I. Introduction. The purpose of this policy is to establish a framework on what constitutes shared governance at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo (UH Hilo).

UH Hilo is a member of the University of Hawai‘i system and is governed by the UH BOR definition of shared governance, as stipulated in the BOR General Overview: “The academic world differs from the corporate world in several respects. Most notably, important policy decisions are the result of consultation among the BOR, the chief executive, faculty, students, and staff. This decision-making process is referred to as shared governance. There are different views about the meaning of shared governance, ranging from fully collaborative/joint decision-making, consultative decision-making, or a separation of decision-making jurisdictions. The standard institutional reference for desirable academic governance is the “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” jointly formulated in 1966 by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education(ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). This statement calls for governance based on a community of interdependent parties - the governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The statement recognizes that the governing board has final institutional authority, and recommends sharing authority with the understanding that some areas of decision-making require joint endeavor and that others are essentially separate jurisdictions in which one constituency has primary, but not exclusive, responsibility.”

At UH Hilo, we recognize the importance of the interdependent parties (the governing board, administration, faculty, students and others) and aim to develop policies and procedures that implement guidelines of actions to ensure that transparent communication is present in the process of decision-making among the interdependent parties. We recognize the value of transparency in communication in this process as it will ensure that genuine collaboration, meaningful communication, expression of values, and opinions are conducted within a respectful dialogical space that is open to entertain competing viewpoints. Through transparent communication, UH Hilo hopes to facilitate a sense of belonging within shared governance structures at the university.

Moreover, the UH Hilo Faculty Congress recognizes that the formal process of consultation, collaboration, delegating, making recommendations and decision-making practices are essential to ensuring that a high quality education is delivered at UH Hilo. While conflicts of viewpoints may arise, we attempt to cultivate spaces in which

---

1 Board of Regents General Overview, III. Shared Governance
respected and professional communication is maintained such that the sharing of values, professional opinions and testimony, especially from those stakeholders who are affected by the decisions, can be openly represented in our deliberations without fear or concern of retaliation, direct attacks and microaggressive behaviors. In order to cultivate such an environment, any evidence of retaliation or other abusive behavior should be reported to the Faculty Congress Executive Committee for review and appropriate action. Because Full tenured faculty have the most protection against such abuses, they have a special responsibility to foster an environment conducive to open and substantive debate across the diversity of viewpoints and to protect more vulnerable faculty.

II. Relevant Policies and Documents: Administrators must consult with Faculty Congress in topics specified per UHPA agreement (item C below) in accordance with the following relevant documents:

A. Board of Regents General Overview
B. Board of Regents Policy RP1.210: Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development
C. UHPA-BOR Agreement, R-20: Roles And Consultation Protocols Involving UH Administration, UH Professional Assembly, And UH Faculty Senates
D. UH Hilo Faculty Congress Charter
E. UH Hilo Faculty Congress Bylaws
F. UH Hilo Faculty Congress web site

III. Administrator Faculty Appointments to Non-Congress committees, meetings or work groups.

To gain more faculty perspectives, Administrators may invite individual faculty members to serve on non-congress committees and/or invite perspectives from department chairs or other faculty. However, in these cases (where faculty members are appointed by administration rather than elected by Faculty Congress), the individual faculty input provided should be viewed as representing their own individual viewpoint and should not be interpreted as official consultation with the Faculty as a whole, which can only take place through Faculty Congress.2

Example: An administrator forms a working committee and invites individual faculty members and/or department chairs to participate in the committee or existing work

2 Based within UH Mānoa’s Senate Committee Guidance on Shared Governance 20210217 Guidance on Shared Governance(Revised).pdf
group. In this case, the faculty member would speak to their own viewpoint or expertise on the matter, but it would not be considered consultation with Faculty Congress.

IV. Congress nominations to serve on Non-Congress committees.

Administrators may seek input from faculty members to gain insight on initiatives or ideas. Administrators may request Faculty Congress to nominate individual faculty members to participate in these non-Congress committees. All requests should be made to the Faculty Congress Chair. The Faculty Congress Chair will submit the nomination requests to the Faculty Congress Executive Committee and/or to the relevant Faculty Congress committee(s) to make a recommendation. If more than one person is nominated, a vote will be held to select the person. However, in these cases, the nominated/selected individual faculty member’s viewpoint should not be interpreted as representing official consultation with Faculty Congress. Rather, in these cases, the nominated/selected faculty member shall function as a liaison to, not a representative of Faculty Congress or its committees.

Example: An administrator forms a working committee to create an Honors Program and requests 3 members to be nominated by Faculty Congress to serve on this committee.

V. Consultation is a multi-faceted process that involves stages of dialogue and communication. The following steps articulate the stages of consultation:

1. **Information.** The Congress is informed about a proposed change in policy or re-interpretation of policy, or topics specified in UHPA R-20 which necessitates consultation. All requests must be made to the Faculty Congress Chair with the relevant information.

2. **Feedback.** The Faculty Congress provides feedback on any relevant information provided regarding the topic. Feedback requests should be made to the Faculty Congress Chair with the relevant information, type of feedback needed, and an appropriate date by which the feedback is requested.
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3. **Dialogue and Active Participation.** Congress representatives will participate in active dialogue with relevant stakeholders to form a proposal.

