



# 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](mailto:itcommittee@cmi.edu)



## The College of the Marshall Islands Faculty Senate

Regular Meeting February 27, 2026

Supposed Meeting Start: 11:10 AM  
Face-to-Face Meeting Location: RH 119 CMI Uluga Campus  
Zoom Meeting ID: 211 006 2444 Zoom Passcode: cmi2022  
Polycom-Rooms @ Arrak Campus & CMI D.E. Centers  
Simple Minority Quorum

### MINUTES

Present During the Meeting: 33 (11 via Zoom, 22 face-to-face)

Not Present/Unexcused During the Meeting: 16

On Leave & Excused, Others: 2

Time Meeting Started: 11:10 AM

#### Overall Summary:

The Faculty Senate discussed two major governance matters: the development of a CMI Artificial Intelligence policy and ongoing revisions to the faculty workload policy. The Senate unanimously agreed to form a volunteer committee to draft an AI policy—likely adapted from existing models—and coordinate it with relevant institutional bodies. Much of the meeting focused on the workload policy, which has been under review for over a year and has involved confusion about communication between the Faculty Senate and the Human Resources Committee. Key debates included whether to reference a 40-hour workweek—ultimately rejected to preserve flexibility in credit-based faculty work—and proposed adjustments to teaching credit requirements, including recognizing committee service through credit equivalencies. The Senate agreed to continue reviewing the revised policy through a shared working document and provide further faculty input during two weeks before final decisions are made.

#### I. Introductions:

- a. **Faculty Senate President: Viviana Uriona** welcomed the Senate members and informed the body that the meeting is now in session and recording via Zoom will commence.
- b. The **FS Secretary** read the College's Mission statement.
- c. **President Uriona** appreciates the presence of all the Senate Members in attendance and also acknowledged the presence of the CMI Human Resource Director in the meeting, who is also the chairperson of the Human Resource Committee/HRC.

#### Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

- **FS VP-President:** Requested a final review of the minutes and asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.
- **Faculty A:** Made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by **Faculty B**
- The minutes from February 13, 2026, FS Regular Meeting were officially approved with no abstentions.

#### II. Call for Reports from the Faculty Senate Representatives

President Uriona called for reports of the FS Representatives from their respective Standing Committees. The topics, discussions/deliberations follow.



## ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE POLICY OF CMI

### Summary:

The Faculty Senate discussed the need for the College of the Marshall Islands (CMI) to develop an official Artificial Intelligence (AI) policy after the LEAP Committee requested faculty leadership on the matter. A representative explained that inconsistent practices among instructors regarding AI use highlighted the need for clear guidance and suggested adapting an existing policy from another community college rather than drafting one from scratch. Faculty members recommended that a committee collaborate with the Learning Design team and coordinate with relevant bodies such as the IT Committee and Executive Committee to ensure alignment before approval. The Senate unanimously passed a motion to form a volunteer committee to draft the AI policy and present it to the Senate. During the discussion, a faculty representative also emphasized the importance of shared governance and regular reporting from committee representatives to keep the Senate informed of ongoing work.

### Discussions/Debate:

The Honorable FS Representative for the LEAP Committee shared a report to the Senate body, which focused on the need to develop an Artificial Intelligence policy of CMI.

**FS Representative:** The LEAP committee wants the faculty to write an official CMI AI policy. So we need to gather people who are interested in working on that. They want it by the fall, which seems fairly reasonable. It came up a few months ago. I actually brought it up because I feel like we should have one. Different things different teachers say about using AI, and they just agreed, okay, assuming that the LEAP committee or someone else would write it. And then at the meeting yesterday, they said, so is the faculty doing that? Yet? No, you didn't ask me to ask the faculty. So now I'm asking. That's the only thing I know is they said the faculty should write it. That was the end of that. So presumably, some people need to volunteer to work on this. To me, and I'm sure this is what most colleges do, is go online and repurpose somebody else's. I mean, I don't think it's a matter of writing one. It's just going online to a community college similarly situated in the US and taking theirs and modifying it for us. I don't think anybody writes these from scratch.

**Faculty:** Suggested that the formed committee work with the Learning Design team to develop the policy fit for CMI and then it goes through the ITC for IT infrastructure alignment, and then to EC for approval.

