CAS Senate Executive Committee Survey on CAS Reorganization

Executive Summary: UH-Hilo College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate Executive Committee polled its faculty and staff on their opinions concerning the administration’s plan for reorganization. The survey was open for responses from October 18-26, 2016. The administration’s plan for reorganization was posted on the UHH Chancellor’s blog on September 6, 2016 at: https://hilo.hawaii.edu/blog/chancellor/2016/09/06/academic-reorganization-at-the-university-of-hawai%CA%BBi-at-hilo/

The questions in the survey and their possible responses were:
1. What division are you in? a) Humanities, b) Natural Sciences, c) Social Sciences (excluding Kinesiology), d) Nursing, e) Kinesiology, f) Other (please specify)
2. Are you faculty or staff? a) Faculty, b) Staff
3. Do you support reorganization in any form? a) Yes, b) No, c) Undecided
4. Do you support the plan for reorganization as put forth by the administration? a) Yes, b) No, c) Undecided
5. What minor adjustments could be made to the administration’s reorganization plan to make it more acceptable? Text responses collected
6. What major adjustments could be made to the administration’s proposed reorganization plan to make it acceptable? Text responses collected
7. Do you feel like you will be affected by the administration’s proposed reorganization plan? a) Yes, b) No

Overall CAS Summary (*out of numerical order)
1. % of Responses (total #): a) Natural Science 39% (45), b) Social Science 31% (36), c) Humanities 25% (29), d) Nursing 4% (4), and e) Kinesiology 2% (2)
2. Who responded? a) 95% Faculty (110), b) 5% Staff (6)
3. Do you support reorganization in any form? a) Yes 58% (67), b) No 17% (19), c) Undecided 25% (29)
   a. Natural Science a) Yes 80% (36), b) No 7% (3), c) Undecided 13% (6)
   b. Social Science a) Yes 36% (13), b) No 31% (11), c) Undecided 33% (12)
   c. Humanities a) Yes 42% (12), b) No 18% (5), c) Undecided 39% (11)
   d. Nursing: a) Yes 100% (4), b) No 0% (0), c) Undecided 0% (0)
   e. Kinesiology: a) Yes 100% (2), b) No 0% (0), c) Undecided 0% (0)
4. Do you support reorganization as put forth by the administration? Yes 32% (36), No 40% (46), Undecided 28% (32)
   a. Natural Science a) Yes 59% (26), b) No 14% (6), c) Undecided 27% (12)
   b. Social Science a) Yes 6% (2), b) No 72% (26), c) Undecided 22% (8)
   c. Humanities a) Yes 28% (5), b) No 50% (14), c) Undecided 22% (9)
   d. Nursing: a) Yes 25% (1), b) No 0% (0), c) Undecided 75% (3)
   e. Kinesiology: a) Yes 100% (2), b) No 0% (0), c) Undecided 0%, (0)

*7. Do you feel like you will be affected by the administration’s proposed reorganization plan? a) 81% (90), No 19% (21)
   a. Natural Science a) Yes 73% (30), b) No 27% (11)
   b. Social Science a) Yes 89% (32), b) No 11% (4)
   c. Humanities a) Yes 82% (23), b) No 18% (5)
   d. Nursing: a) Yes 75% (3), b) No 25% (1)
   e. Kinesiology: a) Yes 100% (2), b) No 0% (0)
5. What minor adjustments could be made to the administration’s reorganization plan to make it acceptable? – comments like ‘none’ or ‘n/a’ or that redirect to major adjustment responses are omitted here for brevity. All comments are in the full reorganization poll responses report.

Responses:

