LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
2002 – 2003 Faculty Senate

UNAPPROVED Minutes of the February 5, 2003 Meeting

James Goodman, Chair
Warren Imada, Vice Chair
Jack Pond, Secretary


GUESTS: James West

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 3:24 p.m. with a quorum.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the December 11, 2002 meeting were read and approved.

REPORTS:

FACULTY COMMITTEE – Senator Currivan reports that two individuals from KCC are developing a student evaluation form that is compatible with the BANNER system.

PROGRAM REVIEW – Senator Levy reports that a proposal outlining a process for program review is forthcoming from the committee. The Senate will play an important role in the process.

STUDENT COMMITTEE – Senator Hill reports that this semester’s Opening Day Experience was held on Jan. 9, 2003. The number of students in attendance was lower than in the past (75 students compared with 125-150 students in most spring semesters). The lower attendance may be attributed to a massive traffic jam that morning. This semester, the initial hour-long meeting in the Theater was cut to about 30 minutes and student guides offered campus tours to participants.

NEW BUSINESS:

LCC REORGANIZATION - The Senate held discussion on the proposed Leeward Community College reorganization plan, which was recently distributed and discussed in a joint meeting of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council. The Senate heard input from the Vocational Technical Division and the Academic Support Unit. Arts and Humanities Division Chair, James West, gave views from his division. Discussion centered around how the proposed plan would improve what we do at LCC and the necessity of putting the
details in writing in order to hold the administration accountable. Senators questioned the selection of the various administrators as well as the funding requirements to establish new offices. There was also discussion about the importance of setting job descriptions for each of the deans and establishing a reporting order below the deans’ level. After the discussion, the Senate directed the Secretary to draft a resolution for Senate review and vote. (Resolution 03-01 is attached.)

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE LCC MISSION – Chair Goodman announced that Larry Andres and Jake de St. Croix were nominated to sit on this committee. Two more faculty names are needed. Senator Kappenberg agreed to serve; Senators should send the names of other faculty who might be willing to serve to the Chair.

OLD BUSINESS:

CURRICULUM REVISION AND REVIEW – Senator Kennedy presented the latest draft from the AIC on Curriculum Revision and Review. The Senate made two suggestions. The first added the phrase “...within the current semester” to points 6 and 7. The second recommended change to point 2. “Each discipline will review its own courses, ensuring the accuracy, academic rigor, integrity and currency of the core outlines…”

Motion 03-01 (Palombo/Currivan): To accept the AIC report on Curriculum Revision and Review as amended.

PASSED - Unanimously

CHAIR’S REPORT:

The Chair reported that at the recent ACCFSC meeting in Hilo, he was appointed to serve as the liaison to the ACCFSC Webpage. The entire ACCFSC is becoming more organized. Chair Goodman has also been appointed to serve on the Search Committee for the Vice President of Academic Affairs (currently held by Deane Neubauer). The chair reports that there appears to be adequate community college representation on the committee.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Lunch with Dr. Peter Englert will be on March 14 immediately following the BOR meeting to be held on our campus.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: Jack Pond, Secretary
Leeward Community College
Senate Agenda
Wednesday, February 5, 2003
3:15 - 5:30 pm
FA 201

I Approval of Minutes

II Reports
A. Standing Committee Chairs:
1. Budget and Planning—Judy Kappenberg
2. Faculty—Linda Currivan, Ruth Pfeiffer
3. Elections—Cindy Hochstein
4. Academic/Institutional Support—Cindy Martin, Carileen Yokotake, Karim Khan, Pat Kennedy
5. Legislative Relations—
6. Program Review—Gail Levy
7. Student Committee—Kathy Hill
8. Curriculum—Nancy Buchanan

B. Ad Hoc Committees
1. Senate Service Committee—Mimi Nakano

C. Chair’s Report
1. ACCFSC Meeting at Hilo 01-17-03.
   a. ACCFSC Webpage: Liaison
   b. VPAA (CAO) Search Committee
2. Dr. Peter Englet’s visit 03-14-03.
   *After LCC BOR meeting.

III Old Business
A. AIC on Curriculum Revision and Review
   1. Curriculum Review Policy
B. Student Evaluation Forms.

IV New Business
A. LCC Distance Education program at Caratis University, Hong Kong.
B. Nominations for Committee to Review LCC Mission Statement.
   1. Four names:
C. LCC Reorganization proposal.

