resolutions submitted for consideration for a given regular meeting shall be voted on at the next scheduled regular or special meeting of the Faculty Senate. Exceptions can be made for motions and resolutions that the Senate deems urgent. Review of and voting on exceptional motions and resolutions require two-thirds approval of votes cast.

The committee does not think that tabling the motion was appropriate. These procedural gymnastics to prevent the Budget and Planning Committee from bringing forth a motion confused the issue and were undemocratic. The committee was also disappointed that this was one of the few votes in recent years where clickers weren't used. This was an important vote for the Budget and Planning Committee. All our committee was asking for was a level playing field. The move to table the motion by a show of hands was the kind of high-pressure vote that the clickers were meant to do away with. It was a stampede. The lack of anonymity in voting is especially risky for junior faculty members who fear retaliation. Many on the Senate felt that the introduction of the clickers was a very good idea and should be used consistently.

Another irregularity was the Vice Chair contacting members of the committee, to check if they had approved the motion. The committee members were stunned. This was unprecedented. The implication was that the Chair had been less than truthful about his committee's support for the motion.

These incidents show that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was overzealous in trying to prevent the Budget and Planning Committee's motion from being brought to the Senate floor. Other instances were the Chair stating that it was not ready, and that there wasn't adequate support for the motion. The Chair requested that the committee withdraw its motion. This overzealousness was undemocratic and represents a dangerous precedent for the Faculty Senate. The Budget and Planning Committee feels that any senator, and certainly a standing committee, should be able to present a motion to the Faculty Senate for a vote.

At the April 15, 2020 meeting the Budget and Planning Committee was allowed to introduce the following motion only after the wording of the motion was changed:

The Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee requests that the annual Operating Budget (Operational Expenditure Plan) be routed through the Faculty Senate each year, before it is finalized, for review and comment.

The motion did not pass. The final vote was 50% yea, 49% nay, and one abstention.

The Budget and Planning Committee felt strongly that they shouldn't have been required to change the wording of the motion that was already agreed to by the members of the committee. The original wording was "The Faculty Senate requests that the annual Operating Budget (Operational Expenditure Plan) be routed through the Faculty Senate each year, before it is finalized, for review and comment." That motion was supported unanimously by the members of the committee March 10, 2020. The intent of that motion also had the unanimous support of the committee, as evidenced by Recommendation 2 in the committee's February 14, 2020 report.

It is hoped that a future Budget and Planning Committee will be able to get the annual operating budget routed through the Faculty Senate each year in order to institutionalize the Senate's right to review and comment on the budget before it is finalized. It should be attached to the Institutional Priorities List that already passes through the Senate each year.

Turnitin. The Budget and Planning Committee worked hard to keep Turnitin, a plagiarism prevention software, as an option for faculty. Unfortunately, too few faculty members took advantage of this service to continue funding. It seems that most faculty members, if they are checking for plagiarism, use Google search. The few faculty members that used Turnitin found that Turnitin was far more effective at flagging instances of plagiarism than Google search. It is unfortunate that more faculty did not use Turnitin to test how effective their current methods are. Plagiarism is a major problem at Leeward CC, and students are at a disadvantage in their future education if they don't learn how to prevent it.

Leeward Community College Value-Added Product Development Center in Wahiawa. Leeward CC needs to remain vigilant that the State will provide the funding

for this new satellite campus and that it will not become a financial liability for the College.

The Degree to Which Leeward CC Subsidizes Other Campuses. In the past Leeward CC and Kapiolani CC have subsidized smaller campuses such as Windward CC and Kauai CC. With Kapiolani's decline in enrollment and current financial difficulties the degree to which Leeward CC subsidizes other campuses needs to be discussed.

If the Faculty Senate goes back to a situation where administration is again not allowing the Faculty Senate to review and comment on the budget, the committee recommends that the Senate introduce a motion asking the Board of Regents to clarify BOR policy as it relates to the role of the Faculty Senate in the budgeting process. This was a recommendation made by UHPA during the discussion of filing a grievance. At the Faculty Senate meeting of March 16, 2016, Kalbert Young, UH VP of Budget and Finance, recommended that the Faculty Senate contact the BOR secretary for clarification of BOR policy. Too much time was wasted in the last six years with an unresponsive administration stonewalling the Budget and Planning Committee's requests for greater transparency and greater engagement in the budgeting process. Much progress was made under the tenure of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Della Teraoka, however the Faculty Senate's right to review and comment on the budget should not be dependent on a single administrator. Under VCAA Teraoka's leadership the shared governance document was revised and a mechanism put in place for the Faculty Senate to add items to the budget. Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services Mark Lane posted the annual budgets on the Administrative Services website. He developed graphics and a financial analysis that showed the trends of different accounts over time. These changes made the budget more understandable to a wider cross section of the campus community. However, a budget is projected spending not actual spending. The budgets for the last six years are listed on the Administrative Services website but there is no record of what actual spending was.

The coronavirus has taken a terrific toll on Hawaii's economy, with 38% unemployment and discussion of a 20% pay cut for State workers. Going forward the Faculty Senate needs to be engaged with the budgeting process more than ever. There is a chance that some of us will be out of a job this time next year. Generations of faculty activism are enshrined in Board of Regents Policy, the UHPA contract, shared governance documents and the Faculty Senate's own bylaws which clearly spell out a role for the Faculty Senate in the budgeting process. At Leeward CC, much of that progress was lost as a result of faculty apathy.

Report submitted by Eileen Cain, Paul Lococo and Stan May.