

# Executive Council

---

COLLEGE OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS  
P.O. Box 1258  
Majuro, Marshall Islands 96960

TELEPHONE: (692) 625-3394/3291  
FAX: (692) 625-7203

**To: Executive Council Members:** Wayne Schmidt, President  
Richard Bruce, Dean of Student Services  
Diane Myazoe, Dean of Cooperative Research and Extension  
Tony Prout, Acting Dean of Kwajalein Campus  
Raffy Nayon, Comptroller  
Jane Taafaki Sam, Personnel Director  
Seyoum Teshome, Faculty Senate President  
Jonathon Cassel, Director of Academic, Kwajalein Campus  
Aluka Rakin, Staff Senate President  
David deBrum, Acting Director of Physical Plant, Majuro Campus  
Heralds Lemari, Student Body President

**From:** Cheryl Jorban, Executive Assistant to the President

**Re:** Minutes of 1/15/03 EC Meeting

---

The Executive Council convened at 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 15, 2003.

EC Members present: Wayne Schmidt, Richard Bruce, Diane Myazoe, Raffy Nayon, Jane Sam, Seyoum Teshome, Aluka Rakin, Cheryl Jorban, David deBrum, and Jonathon Cassel (via telephonic conference call).

Absent: Heralds Lemari, Tony Prout

The meeting began with a period of silent reflection.

## Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the EC meeting on November 21, 2002, were amended to reflect the following changes:

Page 1, **Update of WASC Visit:** insert the word "ready" to read: "The ACCJC feels that Kwajalein campus is not ready for approval...."

Page 2, **Kwajalein Students' Academic Progress:** change the word "process" in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence to "progress", to read: "...some faculty indicate that the Kwajalein students are making adequate progress...."

The minutes of the EC meeting on November 21, 2002, were approved as amended.

## Report from President:

Wayne reported on his recent trip to San Francisco to attend the ACCJC meeting. He initially met with

Executive Director Barbara Beno and Board member Bryce Harris (who is from Sacramento City College, same college as WASC Team leader Bob Harris, President of SCC--but not related) at an informal lunch. Wayne was briefed by Dr. Beno and Bryce Harris as to the kinds of questions the Commission would ask him.

They asked about the CMI audits and when to expect completion of them. Wayne explained that because Deloitte and Touche are also completing audits throughout other government agencies, they are somewhat behind in CMI's audits. Two findings of the 1999 audit that CMI contested have been removed. CMI contested 3 other findings, and they were partially modified but not removed. The draft report for the 2000 audit is due shortly.

They asked about student learning outcomes and indicated that CMI could improve on tracking of student progress. Wayne indicated that he is in the process of reanalyzing developmental data and resubmitting the report which was originally not accepted by the Commission (completed by John).

They also asked about the Accounting Manual. Wayne explained that although the Accounting Manual is not yet finalized and the training has not yet taken place, CMI has already begun implementing the policies and procedures outlined in the manual.

When in front of the entire Commission, the same questions were reiterated and answered by Wayne.

When asked by EC members what decision the Commission would make on CMI, Wayne replied that Dr. Beno would draft a letter detailing the Commission's findings, and send it to Wayne for review/comments by the end of the week.

### **Report on Registration:**

Richard reported that as of this date, 641 students have registered for Spring Semester. This is the number provided by Raffy, and Monica is still cross-checking those figures with the student registration forms.

Richard noted some problems and concerns with this semester's registration:

- Incorrect GPA calculations which affect Financial Aid. To alleviate this problem, Jenny and Monica will do an internal audit of all records.
- Last-minute setup of Room 102 caused some delay in registration.
- Inconsistencies in faculty advising, especially for those students enrolled under a previous program sheet (i.e. Business Majors enrolled in Business Math II vs. Math Survey).
- Mistakes and deletions on class lists caused by computer accident and having to reenter data.
- Class schedule given to Peter just prior to registration, thereby not allowing sufficient time to set up class lists.
- Last-minute completion of grade sheets and list of students who owe money, causing some mistakes and delays.

Richard also noted improvements in this semester's registration process:

- Having the students line up outside to pay their fees and past monies owed was a great improvement.
- The lunch provided by Administration was helpful and very much appreciated by those involved in the registration process.
- The students appreciated the fact that the lines were not closed and the registration process was not halted during the day.

Richard expressed his thanks to all who assisted in the registration process.

