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AIC on Administrative Instability & Turnover
Progress Report (April 1, 2003)

1. Summary of the original problem:

The committee on administrative instability has determined the following based on the findings of the committee reports in 1994 and 2000. The 1994 report states

8.2 The team recommends that the College and System stabilize the administrative staff of the College to insure the continuity and effectiveness of leadership, as well as limiting the disruption to the operating and planning procedures caused by frequent changes in the administrative staff. (8C)

Some members of the committee were worried that the problem might have been overstated in the 1994 report and, with the instability which occurred in 2000, the problem may seem worse than it is. Nevertheless, the committee has taken its task very seriously and has done its best to analyze whatever problems exist.

The 2000 report recommended:

8. The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses. (Standard 10B.4)

The 2000 report, however, has some validity because several administrative positions had temporary occupants due to unusual conditions. The provost left suddenly for reasons not internal to Leeward Community College after holding her position for one year. The Dean of Instruction became Interim Provost and the Assistant Dean became an Acting Dean of Instruction. To add to the impression of administrative instability our Dean of Students accepted a position on the Manoa campus which meant that a counselor was serving as an Acting Dean. The assistant dean positions by their very nature are likely to be occupied for a shorter period of time than other administrative positions due to the ambitions of those occupants to advance as well as their desires to go back to the classrooms.

2. Present status of the problem:

Because the University of Hawaii and Leeward Community College are going through needed changes, it is necessary that even more acting administrators occupied positions, a problem which should be resolved soon.
The committee believes that administrators are under paid and less prepared than they should be for the position and they do not receive appropriate feedback on their performances.

Further, administrators are over worked and are too confined to their offices, which interferes with keeping in touch with the campus.

Various disparate duties side track them in accomplishing needed tasks.

Necessarily, the composite of these problems, affect the morale of the administrators.

3. Proposal of a solution:

We proposed the following solutions.

That all administrators should be paid a salary equal to or higher than the highest paid faculty member. However, this is a concept and not a rigid formula to aid in determining appropriate administrative pay.

As previously indicated in the report, the committee believes the job may be more attractive if the college offers administrators professional liability insurance.

Problems of inexperience should be addressed. First, internships to faculty and staff interested in becoming administrators should be provided and secondly, on the job training for administrators once they have accepted their positions should be an integral part of the position.

Ongoing evaluations by other administrators and relevant faculty members with feedback to those being evaluated might add to administrative stability. There is now an evaluation process, however, administrators don’t appear to receive enough feedback from the process.

Previously the policy was for the Provost to discuss in some small degree with each administrator his or her evaluations without showing those evaluations to the administrators.

The Provost is still treated in a similar manner by the Chancellor and he is not aware of who his evaluatee group is.

Some pressures relating to working conditions have been minimized for administrators by the hiring of a grant writer and creating temporary positions for publications specialist and a person to make catalog changes and help with related subject matter. Further, a person has been hired as Fund Development Officer.
The President of the University has instituted a recommendation that all administrators are expected to follow, which requires that they spend at least one day a week out of their offices. They may attend meetings, visit various parts of the campus or catch up on needed work at home among other things.

We further recommend that the college make every effort to send administrators to conferences which 1) may be a benefit to the college, and 2) may benefit them individually.

4. Review by the campus community:

The committee plans to share its recommendations with the campus community by individual email or by hardcopy if requested. The nature of the subject, in the opinion of the committee, does not warrant a campus wide meeting.

5. Following a visit to Leeward Community College from October 23-26, 2000, the evaluation team made the following recommendation in its Evaluation Report:

"The team recommends that the college analyze factors that may be contributing to administrative instability and turnover and develop appropriate local responses" (page 7).

This recommendation was a carryover from the 1994 team visit, and this team was concerned that, since that time, the College had had three provosts in two years and numerous deans and assistant deans in acting and interim positions. While the team recognized that there were external factors for this administrative instability that were beyond the College’s control (e.g., budgetary constraints and declining enrollments), the team asked that the College focus on analyzing and modifying the local factors within its control. A specific suggestion was made to give administrators constructive feedback of their strengths and weaknesses so that they could make changes in their areas of weaknesses.

