



CMI

College of the Marshall Islands

Accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

P.O. Box 1258
Uluga Campus
Majuro, Marshall Islands, MH 96960

Tel: (692) 625-3394/3291/4931
Fax: (692) 625-7203
Email: itcommittee@cmi.edu



The College of the Marshall Islands Faculty Senate

Regular Meeting September 19, 2025

Supposed Meeting Start: 11:10 AM
Face-to-Face Meeting Location: RH 119 CMI Uluga Campus
Zoom Meeting ID: 237 313 9684 Zoom Passcode: 874523
Polycom-Rooms @ Arrak Campus & CMI D.E. Centers
Simple Minority Quorum

MINUTES

Present During the Meeting: 27 (7 via Zoom)

Not Present/Unexcused During the Meeting: 21

On Leave & Excused, Others: 2

Time Meeting Started: 11:15 AM

[Link to view the Sept. 19, 2025 FS Meeting Agenda](#)

I. Introductions:

a. **Faculty Senate President: Dr. Viviana Uriona** shared to the Senate that from this day forward, the Senate will use minority quorum as adopted and will have the following effects:

Punctuality: Meetings will start on time.

Quorum and Recording: Quorum will always be reached, ensuring meetings are officially recorded and topics are discussed "officially from the beginning."

Time Management: General discussions will be timed. This new process is intended to avoid wasting time on side topics.

Teamwork: The (FS president) is working with David and Curtis to improve adherence to "bylaws rules" and have more organization in the meetings.

Structured Discussion and Decision: Time will be allotted for focused discussions, after which we will move to a motion and take decisions.

Voting Procedure: When a vote is needed, a decision will be taken in the room. Separately, an anonymous vote via email will be prepared for members who were not present whenever necessary. These absent members will have two days to cast their vote. The meeting is now in order.

b. The **FS Secretary** read the College's Mission statement.

II. Deliberations/Actionable Items

a. August 22, 2025 Approval of the Meeting Minutes

President Uriona: "Thank you very much. We move now to the review of the minutes of the past faculty senate meeting from August 22. The key points were about Dean Edward. I hope you did check the minutes last time, and maybe you have a motion to accept the minutes?"

"President Uriona if faculty have some comments or questions. Is it clear enough?"

Vice President Sinkey: "Regarding the meeting with our Dean was significant over the issue. It's really important that you're informed about how that discussion went, so that you understand the importance of those meetings."



President Uriona: “I know it's been almost one month back since we invited Dean Edward to discuss the situation of the changing of grades. We decided to have in the minutes a one-on-one discussion here in the minutes, mostly a description of what had happened because it was relevant.” Some comments or motion to accept the minutes?” Or you need more time to read?”

Faculty Senate Secretary: The minutes were shown on the screen for all to view.

Faculty: “Does it say there that he (Dean) apologized?”

President Viviana: “I can't remember whether he apologized.”

Vice President Sinkey: “He did explicitly use those words. There are some key phrases in there (Aug. 22 minutes) that I think would to his position.”

President Uriona: “He said that this kind of situation can happen again.”

Faculty: “Oh, that's not good.”

President Viviana: “This is why we will go to the next step. Versus what he said 2 times.”

Faculty: “In this situation you mean that he will approve it or for the students who will request for a change?”

Vice President Sinkey: “The potential for this to happen is what he was referring to. This situation of grades that could be changed, by him, (by him) or the insistence could arise again, and because of that statement, we feel that it's important that you read the minutes so that we could take the next step.”

Faculty: From the level of students, that is something that allows them, request for a change, and there is a procedure for that. But for him to say that he can do it again not for something which is involved. Is he allowed?”

President Uriona: No

VP Sinkey: That's why the minutes are so important.

Faculty: “Let me paraphrase that. Did he mean something else?”

President Uriona: “He was very ambiguous in the words that he used. I guess I asked him 2x of what he meant, and he did not say that I understood him wrong, ok, and this is why we sent the minutes in this way for you to read what exactly happened here. After we approve the minutes, we can move to the second step because we did write a resolution from the position of the faculty. We need now a motion to approve the minutes.”

Faculty: “As they are written right? - I make the motion to approve the minutes of the past meeting.”