**Faculty Representative:** The AI is on the internet, but that's the only technology. It's really an academic honesty thing. I don't know why technology people. It's about how to use AI. It's a teaching that happens to be in the internet.

**Faculty:**

*Motion: "I move that the Faculty Senate form a committee from those who would volunteer to work on the CMI A.I. Policy and present a draft copy to the Senate."*

**Faculty:** Seconded

**FS President:** Proceeded with the call to vote on the motion. The faculty senate body unanimously agreed to adopt the motion without any abstentions

Important Comments from an FS Representative



**FS Representative:** We must recognize and realize that we have what is the word? Sorry, I'm going old too fast. Shared governance, and as part of our shared governance, you know, most of us have devoted our time to sit in committees, so that, you know, we could bring things that are discussed there, bring it to Faculty Senate, and have faculty senate voice in these policies. So, you know, we should, I'm what I'm saying is we should always make time in our senate meeting for reports from these committees. Motion. That's a comment I want to make. It's what I wrote in the email.

**FS President:** I'm a little bit lost (Faculty Rep) because we called for Representative reports before the urgent topics. We give an agenda at every meeting. We ask whether the reps have anything to report. I cannot figure out where you want to go.

**FS Representative:** No, I don't want to go anywhere. It's just that I saw in the agenda that we it said that we will focus most of our discussion today on the faculty work load. Okay, which is cool, but we must also remember our responsibility for shared governance, and also for our reps who are in shared governments, who are in those groups, that we must consistently come back to the Senate and report so that everybody is on the same page. That's a comment I want to make.

**FS President:** Expressed appreciation for the important comment and asked the body for more reports from other Faculty Senate Representatives

### About the Curriculum Committee

**Faculty:** Raised concerns about membership in the Curriculum Committee.

**Faculty:** Faculty expressed that the CC committee will select its own representatives from the pool of representatives, and invite the faculty representatives.

**Faculty:** Was encouraged to express such concern during a CC meeting and then share to the Senate for records update or documentation.

**FS President:** Moved on to the next item on the agenda

### THE WORKLOAD POLICY

#### Summary:

The discussion recounts the long and complicated development of the faculty workload policy, which has been under consideration for about a year and a half. A faculty-administration subcommittee originally drafted a proposal and submitted it to the Human Resources Committee (HRC), but the Faculty Senate received no feedback. Later, faculty leaders were surprised to see a different version presented as an HRC-approved proposal, which they believed conflicted with college policy and Marshall Islands labor law, prompting the Interim President to return the document to HRC for further review. Confusion also emerged about communication gaps—particularly that the faculty HRC representative had been advised not to report back to the Senate—and about periods when meetings were suspended. With these issues clarified, the Faculty Senate and HRC leadership agreed to review the most recent draft collaboratively, focusing on key concerns such as underload and mandatory makeup work while working through faculty comments and revisions.



### Discussion/Debate:

**Faculty 7:** Can I ask something to that effect? Yes. So, what is the update with our rep to the HR committee? I believe she has resigned.

**Former FS HRC Rep:** Okay, I'll speak. That is why our HR director is here, so that she will be able to discuss the workload policy that was discussed last HRC meeting, and for the information that everyone who this is my last meeting with you to be the HR representative, because I have resigned. Thank you.

**FS President:** I want to try to give you some background on the situation that we had. We brought up the workload policy almost one and a half years ago, and we were discussing this more than once. I sent you a report to follow up on all these. I also have to recall all this, because it's been a long time since. We turned to the solution to create the sub-committee to work on the workload policy. Two people from the administration and two people from us the faculty. Our two faculty members were working with academic administrators to have a proposal to bring to HRC. The proposal was submitted to HRC, and they were waiting for a response from HRC. They never got a response from HRC with feedback.

But when David and I appears to one of the last meetings and EC, we were surprised one of the topics was a proposal for workload policy, which was much worse than the first draft. And the narration from VPASA was, this is the paper. It was voted by HRC. We stopped the discussion there. We said we do not agree to approve a workload policy that is breaching many more laws, not only the policies from CMI, but also the Marshall Islands labor laws and the Interim President decided to bring back this document to HRC to discuss.