a. Natural Science
   i. At the very least, the plan should include an organization chart and links to the duties of the new positions it is proposing. I also don’t see the connection between removing a level of bureaucracy and increasing enrollments.
   ii. The entire process was flawed and the alienation expressed by faculty in other divisions and colleges are a consequence of the "Astronomy on Mauna Kea" approach to "consultation". If you want buy-in, you don't ask for consultation when you really want endorsement of pre-formed plans.
   iii. Less "political" more "practical"
   iv. One of the main ideas that the reorganization committee tried to do was to make their proposals cost neutral. While this organization plan will help the NS division, the two new colleges will still be too big to be managed without adding costs somewhere.
   v. better clarification on specific duties of chairs in each department as well as compensation.
   vi. Natural Sciences should not be joined with Nursing.
   vii. The timing. Can we have a dean here by Fall 2017? And we need to get people from the outside of UH!
   viii. include specifics about amount of clerical/admin support to be provided to dept chairs, deans
   ix. The work of 1 dean, 1 assistant dean, and three division chairs in our current organization cannot successfully be replaced by two deans alone. We will be setting those deans up for failure. The faculty lead positions must not be 'ghost positions' - they need to be filled in order to ease the workload on the deans. Otherwise, I'm largely fine with the reorganization proposal.
   x. We need to make sure that the administration and the staff will not use the reorganization as another effort to dump their workload on the faculty. We already do more than our fair share while our administration takes an OAS5 attitude toward the institution.
   xi. Hire the two division heads per college as the ‘faculty leads’. They could remain as division heads now, in faculty positions with course releases. Also, bigger suggestion, dissolve CCECS and incorporate into its home units.
   xii. None. Most of the details need to be worked out between faculty-staff, unions, and admin after a decision is made.
   xiii. More administrative support for new colleges.
   xiv. More written detail on what exactly we should expect in terms of changes and any disadvantages that the reorganization might bring.
   xv. Do not include Kinesiology and Nursing with Natural Sciences.
   xvi. More thoughtful concern for staff regarding the possible negative implications of reorganization with regard to job security, etc.
   xvii. Associate dean for the colleges

b. Social Science
i. First of all, the current organization position chart for staff at Natural Sciences is incorrect. There is one Secretary II and 2 Office Assistant (OA)Position. Under the reorganization position chart, there will be one division secretary and one OA. What happened to the 2nd OA position? Is this position being transferred to the Dean? If the OA is being transferred to the Dean, what will happen if the senior OA doesn't accept the transfer? Also, under the current CAS there is one Dean and a secretary, and Assoc. Both dean's and their secretaries has different work responsibilities. Under the reorganization, there will be one Dean and a secretary. The dean and his/her secretary will inherit the work of the associate AD and its secretary. I fear some of this work will be shifted to the division level. If this will be the case, I feel there should be a salary adjustment made for the division staff. The secretary and staff receives compensation by their work classification. Also, the proposed reorg will hire new budget analyst for each division. How will this impact the secretary's work classification? Monitoring the division budgets is part of the secretary's work classification. If this responsibility is omitted from the secretary's II responsibilities, then the secretary II could be possibly demoded to secretary I? Is the reorg an attempt to demote staff so that we can afford to hire 2 new Dean's and 2 budget analyst? We will be pushed into poverty?

ii. None, it would require major adjustments. For any reorganization to make sense CAFNRN and COBE must be combined with other departments. Social Sciences and Humanities are too different to be combined.

iii. I am very confused by the purpose of the unfilled faculty lead positions

iv. Fill the "faculty lead" position.

v. Separate Social Sciences and Humanities (not sure if this is considered a minor adjustment or not)

vi. None. We can fix the problems within the CAS that need to be fixed WITHOUT reorganizing the entire college.

vii. 11 month salary and 2 course releases per year for all department chairs; an understanding of the T&P review process with a stated substitution for the missing level of review by Division Chairs; a statement could be presented by the administration as to how this plan benefits students; a statement of the financial costs of the plan and how the university will be saving money.

viii. It seems like we are eliminating some administrative and admin. support positions and putting more duties and responsibilities on the faculty. Is there a way to structure the reorganization so that the faculty are not assuming additional duties?

ix. Reorganization is not necessary. There are no minor adjustments to the plan that would make it more acceptable.

x. More explanatory detail on how the logistics of the reorganization (budget, staffing, etc.) would work, and a better understanding of what the specific advantages of this new model would be.

xi. Split the college along traditional lines and create Natural Science, Social Science and Humanities Colleges

xii. Have Social Sciences and Humanities separate. Merge one of smaller colleges with one of the large CAS divisions, e.g., CAFNRM and Natural Sciences. Otherwise, what has the reorganization gained if the idea was to even up the sizes of colleges?
xiii. I don't believe that COBE and CAFNRM should remain as small divisions. They should be folded into the reorganized divisions.

xiv. At the very least, the Social Sciences and Humanities should be separated. Each could become a college...

xv. The admin really needs to concentrate on student recruitment to keep this university running. I do not think re-org will impact student recruitment or retention in any kind of way but will result in higher faculty dissatisfaction and divisiveness.