Faculty: Seconded

President Uriona: “Conducted the voting process, noting that there were zero against or abstentions; The motion was approved by the majority of the people present.” Thank you very much.”

President Uriona: “We will save this record. We usually delete record of our meeting after a certain time, I am not sure of the time. like two weeks later. Is it archived?”

VP Sinkey: Is it in the archives

FS Secretary: It is stored on our website.

President: We will never delete this particular record.

Faculty: Asked if the FS possesses a video recording of such a meeting.

FS Secretary: Yes, we do have video and audio.

VP Sinkey: There is a video recording. So it's pretty clear.



b. Presentation of A Resolution Letter: Academic Integrity and Leadership Accountability
Resolution of the Faculty Senate of the College of the Marshall Islands

Abstract:

The discussion provides background information detailing the process taken by faculty leadership to address a case of academic integrity violation by a staff member named Edward. Leadership collected data from instructors regarding four distinct steps Edward used to pressure them to change student grades, including using a favor-based appeal, offering to prepare paperwork, and ultimately unilaterally changing the grades himself after instructors refused. The issue was presented to Dr. Newnham (the President), who was informed of all of Edward's actions. Dr. Newnham then decided it's an opportunity for Edward to address the faculty directly to explain his actions and answer questions from the Senate members.

The transcription of the discussion that followed is shared below:

President Uriona: "This is the resolution letter by myself and David. Did you (Senate body) read it?"

Faculty Senate Secretary: The resolution letter was shared on the Zoom screen for all to read.

Vice President, David Sinkey: Read the entire resolution letter.

President Uriona: "For this step. We don't need a motion. We, your reps/officers, we can present this in front based on the facts that we have. Ok, this is just to inform you that we are doing about this resolution to take care of the integrity of our work that we do, and also for the future of the CMI. Do you have questions or comments?"

Faculty: So, this is addressed to the senior leadership team and but not the Board of Regents right?

President Uriona: Well, this is addressed to everyone, because this will be published. it on

VP Sinkey: This will be published.

Faculty: On the website?

President Uriona: Asked which website? Ours or CMI website?

FS Secretary: Our (FS) website.

President Uriona: Is this published at the moment?

FS Secretary: It is part of our meeting so..

President Uriona: "This is not at this moment. This has not yet been published because we had to discuss this and if finalize our discussions here and we decide to adopt the Faculty Senate website, we can also publish it through this way. At the same time, we can also send it to be part of the faculty senate minutes, because minutes are part of the website of CMI that can also be attached there".

Faculty Secretary: "This, I think, is the closure that those who were affected needed. We really need to recognize that closure, because faculty who have experienced such are: (1) traumatized because of not being able to defend themselves during that time, and so we don't want such a thing to happen again. So, it's a closure for those who are affected and at the same time a reassurance for us that it will never happen again."

Faculty: "If we were to publish using the CMI website, it would become public. So what happens to the accreditation team and the press once they find out?"

President Uriona & VP Sinkey: "That is a good question."

Faculty: Coz you know, it is on the website and will be public knowledge, and the Press can get a hold of it and will involve accreditation.

President Uriona: This is a good question. In my experience, there has to be one person from us to tell the ACCJC because one has to watch the CMI page to check these minutes. And I don't think that they do because I don't think that they are usually checking what we are doing



as a faculty. But this, of course, is a good question. It's against scandal, yeah, but we need to do something."

Faculty: So, it will become public knowledge on the web?

President & VP: "Yes, yes."

Faculty: And that's what we want, is that our intention?"

President Uriona: "As I have said, we are not asking you to support this. This can go to our responsibility as your officers. This is why we put our names there, and we are not saying the full faculty support this. If you are in conflict with this side of position you can do that for your own in every discussion. We are giving you an open door and try to be at the same time try to be sure that our work here will be safe. Because our point here is not to lose accreditation, the other point is, if we are not losing the credibility of how we work here, then we, all of us, can pack our things and go home."

Faculty: Maybe Dean Edward did not realize the implications of how widely he implicated himself. He did not realize that.