### **Faculty Resolution:**

Seyoum read and reviewed the resolutions proposed by the Faculty Senate at their November meeting. Each issue was addressed:

Issue 1) Separate checks for overload and adjunction contracts. Raffy explained that the system is not set up for more than 26 pay periods. The last pay period in 2002 (which was combined) allowed for two separate checks at the end of Fall Semester because one represented Pay Period 25 and the other Pay Period 26. Separate checks for Spring Semester will not be possible. Wayne asked if a separate account could be set up. Raffy indicated no, because we have only one payroll account. Seyoum asked Raffy to provide written explanation for the faculty.

Issue 2) Violation of CMI's policy as stated in the Personnel Manual. Wayne explained that a step increase is always paid retroactively even if the due date of the step increase has past. Jane concurred that all step increases are retroactive. Jane encouraged the department chairs to ensure that evaluations are completed in a timely manner to prevent delay in step increases.

Issue 3) Renewal Incentives. Jane explained that the current wording in the Personnel Manual is "salary." As long as the renewal incentives are associated with or based on salary, they must be taxed. An amendment to the current policy needs to be approved by the Board of Regents, or the new manual with the wording changed needs to be approved. Wayne stated that this issue also needs to go before the Staff Senate since there should be separate schedules for each class of employee: staff, faculty, and administration. He also stated that if the Board decides to change the housing policy, we should be thinking of a variety of benefits that could be set to replace that. All agreed that the renewal or recruitment incentives/benefits should be untaxed. All agreed that separate schedules were needed.

Issue 4) Incorrect Pay Level Placement of Current and Former CMI Employees. Jane and Wayne have currently reviewed more than 20 employees (mainly faculty) who were incorrectly placed. Wayne made a presidential decision to correct all errors at the time of step increase (anniversary date) or contract renewal, whichever came first. Wayne stated that his desire is to pay everyone, but the college does not have the financial means to pay all monies due from past contracts. When asked by Jonathon the amount CMI would have to pay, Wayne estimated \$1 million. Discussion ensued regarding the employee

responsibility to check out the salary when contract is negotiated. Once a contract is signed it is a legal, binding document. The College also has a responsibility to be honest. CMI admits that mistakes were made in salary placement, but CMI did not wait for employees to complain. Instead all contracts and placement levels were checked and corrected. As of this date, almost all faculty contracts have been changed to reflect the increased salary.

Jonathon asked whether CMI's established pay levels are mandatory or merely guidelines. Jane responded that the salary schedule is mandatory, and PSC format is followed. There are limits on the step level of initial hires (Step 5), but the cap on step increases at all levels has been removed. When asked about the remaining 5% salary increase due per Board resolution, Wayne responded that the 5% is still due, but CMI does not have the financial means to pay the 5% increase at this time.

Wayne asked that this resolution be returned to Faculty Senate for more specific suggestions as to how CMI can correct the errors. How do we pay (scope and limit of back-pay—i.e., is one year back acceptable to faculty?) and where do we find the funding? He also reminded all that whatever is recommended, the final decision lies with the Board of Regents.

Diane asked about those people in Federal programs—if the money is available now, can the mistakes be corrected immediately? Jane responded that the majority of salary placement problems were with faculty contracts.

As a final note, Wayne extended a formal thank-you to all for their input, and also extended a formal apology to all on behalf of former presidents for errors in previous contracts. He reiterated his intent to correct all problems. The Self-Study Report reflects that CMI is working to correct all kinds of mistakes in all areas.

### **Accounting Manual:**

Wayne asked that this agenda item be postponed to next week's EC meeting because he needs a color printer to be able to show the changes/corrections in the Accounting Manual prior to review/discussion.

### **Others:**

Louiston Trial – Wayne stated that the trial is still set for March 10<sup>th</sup>. Carl Ingram is the judge. There has been some concern regarding conflict of interest since Camilla is a CMI employee, but according to Wayne's explanation, she is also related to Louiston, so the two sides' interest "cancel out". When Wayne commented to Camilla about Carl's appointment, she tactfully responded, "I can't talk about the case."

Diane reported to the group that the CRE/Land Grant Board meeting will be held on Kwajalein next week Saturday. She also invited all EC members to her "virtual" graduation ceremony at 12 noon this coming Saturday in the CMI Conference Room.

Richard asked for clarification on personnel evaluation forms, asking why 2 people need to review an employee. Jane replied that this topic was discussed at a previous EC meeting, at which time it was recommended that another person (peer worker or someone outside the department) reviewing an employee can be helpful in achieving a truer, fairer evaluation since many times supervisors do not have full involvement in and knowledge of an employee's level of performance and effectiveness. Richard asked to see a copy of the minutes, and the topic was found in the EC minutes of April 1, 2002. Richard asked if he could exercise his discretion to not have a second evaluation completed for his staff, and Wayne stated "yes" since the change in Personnel Manual had not been approved by the Board.

The EC meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.