VI Adjournment
*Spring 2003 future meetings:
   February 12, March 5, April 2, April 30.
1. This division feels it cannot vote on the proposed reorganization until detailed job descriptions for all positions have been finalized. Rationale - It would be impossible to understand how the whole structure would work and interrelate until all the duties and the interactions are made clear. Without these detailed job descriptions, no accurate assessment of success or failure in all positions would be possible. Further, it would impossible to ensure the proper selection of interim or permanent candidates without a job description for each new and revised position. This was the major point of unanimous and universal Division agreement among all members.

Vote - 10 yes, 0 no

2. All positions including Chancellor should be re-advertised and assigned to selection committees. Rationale - Both new and revised positions can be assumed to contain significant changes in duties, responsibilities, lines of authority and responsibilities than those positions which currently exist. Otherwise, there is no rationale or need for reorganization. Therefore, all new and revised positions will include substantive differences from exiting positions and line authority. Based on this fact, it would be impossible to logically find and place the best individual into any position until all of the duties and responsibilities, as well as relationships and accountability are clearly established in advance of advertising and filling the positions.

Vote - 8 yes, 1 no

3. All revised or "redefined" positions should be re-advertised and assigned to selection committees, especially if a promotion (real or implied) of any kind is involved. I.e. from an assistant Dean to Dean, or Director to Dean. Rationale - DPC and TPRC committees must review and approve all Faculty promotions. Promotions (either in responsibilities, pay, line authority, or status) without some appropriate form of traditional collegiate review of past service and accomplishments would set an unacceptable precedent.

Vote - 8 yes, 1 no

4. Proposal - Each Voc Tech Program becomes a "Division" I.e. "Culinary Arts Division, Automotive Technology Division," etc. Current VocTech "Program Coordinators" become "Division Chairs" who would report directly to the new Dean of Career and Technical Education." Rationale - It has always been somewhat unrealistic to expect the VocTech Division Chair to be thoroughly familiar with the unique needs and subject matter of several diverse and highly technical programs, other than their own. Further, each Division Chair must be absent to some degree from their individual programs while serving as D.C. This proposition eliminates the single overarching Voc Tech Division Chair and allows each "Division" (currently "department") Chair direct access to the new Dean of
Career and Technical Education position. The advantage would be to facilitate direct expert input from each program to the proposed new Dean of Career and Technical Education position.

Vote - 10 yes, 0 no

5. Division Secretaries should NOT be expected to also serve as Dean secretaries. There should be a separate pool of clerical support for the proposed new and revised Administrative positions. Rationale - It would be unrealistic to expect that Division Secretaries could provide services for all division Faculty members, the Division Chair, and the Deans for each Division.

Vote - 10 yes, 0 no

6. All selection committees should be composed of at least 75% of the full time employees directly from that area. I.e. The selection committee for the Dean of Career and Technical Education should be composed of at least 75% full time Vocational education Faculty members. Rationale - To quote Mark Silliman, "Those closest to any issue should have the strongest voice in decisions directly affecting them." This is the stated foundation principle of collegiate "shared governance."

Vote - 10 yes, 0 no

7. If no job descriptions can be supplied before the new and revised positions are filled, (even on an interim or temporary basis) the Voc Tech Division will NOT endorse the reorganization proposal. Rationale - Once again, this division feels very strongly that it is impossible to fill any position, new or revised, without a clear and precise job description, and it would unwise to attempt to do so.

Vote - 6 votes to not endorse the reorganization if no job descriptions are available prior to the final vote on reorganization, 4 votes to endorse the reorganization if job descriptions are not available prior to the final vote on reorganization AND there is no alternative.

However, the Voc Tech Division restates it's unanimous position that no reorganization should be implemented under any circumstances unless and until detailed job descriptions are in place prior to filling of positions by selection committees, either interim or permanent, and prior to implementation of the reorganization proposal.

In any and all cases, regardless of acceptance or rejection of the reorganization proposal, all Division members endorsed strongly and voted unanimously in favor of reinstatement of a Dean of Career and Technical Education.

Aloha!
Robert W. Hochstein,

Technical, Occupational, Professional "TechOp" Division Chair
Leeward College Television Production ("TVPro") Coordinator
Curriculum Revision and Review

Purpose: To establish policy and procedures for institutionalizing curriculum revision and review, and for the periodic review of core outlines and course syllabi with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs and of assuring the continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies.