President Uriona: "Oh, well, maybe I have to explain to you some background information. We have all the data from the instructors that were approached by Dean Edward. We went to Dr. Newnham. We spoke with Dr. Newnham and presented the matter without mentioning the names of the faculty and all the steps that Edwards made. Dean Edward did made some steps in a way, I am asking you if you can support this student; He made four different steps to put pressure on the same instructors. *First-asking, and second-saying you have to do that because I helped you before, Third, Oh, I know you have a lot of things to do. I prepared the paper for you. Can you sign? And when the instructor checks, I say, Hey, this is a change in grade for one year back. I'm not doing that then. And that was the fourth step. He walked back and he (Dean) changed the grades.* If he doesn't acknowledge these four steps then...My daughter can acknowledge although she is 10 years old."

VP Sinkey: "And to that point, the fact that it's being publicly reported, it shows that if it ever happens again, we have a record."

Faculty: So, we are doing this after we have exhausted all the proper avenues that we should have done. So, Dr. Newnham, our president of the college, knows about this.

President Uriona: Knows about what? He does not know about the resolution because this is our thing."

President Uriona: He acknowledges all these steps. We presented to him all these steps. He wanted to speak to Edward, and then decided that it would be good for Edward to have the chance to come to us and explain to us. And he got it from this situation, this chance to explain everything here, and also to answer questions from the faculty members."

Faculty: "Another question, so what's the status of the student grades that were changed? Have they been reverted or are they standing as it is?"

Faculty and Officers: We can't change it back then, It's history now."

Faculty: "No, They graduated last summer."

VP Sinkey: "Hence, the seriousness of the matter."

President Uriona: "Part of this is to alleviate the pressure of possibilities when we encounter this again, especially right before graduation, as people get desperate, and they want to graduate, and they start looking back at their GPA..."

Faculty: "What concerns me, really, is the response of the administration. They were informed about it, but we haven't heard anything in the past month."

VP Sinkey: Well, to that note, I just want to reiterate that when Viviana and I brought the concern to the President directly, we brought this issue to the president directly. His response was four words, **"Edward needs more training"**. That was his response. And once we heard that response, we needed as officers to move forward and document the process."



Faculty: “Somehow, I have a feeling of pity for Dean Edward for the administration putting him in that position, and a simple training could have been the solution, or even a proactive consultation by Dean Edward while his position requires him to consult first, but he did not?”

President Uriona: “But I also have questions for you, if you move now to be a Dean with your experience as a teacher, will you think about that you are in a position to change grades just because you're a Dean now? Do you need an extra training to know that this is not possible to do? exactly? (faculty) - **This is not a point of training. This is the point of professional ethics. You do not have to be afraid for us.**

Further comments and discussion are to be shared online for the Senate to move forward.”

SUMMARY:

The College of the Marshall Islands Faculty Senate met to discuss and inform the body about a forthcoming Academic Integrity and Leadership Accountability Resolution, drafted by President Uriona and Vice President Sinkey, and addressed to senior leadership and the Board of Regents. The resolution was prompted by a past incident where Dean Edward exerted pressure on instructors and improperly changed student grades (of students who have since graduated). Senate officers emphasized they were presenting the resolution, which they would publish on the Official Faculty Senate's website, to affirm the integrity of their work and provide closure and reassurance for faculty who felt traumatized by the event. The officers stressed that they were not asking for a vote, as the resolution fell under their responsibility as elected leaders. A key concern raised was the administration's inadequate response to the incident; the college President's only initial comment was that "Edward needs more training," which the officers felt showed a lack of professional ethics awareness and prompted them to document the process with the resolution. The discussion concluded with plans to continue comments and deliberation online.

c. Faculty Evaluation

Abstract:

This Faculty Senate discussion centers on the proposed Student Evaluation of Faculty document. A proponent faculty member, acting on behalf of the LEAP (Learning, Effectiveness, Assessment, and Planning) committee, presented the document and requested the Senate provide further feedback before its official implementation. However, the proponent admitted to having very limited information regarding the administration's plan for using the evaluations, the deadline for comments, or the implementation timeline. Faculty raised concerns that the document was not introduced at the start of the semester and that its use might be unfair. Faculty Senate President Uriona's primary concern was the validity of the evaluations, proposing that only students who have attended at least 80-90% of the class should be eligible to evaluate faculty, especially since the institution lacks a formal attendance policy. The discussion concluded with an action item for the proponent to resend the original Google document to all faculty to gather additional comments.