We call for a special meeting on a Saturday, because it was the information from VPASA had to be done quickly. We present to you an email to meet on Saturday. And from this Saturday, we're still meeting mostly every day, and we bring back what the subcommittee had as a result into this paper. Yeah, this is what HRC Proxy Representative, Faculty C, Faculty D, FS-VP and I have work on and we want to present to the senate for comments and discussions.

**Former HRC Rep:** Good morning, everyone now. FS President said that there was no report from HRC rep after the workload policy was discussed with HRC, actually, I have informed the body that I will bring whatever had been agreed with HRC, and I was informed that it is not necessary anymore, because it's done with the faculty senate, and then it has been already discussed by the HRC, and that's why that workload policy was brought into the next higher governing body. So that's why I did not bring it anymore, because I was informed that it is not necessary for me to report back the workload policy that was approved by HRC, and there was a time when there was a huge lull because Miss Kayo did not report to her office, and so we were not able to meet. After that, we discussed the workload policy. That is what I can remember. This is why I did not report back to the faculty.

**S President:** Former HRC Rep, who told you that you don't need to report back to the Senate?

**Former HRC Rep:** VPASA told me it's not necessary. Let the IEC, let the next governing body, the faculty rep, to defend that faculty workload.

**Faculty:** I'm sorry, just to clarify, you were told that at the HRC?

**Faculty HRC Rep:** Yes

**Faculty:** I was there. She said it when I was there, too. She said it again. This is there's no reason for you to get it back.



**Faculty:** And I'll confirm that, because I was elected as HRC. Additional HRC record. We never had any meetings afterwards. I haven't been in a meeting where the workload policy was discussed because meetings were suspended during the latter months of the Fall. And the first meeting that we had about it again was on the 27th of January.

**FS President:** This is exactly the kind of information that we need. We were looking for this because the former HRC Rep had said that our Senate HRC Reps voted for this workload policy, and this is what she reported to us during the EC meeting. And we said that we cannot believe that our reps voted for this, and then they didn't report. And this is why we were asking you what had happened there.

**Former HRC Rep:** Your question to me was to give my experience and my feelings, which I answered you back. I did not answer you right away because my feelings and my experiences are not as important to me. And I had discussed it with a fellow Rep, I informed him of what had happened. And remember, I was alone as faculty representative to the HRC. I was alone, so whatever my voice should be a collaborative effort of the HRC, even if I don't like it. And if it is during the discussion, I can say no to everyone or to every section that I feel that the faculty is not well represented in that vote. Remember, I was alone.

**FS President:** Okay, now that we have clarified all the background, we can now move forward to explain to you that we have a version that we put all the information back from the subcommittee, and you can comment because I made a copy to recall what we made before, so that we don't lose it. Is exactly a copy, but maybe (HRC Chairperson), I want to give you the voice, because I don't know how you want to help us.

**HRC Chairperson:** Okay, so just to clarify as well, the last meeting, it was not VPASA who said you only have until next month. That was my decision. It's just because we want to move this forward. As you've said before, this has been on the table for almost a year now, so that was my decision, that you give back to us in context in a month's time so we can discuss it in the next week. But I did not say that in the next meeting, we will approve the talk. I just said we will review it with your comments, so it's not like a deadline when you only have a month to review it, but we want the comments to start coming in at the next meeting, so we can discuss it. Now this (left screen) is the most recent version that you (FS Reps) have presented in the HRC meeting last Feb. 17, and I think the right side is the version that HRC wants to present at HRC.

The reason why I asked to meet with you instead of discussing this HRC was because of technical difficulties. The document was changed with your comments, so it was edited. So while we were reviewing even just the first paragraph, I asked FS Rep Proxy, was this first paragraph edited? And he said, Yes, so I don't want to spend the HRC time going through line by line, figuring out what was changed. So, I said, that's why I suggested meeting with the faculty senate to discuss your concerns and decisions, instead of spending HRC time going line by line, figuring out what was added or what was revised. We're going to focus on real concerns, the real issues that you have. But before all of that, I would just like to say, Good morning. Thank you for considering my request to be with you today. So I think the way to do this, if you have another suggestion, I'm open to that, is we go through your comments one by one.