Implementation:

1. The division chair will be responsible for determining which courses will be reviewed each year, so long as they review 20% of the courses per year over a six year cycle.
2. Each discipline will review its own courses, ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines and the continued articulation of the courses with system colleges, should that be the case.
3. If the courses to be reviewed need no modification, the division chair will input approval into Curriculum Central.
4. If the courses that are reviewed need modification, normal curriculum procedures for course modifications will be followed within the current semester. The discipline representative will be present at the Curriculum Committee meeting to present the rationale, etc., for the changes.
5. Curriculum Central will be modified so that the essential elements needed for course syllabi are standardized with the same initial information. This standard information will become the first page(s) of each course syllabus to ensure that course alpha and number, title, credits, prerequisites, description, goals, and learning outcomes, are presented uniformly regardless of the instructor. Also on the first page(s) will be the fields for the instructor's personalized information: name, office, office hours, phone number, email address, course section number, classroom, course meeting days and times, and requisite textbooks and supplies. Additional pages of the syllabus will reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor.
6. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty.
7. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, will work with the faculty to correct the discrepancies.
for the periodic review of core outlines and course syllabi with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs and of assuring the continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies.

Implementation:

1. The division will be responsible for determining which courses will be reviewed each year, so long as all courses are reviewed over a six-year cycle.

2. Each discipline will review its own courses, ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines and the continued articulation of the courses with system colleges, should that be the case.

3. If the courses to be reviewed need no modification, the division chair will input approval into Curriculum Central.

4. If the core outlines that are reviewed need modification, normal curriculum procedures for course modifications as determined by the Chancellor for Community Colleges Memos (CCCM) will be followed within the current semester. The discipline representative will be present at the Curriculum Committee meeting to present the rationale, etc., for the changes.

5. Curriculum Central will be modified so that the essential elements needed for course syllabi are standardized with the same initial information. This standard information will become the first page(s) of each course syllabus to ensure that course alpha and number, title, credits, prerequisites, description, goals, and learning outcomes, are presented uniformly regardless of the instructor. Also on the first page(s) will be the fields for the instructor's personalized information: name, office, office hours, phone number, email address, course section number, classroom, course meeting days and times, and requisite textbooks and supplies. Additional pages of the syllabus will reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor.

6. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty. within the current semester.

7. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, will work with the faculty to correct the discrepancies. within the current semester.

2/5/2003
### Course Syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Alpha*</th>
<th>Course Number*</th>
<th>Course Title (long)</th>
<th>Credits*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Office Hours:**

**Contact Information:**

**Catalog course description***:

**Co-requisites***:

**Prerequisites***:

**Recommended preparation***:

**Textbooks and other resources:**

**Student Learning Objectives:**

**Grading Policy:**

**Students with Disabilities Statement (get from Tamara Watson-Wade)**

*From Curriculum Central
University of Hawai‘i Salary Study

JBL Associates, Inc.
January 2003

Peer Groups for Faculty Salaries
- Includes only instructional faculty
- 9/10 month contract only
- For 2001-02
- Source is US Dept. of Education IPEDS data
- Excludes volunteers, those paid by other agencies, and clinical MDs

Purpose
- Analyze salaries for faculty and other professionals in the UH system
- Develop external comparisons for four UH faculty groups; CC, Manoa, Hilo, West Oahu
- Provide salary benchmark data for faculty in the medical school and law school

Four Peer Groups
- Selected nationally using JBL formula
- Selected from the West coast using JBL formula
- Selected by UH administration
- Combined, non-overlapping institutions from the previous three groups—All Peers
- Redundancy provides confidence in results

Purpose
- Provide salary benchmark data for other professionals including librarians, researchers, and agricultural extension agents
- Various sources of data were used for these groups

Results
UH CC Results

Average salary $48,170
Peer average $59,499
Peer 50th percentile $59,994
Peer 80th percentile $67,069
80th percentile 2006 $79,503

UH Manoa

Average salary $64,829
Peer average $76,794
Peer 50th percentile $74,592
Peer 80th percentile $82,288
80th percentile 2006 $101,617

UH Hilo

Average salary $49,890
Peer average $60,463
Peer 50th percentile $56,470
Peer 80th percentile $65,412
80th percentile 2006 $76,347
**UH West Oahu**