The transcription of the discussion that followed is shared below:

President Uriona acknowledged the Hon. FS Member and FS LEAP Officer, and gave him the time to speak about Faculty Evaluation at CMI

Proponent Faculty: “The LEAP just asked me to send this document to the Senate. It's the student evaluation of faculty that's been sent around. I guess they wanted more faculty to



comment on the document before it's instituted. I guess it was a very brief discussion at leap, and they just asked me, please, can you bring this up at the Senate and remind faculty again that we would, the administration would like your feedback on this form. I know this is my understanding. Again, it was a very short discussion in the LEAP meeting as far as how this is going to be instituted. I mean, most places I've taught it's part of your renewal of your contract, as they go over your evaluations, I don't know how they're going to use it here. They just asked me to please bring this up at the Faculty Senate. That's sort of the end of my knowledge of this document."

President Uriona: "Until when can we comment on the document?"

Proponent Faculty: "I don't know. They wanted me to just remind the faculty of this document, is there for us to comment on. I know when it first came out, I remember there was a couple of comments. Elizabeth made a comment. I feel like I saw someone had made a comment on it. They just want more comments. What they're going to do with those comments, and what deadline? I have no idea, okay, but we can literally just ask me, please bring this up."

President Uriona: "Okay, we cannot see the comments here. We need another document to send to the faculty. Or can you send to the whole faculty the Google Doc that we can do the comments in the regular paper."

Proponent Faculty: "I'll go back and look through my emails from that meeting and see if what they sent me had comment. I feel like what I saw in the in the LEAP meeting had comments on it. Okay, so I'll see. I'll try and find that and send it to Curtis and he can send it around."

Faculty 1: "We did not see this at the beginning of the semester, it shouldn't be implemented this semester. It's not fair for us."

Proponent Faculty: "Yeah, it was sent a long time ago. Oh, was it? I mean, I feel like this was sent a long time ago, maybe even in the spring. So is, I could be wrong about that, but saw, didn't you make a comment on it? Was it in the spring? I can't really remember, but I know that this was given access to everybody sometime in August last year."

President Uriona: I think I saw it just shortly before the semester started. Faculty evaluation is not new. From what I know from other institutions, it's part of evaluations. We have a peer evaluation. We have, yes, student evaluating faculty. We have that. But my concern here is if we're going to adopt this, we will look at the attendance because, you know, we don't have an attendance policy here. The student that should evaluate the faculty should be students who who have attended at least 80% 90% of the class. Yes, because you do not evaluate the faculty that the student is maybe attendance is 40% or 30% or 50% or even not coming evaluating faculty. This is my only concern on this, if we're going to go forward with this. Okay, we, we will get an email from you, can you send again the original Google to all the faculty members to work on this? Yeah, sure. I'm looking for it now to provide comments."

Summary:

The Faculty Senate discussed a Student Evaluation of Faculty document sent by the LEAP committee, which requested more faculty feedback before implementation. The proponent faculty member presenting the form admitted to having minimal information about its intended use, the deadline for comments, or the administration's plan, which prompted President Uriona to request the original Google document be resent to all faculty for commenting. A faculty member voiced concern that implementing the form mid-semester would be unfair, though the proponent countered that the document was first circulated as far back as August of the previous year. President Uriona acknowledged that student evaluations are standard practice but raised a critical concern: since the college lacks an attendance policy, he argued that only students with 80% to 90% class attendance should be eligible to



complete the evaluation to ensure valid feedback. The meeting concluded with the proponent agreeing to redistribute the document for further faculty input.

d. SPED Students

Abstract:

The Faculty Senate addressed a critical issue regarding the admission and lack of identification for SPED (Special Education) students entering the college's general classes without faculty knowledge. Faculty reported discovering these students' accommodation needs only after experiencing frustration in the classroom, violating existing policy which states students should file accommodation requests two months prior to registration. A key problem identified is the lack of a CMI policy or process to officially label or identify these students—especially those without an Individualized Education Program (IEP)—unless the student self-declares. To address this, the Senate passed two motions: first, to compel the responsible accommodation committee to carry out their work at the beginning of registration and inform faculty so they can decide on appropriate accommodations; and second, to draft a proposal for the Admissions Committee to create a formal special admissions/identification process for SPED students to ensure faculty are informed and the college can provide necessary classroom support. Professional development for faculty on this topic was also suggested.