As explained in the College’s 10/7/02 Interim Report, the Accreditation Implementation Committee on Administrative Instability and Turnover studied this recommendation and felt that the instability at this college reflected a national and University of Hawaii system trend of administrative turnover. Nevertheless, the Committee proposed several solutions it felt could help the College’s administrators: pay increases; insurance coverage for professional liability; appropriate on-the-job training and administrative internships; more meaningful and helpful evaluations and feedback for professional growth and improvement; opportunities and funding to attend conferences; and relief from heavy workloads and stressful working conditions through additional staff.

Some of these suggestions, especially those requiring additional funds and system-wide agreements, were not within the College’s control. However, since
the Committee’s suggestions were made, Provost Mark Silliman has tried to implement two of them. The first, administrators receiving constructive feedback on their job performances, was already in progress. All administrators are evaluated every year.

In recent years, the UH administration sends by e-mail to selected faculty and administration a form asking for evaluations of administrators. These evaluations are confidential and those doing the evaluating simply return them after completing the evaluation. Previously, provosts were simply giving verbal comments to administrators. Now, however, Provost Silliman has shown each administrator the evaluations and has allowed them to keep a copy for their own use.

Two administrators consider the new process to be an improvement. None of the others worked as administrators under the old system except that some of them commented favorably on the present plan. Although the provost has asked for such feedback for himself, a response has not been forthcoming from the Chancellor's Office, which evaluates the provosts of all the community colleges.

Leeward administrators are mostly following President Dobelle’s suggestion of spending a day out of their offices. As indicated in the 2000 Report, the AIC Committee recognizes that morale is an important issue and the effect of aforementioned concerns are not yet determined because of the short time of their implementations.

The second suggestion, additional staff to relieve the heavy administrative workload, has proven much more difficult to implement. Provost Silliman appointed a committee to determine if the College’s programs and services would be improved if changes in its organizational structure were made, a move strongly recommended by then-Chancellor Joyce Tsunoda. After its investigations, the Reorganization Committee concluded that changes might be beneficial. However, before going ahead with specific changes at the college level, as had some of the other community colleges, Provost Silliman decided that it would be better to wait until the larger reorganization changes proposed by the newly appointed University of Hawaii System President Evan Dobelle were put into effect.

Under this new UH system reorganization, the Office of the Chancellor for the Community Colleges is being replaced with the Council of Chancellors, the Provosts of the community colleges are evolving into Chancellors, and Chief Academic Officers (CAO) are being created at each community college. The Provost becomes a Chancellor and, though an actual job description has not yet been written, the Chancellor will be in charge of budget and external factors. The degree of his authority over factors on the rest of the campus is yet to be determined. The CAO’s position will be something like a super Dean over Student Services, Office of Continuing Education and Training (OCET) plus his previous duties overseeing the Academic programs and their support services.
Therefore, it would put the Dean of Student Services and the Director of OCET under the CAO along with 3 other officers: two Assistant Deans will be made Deans, placing them online with the heads of Student Services and OCET (the position of Assistant Dean of Instruction will be upgraded and titled the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Assistant Dean for Academic Services will also be upgraded to Dean of Academic Services). A new administrative position, Dean of Career and Technical Education, will be added on the same line.

Two major administrators will work directly under the Provost/Chancellor: 1) the already existing Director of Administrative Services, and 2) the proposed Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment. They will not be directly under the CAO but will have the status on campus similar to the Deans and other Director.

Under the present structure, the Dean of Instruction oversees all six of the College's academic divisions. Under the proposed structure, the Dean of Arts and Sciences would be responsible for four divisions, and the Dean of Career and Technical Education for two. Such a division of labor should go a long way to address the evaluation team's recommendation.

It is also hoped that placing student services and OCET functions directly under the CAO will better coordinate the campus affairs, especially since there is often overlap between the various services.

The plan was unveiled in January, and there has been great discussion regarding its merits throughout the campus. Both the Faculty Senate and the Campus Council have struggled with trying to understand its positive and negative effects. Nevertheless, the Faculty Senate passed the reorganization proposal on Wednesday, March 5th, while the Campus Council approved it on Thursday, March 6th.

Both bodies wanted it understood that constituent faculty and staff be represented in the development of job descriptions, as well as the selection process for the new positions and their eventual occupants.

The AIC Committee on Administrative Instability needs to revisit the subject later, because, with the administrative structure in a state of flux, it is too early to institutionalize proper evaluative procedures as required by other AIC committee.