- Average salary: $51,198
- Peer average: $50,645
- Peer 50th percentile: $49,149
- Peer 80th percentile: $58,690
- 80th percentile 2006: $72,580

**Salary Dollar Difference From All Peers by Academic Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>7,567</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>11,329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilo</td>
<td>7,567</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>11,329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoa</td>
<td>7,567</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>11,329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oahu</td>
<td>7,567</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>11,329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent Increase to Meet All Peers Average Salary by Rank in 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilo</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoa</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oahu</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Percentile Rank for UH Salaries With All Peers, 2001-02**

- CC's: 21%
- Hilo: 34.5%
- Manoa: 18%
- West Oahu: 62.5%

**Other Professional Employees**

- Researchers, 11/12 month contracts
- Agricultural extension agents
- Librarians
- Law school faculty
- Medical school faculty
Agricultural Extension Agents

- Directors $123,761
- Associate directors $106,693
- Assistant directors $90,369
- Department head $106,507

Medical School Faculty (non-MD, High and Low Median)

- Chair $185,000 $146,000
- Professor $169,000 $87,500
- Associate $109,500 $61,000
- Assistant $88,000 $49,500
  High salaries tend to be in basic sciences and radiology
  Lows tend to be in other clinical sciences

Law School Faculty Low and High Average Salary (West)

- Professor $111,000 $145,692
- Associate $81,000 $121,260
- Assistant $74,549 $115,800
  (UC Hastings is the high salary)

Cost of Living Differential

- Not included in the salary reports
- Federal studies show costs in Hawai'i are 22 to 11 percent higher than Washington, D.C., which is 10 to 15 percent higher than the average
- Hawai'i is at least 21 percent more expensive than the mainland and as much as 37 percent, depending on location

Medical School Faculty Salaries for MDs (High and Low Median)

- Chair $649,000 $167,000
- Professor $409,000 $124,000
- Associate $333,000 $94,000
- Assistant $248,000 $73,000
  All high salaries are in surgery
  All low in basic or clinical sciences

Conclusions

- UH faculty are paid less, on average, than those in their peer groups
- Professors lag more than junior ranks
- To meet the goal of paying faculty at the 80th percentile by 2006-07 would cost an extra $178 million above current salary expenditures
- This does not include non-teaching professionals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Asst Prof</th>
<th>Asst</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilo</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mance</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Oshu</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions?
Subj: Today's Senate Meeting in 3:15 in FA 201
Date: 2/5/03 6:01:40 AM Hawaiian Standard Time
From: goodmanj@hawaii.edu
To: wimada@hawaii.edu, GJMPond@aol.com, nbuchana@hawaii.edu, lococo@hawaii.edu, glevy@hawaii.edu, rflegal@hawaii.edu, cindymar@hawaii.edu, jkappenh@hawaii.edu, kathylil@hawaii.edu, currivanp001@hawaii.rr.com, candyhochstein@aol.com, knana@hawaii.edu, pkennedy@hawaii.edu, mnakano@hawaii.edu, ssteph@hawaii.edu, rpfieff@hawaii.edu, cyoko@hawaii.edu, ganne@hawaii.edu, dobson@hawaii.edu, zenaia@hawaii.edu, goodmanj@hawaii.edu
CC: dykstra@hawaii.edu, west@hawaii.edu, wittgenshannon@hotmail.com

Sent from the Internet (Details)

Hello Senators,

This is a reminder for today's meeting. I have also invited Interim Dean of Instruction Doug Dykstra to speak on item IV A., Arts & Humanities Division Chair Jim West to speak on item IV C and Student Government representative Shannon Smith to attend our meeting.

We will have a lot to discuss and consider.

See you then,

James Goodman
Faculty Senate Chair
UH-Leeward Community College
808-455-0613

Leeward Community College
Senate Agenda
Wednesday, February 5, 2003
3:15 5:30 pm
FA 201

I Approval of Minutes

II Reports
A. Standing Committee Chairs:
   1. Budget and Planning: Judy Kappenberg
   2. Faculty: Linda Currivan, Ruth Pfeiffer
   3. Elections: Candy Hochstein
   4. Academic/Institutional Support: Cindy Martin, Carleen Yokotake, Karim Khan, Pat Kennedy
   5. Legislative Relations:
   6. Program Review: Gail Levy
   7. Student Committee: Kathy Hill
   8. Curriculum: Nancy Buchanan

B. Ad Hoc Committees
   1. Senate Service Committee: Mimi Nakano

Wednesday, February 05, 2003 America Online: GJMPond
C Chair’s Report
  1. ACCFSC Meeting at Hilo 01-17-03.
  2. Dr. Peter Englert’s visit 03-14-03.
     a. After LCC BOR meeting.