**FS President:** Yes, we have this possibility. We also prepared with FS VP and FS HRC Rep Proxy the paper that we can share with everyone about exactly the points we didn't share with you, because it was more of an overview. This remains a serious problem, for example, the under load and mandatory makeup work. Yeah, one of the topics, if this is the direction that you want to go through and stay to work on any one of these topics, because we have some. **HRC Chairperson:** It's up to you. I thought that it's just to go through the real issues one by one, but if you want to focus on those three issues immediately, that's also okay with me.

## A “FOURTY-HOUR” IN THE WORKLOAD POLICY

### Summary:

The Faculty Senate and Human Resources Committee debated whether a 40-hour workweek should be explicitly included in the faculty workload policy. Some faculty argued that referencing 40 hours—consistent with Marshall Islands labor norms—helps define underload and overload and provides a clear benchmark to prevent excessive workloads. Others worried that including it might reduce flexibility, potentially leading to strict office-hour requirements or time tracking that does not reflect the credit-based nature of faculty work, which varies by course type, student numbers, and instructional responsibilities. The HRC chair explained that the revised policy focuses on credit loads and course outlines rather than work hours, while emphasizing that faculty participate in policy formation through shared governance but do not have final decision authority. After discussion and a motion to vote, the Senate decided not to include the 40-hour reference in the workload policy, with a majority supporting its removal.

### Discussion/Debate:

**FS-VP:** I would like to add, I know the faculty was concerned about a large part of the amount of time they were committing to the work, and so I know that the first comment there directs a lot of attention to the 40 hours. Maybe you could elaborate on that.

**HRC Chairperson:** Is it the 40 hours? Is that something FS doesn't like to put back?

**HRC FS Rep Proxy:** We were just confused why it was removed.

**HRC Chairperson:** Because in the last discussion, if you can remember, I pointed out that faculty are working more than 40 hours, that's why it doesn't necessarily have to be in there, and VPASA is aware/agreed on that.

**Faculty:** Can I just ask something? Is it because we are paid 80 hours bi-weekly? That's why it spelled out 40 per week. Is that the reason why 40 was there?

**HRC Chairperson:** Technically, yes.

**FS President:** Yes and No. It's also a low situation. The Marshall Islands have a law of 40 hours a week. Okay? If you are not in accordance with this law, you're breaking the Marshall Islands law. And this is around the world. This is not something that especially specifies the law, but is common sense on the island. If, at the same time, we don't have this in the policy, how can we understand the underload and the overload? It is not logical.

**HRC Chairperson:** The underload and overload are not based on ours. That's why they remove the credit hours. It's not just credits right now, based on the first outcomes. So that's why there is no mention of hours anymore, because it's not really based on the work hours. It's based on credits.



**Faculty:** When we say 15 credits, like 15 credits has a different component in it, like a theory lab and this clinical, etc. So those 15 will vary according to the individual and the courses they are taking. So when we say 15 credits for one faculty and another person who is only taking the theory or in the college, those 15 lecture hours will vary totally. So then how will that work? It's out, because it is going to exceed the actual number of hours.

**HRC Chairperson:** That's why there is a definition of the variances. That's what the variances is for.

**Faculty:** When we are not taking into consideration hours

**HRC Chairperson:** It's taking here the number of students that you're teaching for every person/people in the variance table.

For the lab, it's computed differently. It's not just based on the credit space. This is actually based on student number.

**HRC FS Rep Proxy:** It took us a long time to figure this table out, and fellow faculty, she helped us a lot. The research I did is that nobody does it like this. Colleges just do not do it one student at a time. That formula of one student times five divided by five, I don't know why you would multiply something by five and then divide it by five, but that. How you that's how they determine the credits for students. And according to what I found, this is unheard of, unheard of. This is not how it's done.

**HRC Chairperson:** It can be unheard of in other colleges, but what if this applies to us?

**HRC FS Rep Proxy:** It's unfair. I mean, Joshi can talk to it more, but, I mean, I just looked, I just looked it up, and it says this is just not how colleges do this. It's not how they award credits.