4. **Proposed Response.** After feedback and dialogue with Faculty Congress Representatives, administration and perhaps at times UHPA, a proposed response will be submitted to Faculty Congress for review. Proposals should be submitted to the Faculty Congress Chair.

5. **Continued Dialogue and Feedback.** It might be necessary for Faculty Congress to initiate further dialogue with the greater faculty membership. This may include generating surveys and/or initiating town halls. After reviewing the information and making relevant revisions, the proposed response is submitted to the Faculty Congress Chair so that Faculty Congress will vote. The Faculty Congress Chair will transmit the approved proposal response to the person who initiated the consultation.

VI. Consultation through Motions passed by Faculty Congress.

Faculty Congress utilizes the platform of motions in order to communicate proposals, initiatives, requests for administrators to take action, or provide comments on matters relevant to shared governance. In order to ensure that transparent communication takes place in a timely manner, the following guidelines are provided below:

1. If a motion is passed by Faculty Congress that requires a response from the administration, then the administration shall have 30 days to respond to the motion in writing by clearly and directly addressing the specific issues in the motion. The response should be submitted to the Faculty Congress Chair. Exceptions may be made when motions require less than a 30 days response. In these cases, the motion will stipulate the response time needed and will be no less than 5 business days. If administration is unable to respond appropriately within the 30-day (or, as specified, less than 30-day) time period, they shall provide the reason in writing, along with a proposed alternative time period.

2. If there is an adverse action taken as defined in BOR.III.B.3.c, the administration shall respond within 30 days of the motion in writing and must provide rationale and substantive reasons as to why the adverse action is taken. Additionally, the administration ought to provide an alternative proposal to address the problem. The response should be
submitted to the Academic Chairs or program coordinators from the academic units that were affected by the adverse action and to the Faculty Congress Chair.

VII. Vote of No-Confidence.

A Vote of No Confidence is understood to be the last resort in representing the Faculty Congress’ voice of disapproval to any members in the administration and should be implemented with care, including review of feedback from faculty and documentation of patterns that demonstrate administrative disregard for shared governance, transparency, and/or other faculty concerns as evidenced through previous Faculty Congress actions and motions.

ADDENDUM: The following motions related to shared governance that have been previously approved by Faculty Congress are incorporated into this shared governance policy:

**Motion** for Shared Governance with Respect to Budget Cut Allocations:
WHEREAS, UH Hilo Faculty Congress is the duly authorized organization with the responsibility to speak for the faculty on budget planning and implementation (as well as other academic policy matters) as codified in the University of Hawaii Board of Regents Policy 1.210 on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development.
THEREFORE the UH Hilo Faculty Congress expects that any administration plan for the allocation of job and program cuts be presented in its entirety (including planned cuts to all Units) to the Faculty Congress with sufficient time for consideration prior to presentation to the Board of Regents and that no plan will be presented to the Regents for approval without first being recommended for approval by the Faculty Congress.

**Motion** re: Communication to Faculty:
This addendum details specific actions that will demonstrate support for Motion 18-19-002 with regard to improving communication by UH Hilo administration (i.e., Executive/Managerial positions as defined by University of Hawaii policy) to faculty. We request that UH Hilo administration:
1) Within one week of each UH Board of Regents meeting, write and distribute to all faculty a report highlighting discussions and actions taken at the meeting that pertain to UH Hilo.
2) Send to each of your respective faculty the budget allocation for the current fiscal year, along with rationale for the allocation and invite questions and suggestions from the respective faculty senates and congress. For example, Chancellor should send to all UHH faculty the budget allocated to each unit and rationale (i.e., academic affairs, student affairs, administrative affairs, etc.); each Vice Chancellor should send to their respective faculty the budget allocated to each unit and rationale (e.g., VCAA allocation to each college and other major unit within academic affairs); each Dean should send to their respective faculty the budget allocated to each unit and rationale; etc.
3) Each quarter, send to your respective faculty a list of planned (upcoming quarter) and actual (for the previous quarter) expenses, including new hires.

**Motion** re: Consultation with Faculty:
This addendum details specific actions that will demonstrate support for Motion 18-19-002 with regard to improving UH Hilo administration (i.e., Executive/Managerial positions as defined by University of Hawaii policy) consultation with faculty. We request that UH Hilo administration:
1) Send the proposed UHH mission revisions to all faculty and invite Faculty Congress to provide suggested edits. The version submitted to the UH System and Board of Regents for consideration should be acceptable to Faculty Congress.
2) Invite Faculty Congress input on all strategic, academic, budgetary, and personnel issues pertaining to UH Hilo that will be discussed at a UH Board of Regents meeting (of course, excluding those personnel issues that will be discussed in executive session due to confidentiality requirements).
3) Promptly report to and seek guidance from Faculty Congress regarding any verbal or written strategic issues (e.g., mission, vision, goals, objectives, strategies, priorities) from the UH System and/or campus-level discussions.
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