III Old Business
  A. AIC on Curriculum Revision and Review*
     1. Curriculum Review policy
  B. Student Evaluation Forms.

IV New Business
  A. LCC Distance Education program at Caratis University, Hong Kong.
  B. Nominations for Committee to Review LCC Mission Statement.
     1. Four names:
  C. LCC Reorganization proposal.

VI Adjournment
  A. Spring 2003 future meetings: February 12, March 5, April 2, April 30.

*In preparation for our discussion on the Curriculum Revision and Review proposal below, I have pasted it
below, which others may find at:

http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/aic3/crr-policy021015.htm

and the Ctte’s full info at:

http://www.lcc.hawaii.edu/ac2006/aic3/crr-policy021015.htm

DRAFT 2  October 15, 2002

Curriculum Revision and Review  LCC Policy #___

Purpose: To establish policy and procedures for institutionalizing curriculum revision and review, and for the
periodic review of core outlines and course syllabi with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all
courses and programs and of assuring the continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional
methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies.

Implementation:

1. The division will be responsible for determining which courses will be reviewed each year, so long as all
courses are reviewed over a six-year cycle.
2. Each discipline will review its own courses, ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines and the continued
articulation of the courses with system colleges, should that be the case.
3. If the courses to be reviewed need no modification, the division chair will input approval into Curriculum
Central.
4. If the core outlines that are reviewed need modification, normal curriculum procedures for course
modifications as determined by the Chancellor for Community Colleges Memos (CCCM) will be followed within
the current semester. The discipline representative will be present at the Curriculum Committee meeting to
present the rationale, etc., for the changes.
5. Curriculum Central will be modified so that the essential elements needed for course syllabi are standardized
with the same initial information. This standard information will become the first page(s) of each course syllabus to
ensure that course alpha and number, title, credits, prerequisites, description, goals, and learning outcomes, are
presented uniformly regardless of the instructor. Also on the first page(s) will be the fields for the instructor’s
personalized information: name, office, office hours, phone number, email address, course section number, classroom, course meeting days and times, and requisite textbooks and supplies. Additional pages of the syllabus will reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor.

6. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty.

7. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, will work with the faculty to correct the discrepancies.
Frequently Asked Questions on Reorganization

This FAQ was prepared by the administrative staff in response to a number of requests from the campus community for more information on the proposal Provost Mark Silliman presented to a joint session of the Faculty Senate and Campus Council. We hope that this positively contributes to an ongoing discussion of this important issue. Please note that while the reorganization of the UH System has been approved by the Board of Regents, the President has directed that its formal implementation be delayed until WASC has had an opportunity to act on the substantive change requests from the affected campuses.

What is the strategic thinking behind this “reorganization”?
The proposed reorganization is more of a restructuring of the administrative layer of the college and does not change the campus organization at the division and unit level. It addresses the issue of administrative workload by increasing the number of administrators in the Office of the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) from the three to four as well as providing additional support to the Chancellor through the Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment. The latter administrative position has already been broadly discussed and is part of the College’s Strategic Plan and Biennium Budget Request.

The Board of Regents at its December meeting has already approved the creation of the position of Chancellor to serve as the Chief Executive Officer reporting to the President. The Chancellor will be ultimately responsible for the campus and will share in the governance of the University of Hawaii System through the Council of Chancellors. The Chief Academic Officer will be responsible for all academic programs on the campus including Student Services and Continuing Education & Training. This answers the need for a more closely coordinated effort among all academic units. The administrators under the CAO have all been retitled to Deans to reflect their academic nature, that their units have faculty in their composition, and they are equals on the administrative team.

The two Directors positions, Administrative Services and Planning, Policy and Assessment, are support staff to the Chancellor and do not have line responsibilities for the academic units of the campus.