xvi. Have a separate college of Social Sciences and a separate college of Arts and Sciences.

xvii. The plan was determined without a strategic plan in place for the future. How will administration address issues that may arise as a result later? Will changes or accommodations be made when necessary.

xviii. None. Reorg should be deferred until we can complete a campus strategic plan that will bring us together rather than foment divisiveness.

xix. Separate Humanities and Social Sciences into different colleges.

xx. Don't split up current CAS.

xxi. There is a Dean but no Associate Dean, and then there are Chairs. How will the compensation and role of Chair change given the rise in workload or we should maintain Associate Deans. A more even distribution among the different colleges, still seems lopsided.

c. Humanities

i. In the new college units, each division elects its own DPC.

ii. clarify how it will enhance student retention and any other benefits to UH-Hilo's mission

iii. Division chairs and division DPCs

iv. I'm not sensing much resistance in humanities to blending with social sciences in a college, but it seems that social sciences has a resistance to wanting to blend with us. This does not feel good going in. I and others hesitate to join into a family where we are not wanted even before the merger. does not bode well for our future of working harmoniously together.

v. Division Chair will be Dean or Assistant Dean after Division becomes College. Those extra administration positions at CAS Deans office will be reduced. 1. Precise cost of the proposal. It does not appear to be cost neutral and would in fact put a strain on what little we have now. 2. Exactly what specific evidence is there that this will improve retention and graduation? 3. Exactly how would DPC, budget, and faculty governance work under the bifurcated model proposed for Social Sciences and Humanities?"

vi. Humanities is facing a lot of heat from Social Sciences. I think there needs to be a coming together for a lot of discussion. Both SS and Hum want to retain their own DPCs. Both SS and Hum need to retain their own budgets. Both SS and Hum need to retain their own scheduling of classes. A Social Science Dean would not look upon Hum very favorably given the reactions that are happening in SS.

vii. Keep the division chair position

viii. Clarify the administration's role while new units are formulating a new structure (including the tenure and promotion procedure and the formation of the DPC and the TPRC); create a job list for each leadership position
ix. It looks good as is.

x. fairness for CAS

xi. The administration's proposed plan is vague on many crucial points, including budgets and DPC procedures. The term "lead faculty member" has got to be better defined. It is not at all clear to me how the proposed plan will improve student enrollment and retention.

xii. Explain why and how reorganization will help improve retention. Address the concerns regarding the forced combination of two diametrically different units into a Soc Sci Humanities college when there are such fundamental differences in attitude between the two sets of faculty regarding curriculum, student outcomes, measuring those outcomes, assessment, and approaches to teaching. These fundamental and often hostile attitudes towards those in the humanities will impact major conditions of work issues such as Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion. Budgets for the respective units will also be one assumes, combined into one and predictably, there will be questions and concerns raised about how much the Humanities requires and what do we (the university) get in return. We already see these petty resentments expressed between units currently separated by Division status. What makes anyone think these inflammatory feelings will suddenly disappear because the two would become one college.

xiii. I'm not sure it makes sense to put Nursing back in with the Natural Sciences. Historically, Nursing was located in the Natural Sciences Division, but the division chair petitioned the Dean to move Nursing out because they really didn't fit in the division in terms of their salary structure and tenure and promotion guidelines. To put them back into the Natural Sciences seems like going back to what was problematic in the first place?

xiv. Do not remove Division Chairs from CHSS.

   d. **Nursing:** 1) Proposal unclear on faculty leads, 2) Need more support staff and summer compensation for department chairs

   e. **Kinesiology:** 1) Appropriate T & P procedures need to be ensured, 2) Need summer compensation for department chairs

6. What major adjustments could be made to the administration’s proposed reorganization plan to make it acceptable? - Again, comments such as ‘none’ are omitted for brevity.

   a. **Natural Science**

      i. The plan should not have fake positions. I am also concerned that the plan does not seem to follow from the work done by the reorganization task force. Before reorganization happens, I think the university needs to address Goal 6 of the strategic plan that just expired. That goal talks about organizational excellence. I don't think this reorganization is going to address fundamental organization problems.

      ii. Start over from scratch WITHOUT a priori endpoints in mind and with the participation of UHH employees from across the university. It is an abomination that the reorganization proposal was approached the way it was and no surprise there is push back.