The transcription of the discussion that followed is shared below:

President Uriona acknowledged the Hon. FS Member and IEC FS Representative, and gave her the time to speak about SPED Students at CMI

Proponent Faculty: Found out that she has a SPED student in class. I think that we should be doing what we already have in the policy. The policy is defined very clearly. I think that when students register, the process should begin there.

Faculty 1: High school reading programs and bridging programs place SPED students in special classes. So there's already documentation. But when they get in CMI, they go straight to our classes. We have no idea they are SPED. We get frustrated in class. Interestingly, they act like normal students, only to find out that they require accommodations.

How can we address this and to whom? As the Faculty Senate, we need to take this to the Dean's Services. Is there equity engagement? Associate Dean for learning support, associate Dean for instructional quality and innovation. They are all responsible for that.

President Uriona: Do we have a dean for equity and success?

Faculty 2: Meyar and Jemimah

Faculty 3: There is also a need to inform the enrollment committee so that this is applied at the beginning, and Meyar Jemimah, and in the Enrollment Committee (EC).

FS Secretary: FS Rep for EMC was shared with the body

President Uriona: Can you work together to prepare the documentation and a proposal to provide to students before the semester starts? The policy says that two weeks, two months before registration, they should have already filled out the accommodation request.

President Uriona: Okay, so we need a motion, okay, so that Hon. FS Rep for EMC can speak for the whole body.

Faculty 1: Does CMI have a policy on accepting these students? Because if we base it on the policy of the Marshall Islands, like, you know, general education policy, if the students don't bring their IEPs on enrollment. We cannot label them, even if the high school teachers are telling us that they are sped like me. I know my sped students when I was in high school, but I cannot label them because they're not willing to bring their IEPs during enrollment. Does CMI have a policy that we faculty can do the forms, the assessment forms, because it has to



come from us, if they allow us. But if they don't have IPs, we cannot label them officially based on the RMI policy.

Faculty 3: We don't have that policy. What is in practice right now is that the student has to declare that they are in that special group. They have to acknowledge that until they are in the classroom.

President Uriona: Then we need to work out something, because the instruction is not the same in the classroom, and we are not equipped in the classroom for students with disabilities. And I'm not going to discover it at the beginning. Are you ready for a motion about this?

Faculty 3:

Motion: I move for the people responsible for the accommodation and request them to carry out their work at the beginning of registration

Just to clarify the motion that the committee will carry out their work, kind of what are we recommending to the motion, if you look at the accommodation policy, it states that they should meet every month, and they should look at the applications that come through for accommodations, and they should it's all stated there in the policy. The committee should inform faculty to give them a chance to decide to accommodate the student or not being able to teach the class in some cases.

Faculty 4: Seconded

President Uriona: The motion is carried with 1 faculty member voting against the motion, with no abstention. There is another motion on the table presented by another faculty involved with this topic:

Faculty 3: There's never been a case of a student with special needs like this discussed, and it's usually with another registration or admissions issue. I think this is becoming apparent to us, because we are getting students, and I feel that we should be making a recommendation to the committee, then there should be a Special admissions or a way of identifying students. I'm recommending that we phrase our proposal in a way that will be included, that something has been included in the admissions process. How to identify students with special needs, because now we are getting students with special needs because there's nothing in the admissions process.

Motion: I move that we write a proposal or something to the admissions committee, raising our concern about how SPED students are being admitted, that there should be some form of identification process at the beginning, with whatever information we need before they are admitted, and that the college will provide the needed help in class. That this proposal be shared by the faculty before being presented to the committee.

Faculty: Seconded

President Uriona: The motion passed, with nobody against and with no abstention.

Faculty 1: Suggested professional development for Faculty as we move forward with these actions.