Why do we need to increase the administrative staff?
The proposal for increasing the number of administrators is a response to two issues. The first is the heavy and growing workload on the administrative staff of the College. The second is the need to respond to the UH System reorganization. The PowerPoint presentation cited four documents supporting the need for the restructuring proposal.

1. The Evaluation Report from our 2000 WASC Accreditation stated that our self-study indicated that “the small number of administrators led to a depletion of `energy and will power (p. 6)” in making its recommendation to the College that it stabilize its administrative staff. WASC has recently asked for “focused” midterm report and visitation, in part, because this issue has still not been adequately addressed. We have received three warnings from WASC on
administrative instability indicating that this is a serious issue that could affect our future accreditation.

The Committee on Reorganization (Phase I) found that there was need for a campus reorganization.

The College's Strategic Plan calls for the hiring of a Director of Assessment and Strategic Planning (Goal C, Objective 1, p. 40).

The UH Board of Regents approved in December a reorganization plan for the UH System abolishing the Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges, changing CC Provosts to Chancellors, and establishing a Council of Chancellors reporting directly to the President. Most of the responsibilities of the former Chancellor for Community Colleges will devolve to the CC Chancellors. In addition, the President expects the Chancellors to devote significant time to the external affairs of the colleges. This will significantly increase the duties, responsibilities, and workload of the Chancellor (former Provost). The Vice President for Academic Affairs has also established a Council of Chief Academic Officers (formerly the Deans of Instruction) meeting directly with the Vice President. It is expected that many of the duties, responsibilities, and workload of the former Provost’s Office will devolve to the Chief Academic Officer. The result is a “domino effect” in which duties, responsibilities and workload have increased throughout the College administration.

Another significant change in workload has resulted from the reduction in general fund revenues for the College. The College has been directed to seek external funding through grants and fundraising. The College has been very successful in raising $11,122,977 in grants over the past five years which has been directly and indirectly responsible for the vitality of all our academic programs. However, grant funding, particularly at the federal level, imposes reporting, management and liability issues which require administrative oversight. Currently, the College is obligated to commit 0.65FTE of an administrative position to grant duties. Where is this position? Chancellor? Dir of Ass/Plan?

Why do we need to restructure now and with urgency?

The Regents have already acted on university reorganization at their December meeting creating Chancellors at each community college (pending acceptance of substantive change proposals by WASC). Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs Deane Neubauer has invited the Deans of Instruction to a meeting of Chief Academic Officers on February 14th. A plan detailing the delegation of responsibilities of the former Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges was drafted in November 2002. The LCC Strategic Plan, approved by the campus after considerable discussion, has already proposed the creation of the Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment and this has been implemented as a request in the University’s biennium budget. Thus a large component of the restructuring has already happened. The addition of a Dean of Career and Technical Education addresses an accreditation issue. The College has been requested to submit a focused midterm report for our accreditation that must address administrative instability in Fall 2003. It is important that the College show action now.
**Who is the author of this proposal?**

There is no one "author." As indicated above, some of the proposal comes from Board of Regents actions, some from policy initiative of the system office, some from the LCC community through the *Strategic Plan*, and some from informal discussion on this campus. For example, input from discussions in the APT Group that retitling instead of redescribing better conveys the character of the changes in some of the administrative positions has been incorporated in this FAQ. Regardless of the source of ideas for the proposal, the proposal comes from the Provost, Mark Silliman and he asked the campus for their input at this time.

**Will all of the administrative positions be open for recruitment and appointment?**

No. The continuing positions, Director of Administrative Services and Dean of Students will remain with the incumbents. The new positions, Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment and Dean of Career and Technical Education, when they are established, will be advertised, recruited, and filled according to Board of Regents policy. The Chancellor, with consultation of the campus, may elect to fill these positions on an acting basis should there be immediate needs.

The retitled positions that are held by interim administrators, Chief Academic Officer (Interim Dean of Instruction Douglas Dykstra), and the Dean of Continuing Education and Training (Interim Director of Continuing Education and Training Randall Francisco), will be advertised, recruited, and filled according to Board of Regents policy.