**HRC Chairperson:** Here is where we're following the credits. I have to go back to the faculty. You propose your own course outlines. Right? In the course outlines, you define your number of hours. Am I right? Yes, everything is based on the course outline. If you want your hours to be counted properly, it has to be reflected properly in the course outline. Right now, what you're saying, what is actually happening in the classroom, may not be reflected in the course outline. That's beyond our control (HRC), which comes from you as faculty, through how you define it. If you want the course outline to properly reflect the hours that you spend in your lab, go back to your course outlines and redefine. But right now, what you are saying is what's actually happening in the classroom; it's not being reflected in the course outline, which is the official document for any course being offered to the public.

**HRC FS Rep Proxy:** So the outlines just need to change in this situation.

**HRC Chairperson:** Change the course outlines, if you think the hours don't match what's reality, how you have to change the course outlines, and defend it in CC.

**FS President:** I want to bring another perspective. Okay, it is just coming to my mind now, when we are discussing the 40 hours or not, if we have a situation that every one of us will have a discussion, to the course outline in the department, or to our own contract to figure out how many hours we are working for the same money, **we don't have more the power to collectivize our conflict concerning how much hours we are working.** If we have a very clear information that, as around the world, only in countries that you will be exploited. We have a 40 hours week. It's not difficult to come together if you are working 41 hours or 42 hours. But if every time when we have the situation individually, we have to figure out, okay, what was the decision in the department? What was the decision with your own contract? This is why we usually have in a workload very clear, no more than 40 hours. And according to this will be created outline, not according we create the outline, and then we can work 80 hours for the same money. You know what I mean? Questions?



**HRC Chairperson:** Just want to remind us all that the faculty senate is not a collective bargaining organization; this is a participatory governance process. Please try to differentiate. This is a participatory governance process. You participate in the formation of the policy, but we don't participate in the decision-making, which is still based on the administration.

**FS VP:** That's a very good point. Could you elaborate a bit more of what that means for the faculty senate to participate. Could you elaborate a bit more on that?

**HRC Chairperson:** It's like what they're doing right now, and listen to your comments and feedback? Yeah, yes. But at the end of the day, it's a majority vote. You bring your comments and feedback to HRC, you vote them. You decide what's the final form of the policy goes to easy for approval. But you cannot say that this is what we want, and this is what will happen. It's different. It's participatory. Participate. But it doesn't mean that we have to negotiate. We have to compromise. That's why I'm here.

**FS President:** What is important to don't have the 40 hours? Because this is not the only point, but what is important to don't have in a workload policy?

**HRC Chairperson:** Is the 40 hours something that everyone really wants to have in there? Just want to see a collective decision.

**FS-VP:** I think one of the key points here was. Said, at what point is something that goes beyond 40 hours? At what point is something a normal load? And how do you define what's overload? That's the thing. What happens is people are looking at the hours on the credits. So, when they look at their time, and they look at how much time is actually being used to accomplish their load, what they were surprised to find was that there was a lot more time actually carrying out the duties to make that load.

**HRC Chairperson:** So are you saying you want the 40 hours to be in there, such that if you're working more than 40 hours, you'll get compensated, compensated for the extra hours? **Faculty (Linus):** I think this is not for the faculty. I think staff actually work by the hour and faculty work by the credits.

**HRC Chairperson:** How are you going to compute your hours? Are you going to submit how many hours/ minutes or something?

**Faculty:** I think there was a document last year that was shared on all the comments about this paragraph, which captured all the comments. One was, do we have to count all the online interactions that we have with our students at night, at dawn, even before eight o'clock? That can be counted for 40 hours or more. Another comment was, this is a prelude to us being subjected to a thumb scanner so we can just document the 40 hours? Those were part of the comments.

**HRC Chairperson:** Those were possibilities when there is a 40 hour.

**FS President:** This is not what is going to happen. This is just a regular This is not that we are getting now because we are wanted to have in a document, which is, will be the work policy, to have a limit of hours. That doesn't mean that the result is we will have a clock to sit in.

**HRC Chairperson:** Can we just put this in a motion? If that's really what the body want. We'll put the 40 hours back or not but I'm just telling you, we're doing this to give you flexibility in your work hours, right?

**Faculty:** Can you explain to us? Then, what is the benefit of having this and one that does not have this?

**FS President:** We don't have to be in the office eight to five now, we also don't have to be in the office from eight to five. Now, as teachers, we don't need it.