Summary:

The Faculty Senate addressed the critical issue of SPED (Special Education) students being enrolled in general CMI classes without faculty being informed, leading to classroom difficulties. Faculty noted that while documentation often exists from high school, current practice requires students to self-declare their special needs upon enrollment, and without an IEP (Individualized Education Program), faculty cannot officially label them. The Senate passed a motion requiring the accommodation committee to strictly adhere to the accommodation policy by reviewing requests before registration and informing faculty so they can prepare or decide on their capacity to accommodate. A second, related motion was passed to draft a proposal urging the Admissions Committee to establish a formal identification process for SPED students to ensure necessary support and information are



provided at the start of enrollment. Faculty also suggested implementing professional development to help faculty manage this process.

e. Faculty Housing

Abstract:

This Faculty Senate's discussion and subsequent action highlight matters regarding a new Public Service Commission (PSC) housing rate that threatens CMI faculty housing stability. Faculty leadership informed the Senate about the distinction between CMI employment contracts and government employment, which is crucial for understanding the impact of the new PSC rate. Faculty raised strong concerns that local landlords, motivated by the higher PSC-related government rates, would ignore existing CMI contracts and raise rents on CMI faculty, making them less competitive in the local market. The FS President and Vice President made a recommendation to the College President, urging HR to professionally manage the urgent matter and avoid premature statements that favor rent increases for faculty whose contracts have not yet expired. The faculty concluded that CMI needs to increase its housing benefit to remain competitive and retain staff and faculty.

President Uriona: Discussed the importance of knowing the difference between government employees and our employment contract with CMI, which would help faculty senate members understand the impact of the new housing rate under the Public Service Commission.

Both the FS President and Vice President presented the matter to the College President (this Friday Sept. 19.) with a recommendation to advise HR to professionally deal with the urgent matter and for HR to avoid making hasty statements favorable to the landlord's desire to raise the housing rent of CMI faculty whose housing contract is still far from expiration and outside of PSC.

Proponent Faculty: Multiple faculty raised strong concerns, expressing that landlords will still raise housing rent for CMI faculty, despite the CMI Act as evidence, as landlords will choose to rent out their housing units to PSC-related government employees who will pay a higher rent. The faculty deliberated that CMI is supposed to increase our housing benefit to stay more competitive in the local accommodation marketplace.

Summary:

The Faculty Senate addressed an urgent threat to faculty housing caused by a new, higher Public Service Commission (PSC) housing rate, which applies to government employees but not CMI employees. Faculty raised strong concerns that landlords would ignore existing CMI contracts and raise rents, prioritizing higher-paying PSC-affiliated tenants. To combat this, the FS President and Vice President formally recommended to the College President that HR be advised to professionally manage the matter and avoid making premature statements that favor the landlords' desire for increased rent. The consensus was that CMI must increase the faculty housing benefit to maintain competitiveness in the local accommodation market and ensure staff and faculty retention.

f. Faculty Work Load Realities

Abstract:

The Faculty Senate Vice President presented a detailed analysis to illustrate that the mandated 15-credit teaching load outlined in faculty contracts forces instructors to work significantly more than the stipulated 40 hours per week. By calculating the time spent on teaching (21.5 hours), required duties like preparation, grading, and advising (an estimated 20 hours), plus mandatory office hours (5 hours), the average faculty workload totals 46.5 hours before even factoring in department meetings, registration support, and uncompensated participatory



governance (committee service), which pushes the total to approximately 49.5 hours per week. The officers argue that CMI is imposing two parallel, conflicting obligations: a 40-hour minimum contract and a 15-credit load, with the latter resulting in unpaid overload. The presentation aimed to raise awareness, prompt faculty feedback on the calculation, and support the officers' proposal to the administration to reduce the minimum teaching load from 15 to 12 credits to better align the contract with the reality of the workload.

The transcription of the discussion that followed is shared below:

Vice President Sinkey/Faculty Proponent: “This is just a brief rundown so that you're informed. Because of the workload, policy has created some conflicts with our actual reality of working. We wanted to show you a simple breakdown on average. This may not fit your teaching situation account, but it takes an average teaching load within an average three-credit class that meets 85 minutes a week. What we want to do is show you what's actually happening with our time compared to the contract that you signed, that said 40 hours. So if we see here number one, an average three credit class meets 85 minutes a week. Excuse me, 85 minutes of class. So if that class number two meets on an average of a little over 4.25 hours a week, Monday, Wednesday, Friday, not everybody's in that same boat, but this again, is on an average. So that means that class is meeting almost four and a half time, four and a half hours a week, point three, we're required to teach 15 credits. So if you have an average class of three credits at five classes a week, we have 21 and a half hours a week. That's just the base, base, base teaching load. If we go to point four, we take into account those duties that are assumed with our teaching, preparation, grading, advising. Some of us have more than that. Some of us have to travel out to ryer. We have to travel out to Laura. There's travel time, commitment time. There's a lot of things that this doesn't take into account. So I'm stressing average. If we average this, we're looking at 20 hours a week with five classes. So that brings us to 41 and a half hours a week. We still haven't addressed required office hours. When we do that bumps us up to 46 and a half we haven't addressed required department meetings, registration and drop ad support, counselor communication. Some of us can keep going with some of the requirements that we have that will push us up. If this is one hour a week, this pushes us to 47 and a half hours. Okay, then many of us up to our own discernment, our own choosing, have uncompensated participatory governance. Some of us are participating to keep things running. Here we have activities. We have supporting communication. After talking to a number of faculty, we averaged two hours a week for this, just in keeping your commitment with your participatory governance committee, going whatever that may be. I know as Vice President, this doesn't even touch it for me, for my commitment, my meeting time, my planning time, it doesn't touch it, and I'm getting zero credits. So, what we're just trying to bring to your attention how this time is stacking. So now our total is up to 49 and a half hours per week.”

“So why is our contract saying 40 hours, but our expected time to fulfill that contract goes beyond and this is an issue that we brought to Newnham directly. So what's that mean? Well, if they would acknowledge the fact that we would like to reduce it from 15 to 12, that means that at four classes a week on average, we would be at 45 hours a year. We're still above 40 hours, folks, and this is what we want you to credit to us, to see, yeah, this is only one example. This is one this is just one example. Some of you are more than this in your commitment level. Some of you are not quite there, but this is an average. So what do we mean? What we're basically saying is, see, my CMI is stipulating two parallel obligations. What do I mean by that? Well, they want us to commit to 40 hours of service per week. That's the minimum. But in order to do that, we have to teach a minimum of 15 credits. Can that be supported in a 40 hour week when we take in things like teaching preparation, advising, registration, counselor, communication, as well as committee service and research, for those



of who are doing research, does this fit into a 40 hour work week? This is what we want you to be aware of.”

“And if we scroll back up, if you see something in this breakdown, you want to go back up to the line items, yeah, oh, it's not responding. Okay. If you see something here that is not a representation, or you think it might not equate to what you see. We'd like to hear from you, because this is something we are not going to let go as faculty officers regarding the administration when it comes to the workload policy, basically, they're having us do overload without getting compensated for us when we look at what we're doing. So this is very important, and we'd love to have your input on this. If you see areas here that are not representing or maybe we've not calculated something right, or maybe you also can do your own calculation following this step to figure out how many classes you have, just know the overload, just the official one that you have to do, right, not counting your overload, just the basic.”

Summary:

The Faculty Senate Vice President presented a detailed average workload analysis showing that the mandated 15-credit teaching load forces faculty to work well over the 40 hours per week stipulated in their contracts. By calculating class time (21.5 hours), associated duties like grading and preparation (20 hours), office hours (5 hours), and uncompensated committee service, the average faculty workload totals approximately 49.5 hours per week. This discrepancy is framed as CMI imposing two conflicting obligations that result in uncompensated overload. The officers brought this issue to the administration and are now seeking to formally reduce the minimum teaching load from 15 to 12 credits, which they calculate would still result in an average of 45 hours of work per week. They urged faculty to review the breakdown and provide feedback as they continue to challenge the workload policy.

g. 3-Hour Class Block Schedule

Abstract:

The Faculty Senate addressed two urgent scheduling issues as department chairs prepare for the next term. First, a faculty proponent raised strong concerns against a potential administrative mandate to move all associate-level classes to a three-hour block schedule. The proponent argued this "one-size-fits-all" approach, adopted by some departments, would be detrimental due to high student absenteeism and was being pushed without consultation with students, faculty, or consideration for differing disciplinary needs. Second, President Uriona highlighted the need for urgent discussion on the increasingly common practice of offering eight-week courses, noting that the lack of clear guidelines is creating scheduling conflicts and negatively impacting student attendance in other courses. Both the block schedule and the eight-week course proliferation were linked to the ongoing, unresolved workload policy dispute, which the President urged faculty to review and prepare to discuss at the next meeting.