The retitled positions that are currently held by administrators, Chancellor (Mark Silliman), Dean of Academic Services (Mike Pecsok) and Dean of Arts & Sciences (Doug Dykstra) will be filled by the incumbents. The following chart may help clarify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Position</th>
<th>Proposed or Retitled Position</th>
<th>Vacant?</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>To be Advertised?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Silliman</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>Interim (Dykstra)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Administrative Services</td>
<td>Director of Administrative Services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Policy, and Assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stella Ho-McGinnes (Acting Dean Stuart Uesato)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean for Academic Services</td>
<td>Dean for Academic Services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pecsok</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Dean of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dykstra (Acting Assistant Dean Bernadette Howard)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Assistant Dean for Career and Technical Education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Continuing Education and Training</td>
<td>Dean of Continuing Education and Training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Interim (Francisco)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why not readvertise and reappoint all the positions?**

Administrative positions are exempt positions serving “at the pleasure” of the supervisor—ultimately the President of the University. This was made very apparent last year when the President notified all administrators in the system that their contracts would not be renewed (this was subsequently rescinded). Administrators are evaluated annually by their supervisor with widespread input from their constituency. Their contracts are renewed annually based on satisfactory performance as judged by their supervisor. The President has not officially indicated whether or not he will recruit new people for the Chancellors’ positions. For further information on the policies governing administrators, see the BOR Policy at [http://www.hawaii.edu/apis/borp/borpch9.pdf](http://www.hawaii.edu/apis/borp/borpch9.pdf) (p. 85).

The retitled positions under the Chancellor represent additional authority, duties, and workload, not changes in core responsibilities. As typical in the UH System, they will not be readvertised. For example, two years ago, the rank of the Dean of Students was promoted throughout the CC system from M-4 to M-5. All Deans of Students remained in their positions. Civil Service and APT positions are not re-opened unless there is substantial change in the core duties and responsibilities of the position. Promotion from one level to another does not constitute significant change in core duties and responsibilities. Faculty positions also have this precedent in that incumbents are promoted through the professorial ranks.

It should be noted that retitling of the administrative positions does not automatically result in any change of salary for the incumbent administrator. Currently, Board of Regents Policy links minimum salary of administrators to the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) salary survey for equivalent positions (Managerial Plan and Compensation Policy, December 2001). The goal is to incrementally reach the 50th percentile (versus 80th percentile for faculty as proposed by President Dobelle). The current incremental goal is the 20th percentile. The average salary of all administrators at Leeward CC is equal to the average Range 5 professor (prorated for 11 month). It is not uncommon for an administrator to return to faculty ranks and receive a pay raise due to the lag between administrative and faculty pay raises.
What will this restructuring cost?
Positions and funding for the Office of the Director of Planning, Policy and Assessment was requested in the College’s Biennium Budget. Specifically, the Director’s position, a staff APT position, and clerical position along with supplies was submitted. Should the position and funding be approved, additional costs for this position would not come from the College’s present budget.

The Dean of Career and Technical Education would come from a redescribed currently unfilled position. Funding would come from internal reallocation. Planning figures for this position are approximately $60,000 annually for an 11 month position.

Clerical support for the Dean of Career and Technical Education would come from the Office of the Chief Academic Officer with the intent to create a clerical position (approximately $21,200 annually). Office expenses are estimated at $5,000 for start-up, $2,000 continuing.

Doesn’t this restructuring add another layer between the Division Chairs and the former Dean of Instruction (now Chief Academic Officer)?
No. With the elimination of the Office of the Chancellor for the Community Colleges, the Chancellor, as Chief Executive Officer (CEO), will be assuming many of the duties of former chancellor’s office. This has eliminated a layer of bureaucracy. The CAO will be performing many of the duties of the former Provost and the Deans will likewise be performing many of the duties of the Dean of Instruction. From the perspective of the Division Chair, they will be reporting to a Dean who is responsible for the decision-making that most affects their areas.

Why not have the Division Chairs report to the Chief Academic Officer?
Currently, the Dean of Instruction’s Office has two Assistant Deans position. The Assistant Dean for Academic Services is a line position with Academic Support Units reporting to the Assistant Dean. The Assistant Dean of Instruction is a staff position with no division officially reporting to the position. This has created ambiguity and poor communication since division chairs and others are unsure who is responsible for any giving area. If the Division Chairs reported to the CAO, then, in effect, we would be adding one more staff administrator. The proposal creates line administrative positions with a clear reporting structure. It assures that decision making is made as close to those affected by that decision as possible and provides for greater advocacy of divisions within the administration. It also delineates a clear path of appeal from the Deans to the CAO to the Chancellor.