**Faculty:** Now I just want to speak, you know, if you we are going to place the 40 hours, it will be a way again that they, the admin will say, you stay in the office from eight to five. And that's not true. Whereas, well as if it is open, we know that we have also number of hours stipulated in our contract, five hours in the office, then you do your thing, and we are it's open actually, for this, this is more beneficial to the faculty. Why? Because if that 40 hours will be placed there, you know what happened? The admin will say, stay in your office from eight to five. Will this mean that if you stay from eight to five, you you will not work anymore, aside from five o'clock.

**FS President:** I want to bring to you another information that we don't have now, because we got this from the Chairperson from the nursing department. We have in our contracts that stipulate 40 hours a week, with five hours at the office, with a bunch of things that we have to do. Yeah, when you compare what the things they have to do in the nursing department, they are doing, not actually I am speaking about from outline and from contract. They are. With 49 hours, if you check the reality, they are doing 56 hours a week. Okay, if we don't have the comparison to the 40 hours in the paper, we are completely loose because how we want to do a stipulated of time?

**Faculty:** What a potential solution to that be? Well, I know it's a little risky, but perhaps that something to the pick of, you know, like not less than 40 hours, or at least 40 hours, or something like that, so that it's in there, but then there is some flexibility in there. I mean, I know that, like, potentially opens the door for someone to at a later date point out, oh, look, it says at least, so working more, no more than 40 hours. Well, I mean, but I mean just something so that there's, you know, so that the numbers there, but there's still that level flexibility that you don't remove the flexibility, but then there's still a direct indication as well of what the expectations.

**HRC Chairperson:** I don't need to say this, but the way to move this forward is to a vote that you want. What do you want? Because some are saying they don't want it. Some are saying you want it. Make the decision to support you, then we will discuss it that patients, there will always be benefits. Let's do it one by one. We cannot agree in everything we have to do it one by 140 hours. What's the pleasure of the group to do it in a motion? That's the way to do it. I mean, you have to speak as a body.

**FS-VP Sinkey:** I have a question, wouldn't this also be handed out on the contract?

**HRC Chairperson:** Once this is approved, the contract will follow. We have to base the contract on the policy.

**Faculty:** The question I have in that table, you mentioned the clinical that is one credit per student per five credits. So, does that mean the course of five credits, or the total number of clinicals of five credits? What does that mean?

**HRC Chairperson:** Exactly based on student count, the computation is based on student count for every five student that you have that's one credit. Okay before we move further, can we first address the first 40 hours?

**Faculty:** If that calculation works out properly, then we can say, Okay, I mean, at least my personal thing will be working.

**Faculty:** The five is the course load credits that the students are paying to enroll the class.

### MOTION, VOTE RESULTS

**Faculty:** Why don't we just vote on whether we want the 40 hours in there? I make a motion that we just vote.

**FS President:** We have a motion to do a vote about 40 hours or against 40 hours.

**FS-VP Sinkey:** Seconded

The voting was conducted by the FS President.



### Results:

The majority of the members of the Senate voted Yes, with 1 against. She proceeded to conduct the next voting, thus,

**FS President:** Do we want to include the 40 hours in the workload policy?

### Results:

Majority of the members voted NOT to include the 40 hours in the policy, with one vote against, and 2 abstentions.

**HRC Chairperson:** Noting that the first paragraph alone took 20 minutes while offering to work with the senate during Saturdays.

## TEACHING CREDITS

### Summary:

The Faculty Senate discussed proposed changes to the teaching credit requirements in the workload policy, particularly the idea of reducing the standard load from 15 to 12 teaching credits to recognize faculty participation in shared governance and committee work. Some faculty questioned whether committee service should be compensated with teaching credit reductions since such service is already part of faculty responsibilities, while others emphasized the need to acknowledge the additional workload. The HRC Chair clarified that the revised policy sets a minimum of 9 teaching credits, with the remaining credits fulfilled through equivalencies or other assignments, leaving department chairs responsible for balancing workloads. Concerns were also raised about fairness, impacts on staff and students in shared governance, the difficulty of assigning equivalency credits, and possible consequences such as class cancellations if enrollment falls below ten students. Ultimately, the group agreed to continue reviewing the policy using a single working document and gather further faculty comments before making final decisions.