The transcription of the discussion that followed is shared below:

President Uriona: Acknowledged the Hon. FS Member and FS Awards Committee Officer, and gave her the time to speak about the 3-hour class block scheduling of CMI

Faculty Proponent: Because our department chairs are preparing to set forth their schedules for next term. What I wanted to bring to the floor is the move to have all classes in the associate level becomes three-hour block glasses. I have a high concern for this. I have multiple reasons, absenteeism, um, the long period. And so what's happening is this, in certain



parts of our college, some departments have made moves to work within their department. But then what happens is, for administration. I can only imagine, is saying this is such a great idea, we all need to do this and come into alignment. But I don't believe that is the best for our students. I don't think it's been documented. Our students haven't been consulted. We haven't been asked what we feel about it or how it fits in with our present duties. Because we're a college with different disciplinary focus, our student needs and ties is spent differently, and to have a one size fits all for everything, I don't feel represents the student body or faculty in their areas.

I guess we are having a brainstorming. We have a discussion. We need a discussion and I'm a little bit afraid that we have a meeting in two ways, because all of this is very urgent, but I want to also take care of our hearts. Yeah, we will prepare online discussion to also to collect your positions concerning the workload policy, because we are fighting this in the EC until, until now, because the subcommittee prepared paper to the workload, and Elizabeth changed the paper completely, and this is a presentation to EC, and we are stopping this, because that will be that, officially, we have to work much more as what we are working now. And please check the critical review of the faculty world law, policy that we you will find in the agenda. Read it, write questions. Bring your ideas for the next meeting. We have to discuss this. We have to discuss the situation of this, in my opinion, also nonsense. All the students have to do eight weeks courses. Okay? We need to discuss this again, because I suppose we discuss this and we have a pathway to follow. But at the moment, a lot of teachers are instructors are teaching in eight weeks, and I got the requirement to do that because this is the reason why my students is not coming to my course, because it's a clash of conflicts of time with the other classes, because everyone is aware and want to teach in eight weeks, and we need to have a line, a red line, in our position, concerning which courses we can teach in eight weeks and which courses we cannot teach in eight weeks. **We can discuss this further in a Google Doc, and also in the next meeting.**

Summary:

The Faculty Senate addressed an administrative push to mandate three-hour block scheduling for all associate-level classes as departments prepare next term's schedules. A faculty proponent voiced strong opposition to this potential "one-size-fits-all" move, citing concerns over increased student absenteeism and the long class periods. The proponent argued the policy is being adopted without proper documentation, student consultation, or consideration for the diverse needs of different disciplines and faculty duties, and does not represent the best interest of the student body.

III. Closing Discussions

President Uriona: Called Standing Committees Faculty Senate Representatives for reports to be shared.

President Uriona: Informed the Senate about the meeting schedules to shift back to the 2nd and 4th Friday of each month to avoid conflicts with other committee or department meetings.

President Uriona: Reminded the Senate members to participate in the shared proposed revisions of the Faculty Senate bylaws, which will be voted upon at the next Faculty Senate meeting

President Uriona: Emphasized the need to conduct assessments and to amass data for SLO analysis

President Uriona: Checked members who did not receive their award token.



CMI

College of the Marshall Islands

Accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges

P.O. Box 1258
Uluga Campus
Majuro, Marshall Islands, MH 96960

Tel: (692) 625-3394/3291/4931
Fax: (692) 625-7203
Email: itcommittee@cmi.edu

The September 19, 2025, Faculty Senate regular meeting was adjourned at 12:30 PM

Submitted By:

Concurred By:

Approval Date:

Curtis Vila
Faculty Senate Secretary
SY 2025-2026

Vivian Uriona
Faculty Senate President
SY 2025-2026

October 2, 2025

Date Approved by the Faculty Senate Body: October 2, 2025

Date Submitted and Concurred: October 2, 2025

Date Submitted by the FS Secretary to the webmaster for posting: October 2, 2025