      iii. I was disappointed that none of the other current colleges were in the admin's reorganization plan. The more I think about the details of the current plan, the less I believe it will be worth the effort. It would be better to go at it saying "let's do this right" even if the smaller colleges are against it. It seems like the
point of reorg was to balance the colleges to make them more manageable, we still have a management problem with the split CAS plan. From conversations, one dean won't be sufficient to handle the work in the new NS college or the SS/H college. Ideally I believe the colleges should be the size where a dean could effectively manage without having to push more onto dept chairs.

iv. perhaps figure out a way to use some of the money proposed for Dept Chair releases and summer salary to provide for secretarial or budget expertise in each new college

v. Will the admin support 11 month appointments for all department chairs? Will chairs be responsible for their own department's budget? The proposal should state in more detail the type of expenditures the administration is prepared to support.

vi. COBE and CAFNRM should be included in the reorganization with CAS.

vii. I wish College of Ag was included under Nat Sci but realize that may not be acceptable. It makes the most sense though.

viii. Remove the small colleges such as COBE and CAFNRM.

ix. Combine small colleges to evenly distribute Dean workload.

x. bring CAFNRM somehow into the Nat Sci College, under a compromise status that preserves some of its autonomy, if necessary.

xi. Uncertain, but guaranteeing appropriate staffing levels for the proposed colleges would be an effective start. I can't imagine the natural science division functioning as a college with the current level of support staff available.

xii. Their plan is not comprehensive enough. Rather than splitting CAS into two colleges, I would like to see CAS, COBE, and CAFNRM reorganized into two colleges of approximately equal size.

xiii. Well, if I ruled the world, I would combine all of the health fields with the College of Pharmacy, combine Humanities and Ka Haka `Ula, Business with Social Sciences, and CANFRM with Natural Sciences. Give all the old colleges school status within their new colleges and you are done (minus the wholesale revolt that would ensue). And bonus, you have one less administrator than you do today.

xiv. The plan should have a long term vision with room for different branches to grow and I support one where the social sciences, humanities, biological and physical sciences each have their own college. E.g. among the natural sciences, the life and physical sciences should be allowed to grow in the near future and will necessarily diverge. If we ever develop an engineering program, it will be hard to grow within an all-encompassing natural science college. Number wise, the natural science has the largest number of faculty, and funding wise, the natural sciences brings a sizable amount of extramural funds.

xv. Do not group Kinesiology and Nursing with Natural Sciences.

xvi. Clearer communication with all parties affected including faculty & staff.

xvii. Small colleges should have been part of the plan.

b. Social Science

i. Leave CAS the way it is. Our focus should be on more funding to retain our students and recruitment. There is hardly any activities for our students to get involved in i.e. intramurals? What about offering activities to do on the weekend? Beach and or hiking excursions perhaps? Kipuka and Drew Kapp plans class and scholarship recipients field trip to cultural sites. I read good
reviews about these trips especially from students who lives outside Hawaii. Sociology has a club and offers camping trips once per semester as well as other activities. What about monthly dances or movie nights? Overhaul our baseball program. The Hilo community loves baseball yet we can't attract fans. UHH rarely recruits local talent and retain them? There are coaches on that team who have no collegiate experience yet they qualify to coach players who are more qualified than they are? Should either dissolve the program, recruit more experienced collegiate level coaches or bring football here. Also, invest in improving our campus appearance and repairs. I hear awful stories of how bad the living conditions are in the older dorms. Retention should be about keeping the student's interested in continuing their education at UHH rather than change in administration. We should be asking the students for their input

ii. For any reorganization to make sense CAFNRN and COBE must be combined with other departments. Perhaps CAFNRN with natural sciences and COBE with social sciences. Social Sciences and Humanities are too different to be combined.

iii. More than just CAS needs to be considered in any plan to reorganize. We have too many colleges (with layers of admin and support) that are smaller than some of the departments in CAS (without the administrative and staff support). The administration also needs to provide more leadership and direction on how any reorganization will be carried out, and elaborate on the duties and responsibilities (at least as they see it) for department chairs (whose responsibilities continue to increase), tenure & promotion procedures (which will need to be addressed in new colleges, not to mention the UHPA contract), and the responsibilities of college deans. It is still not clear how any of these proposed changes is going to increase recruitment and retention, or improve resource allocations.