### Discussions/Debate:

**Faculty:** Are we still in the first paragraph, or are we done? I want to ask a question still on the paragraph, the one that's highlighted, paragraph one, We are recommending or proposing from the current 15 to 12 teaching credits? And what are our reasons, or why are we recommending?

**FS President:** The idea behind it was that every Faculty Senate Rep would get the credits for participatory governance. That doesn't mean that you are only teaching 12 credits. That mean that, if you want, you have the possibility to teach 12 because you are doing another work, there will be three credits (for participatory governance).

**Faculty:** So we are asking for compensation or reward for being in committees. Yeah, that's already in our job description that we will serve in committees. Which is part of the job that we is part of our job.

**FS-VP:** This came up because of faculty participation in the shared governance, because we needed faculty participation so that we had that input. People needed to be rewarded for their work, and that was the concern there. There were people involved, but a lot of those people who are in committees or in certain positions weren't being compensated.

**Faculty:** So what would that mean for the other staff members?

**HRC Chairperson:** I think this is going to answer your question. The 15 credits don't say teaching. It actually says here that we're all required to have 9 teaching credits. The six credits then come from possibly other assignments to make up for the 15.



**Faculty:** Well, nine for all faculty or nine for the chairpersons? - because that was my understanding.

**HRC Chairperson:** Reading the policy (inaudible), emphasizing 9 minimum credits for fulltime faculty receiving credit equivalencies.

**Faculty:** So does that mean if I choose to teach only nine credits, and that's it?

**HRC Chairperson:** No, you have to do six more equivalencies.

**Faculty:** So that's going to be very hard to earn the six. The extra six is going to be really challenging, and it's going to be a lot of work for the chairperson to try to find what to assign you.

**FS President:** Take note that the FS Reps will also get credits.

**HRC Chairperson:** It is stated as a minimum and under the chairperson's responsibility.

**Faculty:** Then, what about the staff members who are in shared governance? How are they compensated?

**FS-VP:** Well the staff is under a different contract, and this was something that staff was looking at as we were promoting this, staff was going, Oh, maybe we should get involved in this as well.

**Faculty:** But compensation should be equal

**FS-VP:** But faculty and staff have different contracts.

**Faculty:** Are students, too? Are they represented in this?

**Faculty:** And then we have students also in the committee.

**HRC Chairperson:** Let us refocus on a minimum of 9 teaching credits. So it's not saying that chairs can only assign nine. It's just a minimum of nine. So it is already in the revised policy, and this is credit equivalent. So, it actually went down from 12 to 9.

**Faculty:** What about the financial implications of the 9?

**HRC Chairperson:** By the instructions of our beloved president, it is to try to take such a thing out of your mind.

**Faculty:** I'm just concerned about the 12. We're recommending/proposing 12 with the other 3 that we have to make for equivalency.

**Faculty:** Do we have to vote on these 12 credits?

**FS-VP:** I think it would probably be a good idea, because it's very specific.

**HRC Chairperson:** So do you want to bring the 12 back as well? The total could be 15, or you want to bring it down to 12 total, or out of the 15, 12 will be for (inaudible).....

**FS-VP:** The problem is, I think it's the variances.

**HRC Chairperson:** Let the chairs handle that part.

**Faculty:** That's a lot of work, unreasonable denial, but 15 with 12 teachings, okay, I can compromise. Can I move a motion that we vote on this document? (This document not this one here...)

**FS President:** But they are the same.

**HRC Chairperson:** They are not the same. Just so you know, our VPASA has been willing to take out the proportionate part in the policy (inaudible)...

**FS Rep Proxy for HRC:** See, I missed that. I didn't hear that. I heard her say, she said, This is what I heard her say, we'll take it out. But the fact the faculty has to understand that more classes will get canceled. Yeah, she also offered to give us more credit for overloaded I don't know if that was just a glib remark or she actually meant that it seemed more glib than real, but that's that is what she said. She said that from the beginning, we won't, we won't take credits away from you, but more classes will get canceled. Is that okay with the faculty? And I said, I don't speak for the faculty.