iv. 1. Reconsider very small colleges in the reorganization (Ag, COBE). There must be a way to keep their 11-month appointments and salaries (which is what I am assuming they are worried about should they be folded into another college) and at the same time increase efficiency that the administration desires. 2. Reconsider putting the responsibility for all retention and recruitment on colleges without additional support (and in fact less support). 3. To address #2, consider pulling positions from Student Services to help address this within the colleges if this will be a primary responsibility of the colleges."

v. None. We can fix the problems in the CAS that need to be fixed WITHOUT a reorganization of the entire college. If we break apart CAS, we may not have the will, leadership, faculty engagement, and resources to put a viable system back together again. This would be a challenge if we were fully funded, engaged, fully staffed, and had high faculty morale. We have none of these at present, making any sort of smooth transition unlikely, at best. More likely, faculty and especially students will suffer.

vi. divide the entire campus into more equitably sized colleges

vii. It seems like the colleges on the extreme ends of the money generating spectrum are remaining untouched. The reorganization was introduced as a way to increase revenue equity, but this does not appear to be the end result. Why were the high and low revenue generating entities not included in the reorganization?
viii. The kinds of adjustments needed to make the plan feasible, and therefore somewhat acceptable, would also make it more expensive and therefore contradictory to one of the main purposes claimed for the reorganization in the first place. For example, there would need to be Associate Deans and/or Division Chairs in order to handle the workload. But then, why not just keep the present arrangements?

ix. Include more colleges (Business, Hawaiian, CAFNRM) as just reorganizing CAS does not seem to address enough of the issues at hand.

x. Natural Science, Social Sciences and Humanities as three separate colleges

xi. Separate Humanities and Social Sciences, merge one of small colleges with one of the CAS divisions.

xii. There is a clear need to eliminate tiny colleges.

xiii. Have a separate college of Social Sciences and a separate college of Arts and Sciences. Have chairs of departments with large student enrollment on 11 mos appointment with 3 course drops per academic year

xiv. It can't be made acceptable because it fails to address fundamental issues at the University which are currently being ignored. Reorg is the administrative version of busywork.

xv. Reorganize tiny colleges (COBE, CAFNARM). Merge hem together or add them to othe colleges formed by splitting CAS.

xvi. Don't split up current CAS.

xvii. Combine very small colleges COBE, etc. Make colleges roughly same size

xviii. Same as minor - clarification of duties and relationship between Dean and Chairs (should maintain an associate Dean and no division chairs) and more even distribution of students/faculty in colleges.

xix. Create two separate colleges for Social Sciences and Humanities: College of Social Sciences and College of Humanities

c. Humanities

i. Different groupings than the current plan

ii. Keep the independent power of each Division.

iii. None. UHH should not be reorganized

iv. You may need to think about separating out Humanities from Social Sciences if no one can specifically address how the model will work. Also, the fiscal viability of smaller colleges such as CoBE and CAFNRM--why aren't these being included in the model?

v. Like Captain Kirk in Star Trek who rejected the rigged game and created new parameters in order to win his game, the business model of SSH and graduation rates is a game Hum cannot win. We need a different form of assessment as WE FEED THE OTHER MAJORS. Part of the feeling in HUM is that the current business model seeks to reduce us significantly. There is a sense that this is unjust as it is a considerable part of our mission TO FEED OTHER MAJORS. Many in HUM would rather have their own division because of the obvious resistance coming from SS. But we should not be punished by SSH and grad rates. It really is not just.

vi. I don't know but something needs to be done to put the Unity back into the university
vii. Explain effectiveness of this reorganization and reveal (or partially share) decisions that have been already made by the administration for implementation.

viii. It is acceptable as is.

ix. The conflation of Humanities and Social Sciences is causing undue stress and anxiety among the faculty. The fate of CCECS and ELI is also a mystery. Will they be shuffled into HUM? The elimination of the Division Chair is particularly problematic in HUM, where there are several small language programs that do not have their own program or department chair.

x. Come up with a plan which actually encourages growth and innovative thinking in the respective units without having to constantly justify its existence to those who apparently would have no problem seeing the Humanities disappear entirely.

xi. None. The one thing that I DON’T want to happen is for Administration to create a separate College of Humanities. This would further add to the problem of small colleges and make the Humanities more vulnerable to cuts in budget and faculty lines.

xii. Merge CAg with CNHS, merge CCECS and COBE with CHSS.

d. **Nursing:** 1) Need more options for grouping departments
e. **Kinesiology:** 1) Combine colleges with less than 100 students