**HRC Chairperson:** Classes, once they have fewer than 10 enrolees, then classes will be cancelled, which is the usual practice anyway. It's not something new. But what she wants to take out is, if it's less than 10, and you want the class to go as usual, and it will just be proportionate. However, she also said that for courses that are really required by the community, by the program, yes, even if the involvement is destined, depending on the justification. So are you (faculty) willing to compromise?

**Faculty:** Can I still make a motion then?

**FS Rep Proxy for HRC:** We get rid of the under enrolment with the knowledge that this will end up with some classes just being cancelled if there are fewer than 10 students in it, and there's no justification for it running, I personally think we shouldn't have to give anything up to get rid of that under enrolment thing, because it's, it's an BUS Faculty, if I wish he was here, he made a spreadsheet saying that the economics of it make absolutely no sense. This is, there is no economic reason I wish he were here to show it. Oh, well, he can explain it.

**FS President:** She wanted to do a motion, but I guess that we need to discuss this stuff much more deeply, because we have some information from BUS Faculty. It's important to understand that we are not responsible for the underload or overall, okay, it doesn't have to be with the money.

**FS Rep Proxy for HRC:** I just like a point of clarification. Yeah, I think (HRC Chairperson) The reason that this is still going on is that when fellow Faculty and I did our thing and submitted it to the HRC last summer, 95% of what we put in there was just removed. Things that removed without comment. Then so that bring goes back to the To what extent is this even a useful exercise? I mean, if everything that we put in there, everything we ask for, even something as simple as the establishment of a faculty workload committee, just to have two faculty and two admins looking at equivalencies and seeing if they're fair to me, an incredibly simple request was just deleted. Like, do we have any say at all? Is there any reason for us to continue with this process if the things that we suggest just get removed? I don't know. I mean, I mean to me, things that we suggest should be taken into consideration. Is something as simple as that.

**HRC Chairperson:** I'm here, okay, we're moving forward. What happened in the past? I am not underestimating the work that you put in, but I cannot speak for that. I have to move forward with this.

**FS President:** Your proposal is that the faculty work on the last version from VPASA.

**HRC Chairperson:** Some of your concerns were actually addressed already. For example, one of your comments here was to prioritize faculty, where it's already here.

**FS President:** The basis of this result was this paper, and we put back inside the subcommittee results, and this is what we share with you that you put your comments inside.

**Faculty:** So officially, is this the document that HR is reviewing? So we need to be working on this document. Is it possible that we just look at one document and comment on the one that we need to comment on?

**HRC Chairperson:** Yes, this is the document that HRC is reviewing. This is the document that I shared with you, FS President, and FS-VP to share it to faculty for comments.

**FS President:** No, because I suppose it was the paper, and I was confused that this was a new one. Okay, I will, I will share with everyone this document as a Google Doc that you can every one of you share there your comments. Can we set timelines? Can we work on this? Maybe one week. I know it's now the midterm, but can we be finished by next Sunday so that we have the feedback in a time that everyone can remember what has happened. Is it possible?



**Faculty:** There's a spring break coming up? Good time for us to really look into this.

**FS President:** You wanted to do a motion? You have all the documents and not you have all the other documents. I will share with you, these documents.

**Faculty:** I just wanted to ask if we can just work with one document. So we'll call this the working document.

**FS-VP:** Focus on one document.

**FS President:** I will put the date from today that everyone knows.

**HRC Chairperson:** One of the things that we changed here is the cross-referencing to the registration procedures. That's where the permission of the instructor applies, okay? So just want you to be aware that there is a corresponding policy on registration which addresses your other concerns. I just need you to be aware of that policy. The registration policy, it spells out how students enroll in courses and how the waitlist is supposed to work.

**FS President:** Just for the record, who made this document version?

**HRC Chairperson:** We at HRC, while we were in the meeting we were editing. **FS**

**President:** Okay, we can now adjourn the meeting.

**III. Closing:** FS President: Gave thanks to the Honorable Members of the Faculty Senate for their high participation and attendance and expressed words of encouragement for FS representatives.

**The February 27, 2026, Faculty Senate regular meeting was adjourned at 12:20 PM**

Submitted By:

Concurred By:

Approval Date:

Curtis Vila  
Faculty Senate Secretary  
SY 2025-2026

Vivian Uriona  
Faculty Senate President  
SY 2025-2026

March 13, 2026