



Testimony BOE <testimony.boe@boe.hawaii.gov>

Testimony.Opposing HR agenda 3.a

1 message

Spencer Gill <spencergill918@gmail.com>

Tue, Apr 13, 2021 at 7:49 AM

To: Testimony.BOE@boe.hawaii.gov

Aloha Chair Takeno and Human Resource committee members,

I am writing in opposition of agenda item 3-A: Compensation adjustments for DOE leadership. Kishimoto and her hand picked team have failed the people of Hawaii in particular, the Maui complex area superintendents.

Indecisive, illogical, defensive, and ill-equipped is what comes to mind when you think of what is happening on Maui and it is obviously a lack of leadership. The incompetent CASs created a combative culture where everyone is fighting with each other. Never before has Maui had so many employee vs. employee investigations and it is because the CASs encourage employees to file complaints on one another. Just in the last year there were more than a handful of Principals under investigation (while sexual harassment complaints against certain principals were covered up by the CAS), in addition to vice principals and teachers. When there is no direction and leadership, the structure of an organization fails and employees go wild.

The culture created by these incompetent individuals has to be addressed. CASs also use the investigatory process to retaliate against employees instead of addressing issues, most likely because they lack the skills.

Maui has pushed out so many students and are leading the pack with the amount of drop outs. Why are schools on Molokai 100% remote learning? My nephew on Lanai was turned away from having a lunch, not only once, and the older kids are still remote. Does anyone care?

Certainly, they do not deserve retroactive pay, they cannot do their job.

Me ke aloha pumehana,
Spencer Gill



Testimony BOE <testimony.boe@boe.hawaii.gov>

Testimony HR Committee: Opposition III-A

1 message

Nolan Alexander <nolana801@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 8:57 PM

To: Testimony.BOE@boe.hawaii.gov

Aloha Board of Education Human Resources members,

I am writing in opposition of agenda item 3A: Compensation adjustments for DOE leadership. In a time where students in Hawaii have been denied an education because of failed leadership starting at the top level, Christina Kishimoto has the audacity to request undeserving retroactive raises. Shocking to say the least.

This year has been a year of chaos, not because of the pandemic, but the lack of leadership beginning with the top levels of the DOE. Deputy and Assistant Superintendent's cover ups of unethical conduct coupled with the wolf pack "defend at all costs" mentality and actions should not be receiving raises, but should also have their contracts end with Kishimoto.

Kishimoto's cabinet is by far, is the most incompetent team of people we've had in decades. The DOE has reached an all time low in dealing with HSTA and the assistant superintendent for OTM is clueless on how to negotiate and handle the unions. Cynthia Covell has elevated HSTA leaving the DOE powerless.

Learning has not been at the forefront of this cabinets' priorities. Complex Area Superintendents are inept in making decisions, wavering continuously and unable to deal with HSTA. The inconsistencies between complexes and complex areas were annoying and a disservice for families, it is obvious families aren't a consideration in the decision making.

Honolulu district CASs are on a powertrip, covering up unethical things happening at schools. They hold interviews for administrators that have a large ticking clock in front of the applicant and give them 30 minutes to complete the interview. It is obvious positions are predetermined by the CASs and established Department procedures aren't followed.

Principals have alcohol in their desks on school campus. Being a drug free zone, CASs know about this and think it is funny. Where is the professionalism? Where is the leadership?

There is a leadership problem in the DOE and it starts at the top level.
Please oppose this request.

Mahalo for your time.

Sincerely,
Nolan Alexander



Testimony BOE <testimony.boe@boe.hawaii.gov>

NO PERSONAL INFORMATION- Testimony against HR Committee, Item III A

1 message

Sun, Apr 11, 2021 at 8:40 PM


To: testimony.boe@boe.hawaii.gov

Testimony against HR Committee, Item III.A

Dear Committee Chairperson Takeno and Members:

We urge you all to vote "no" on Item III.A. Kishimoto's request for raises is appalling and unconscionable as Unebasami, Assistant Superintendents, and Complex Area Superintendents underperformed during the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years. Kishimoto justifying raises based upon her evaluation ratings is misguided as Kishimoto lacks proper reflection of her own conduct and merits. How is she capable of objectively evaluating subordinates implementing her directives?

This request reflects Kishimoto's values, which we believe are not similarly held by the Board of Education. Kishimoto's request for raises sends a clear message to students currently off-track to graduate or experiencing difficulty with hybrid and distance learning schedules, to teachers working harder than before to engage students, and principals stuck implementing the Kishimoto's last-minute pivots: "The problem is you, not leadership! The failures within the Department have nothing to do with our leadership, rather each student, teacher, staff member, and principal is to blame." Kishimoto's request for raises supports the belief that the "ivory tower" ignores the human costs of their decisions. Kishimoto's request is insensitive to the realities of students and their families, and particularly dehumanizing to those in the unemployment line whose kids have been damaged by leadership choices like Acellus.

We urge you to vote "no". Instead, use the \$70k to improve the well-being of students. How about requiring each Educational Officer to offer engagement opportunities for students now and during the summer? The purpose of these opportunities would be to (re)connect students and their families to the joys of learning through zoom book readings and story telling, teaching concepts widely known to be difficult to understand at each grade level, crayon art, or talk story sessions to improve reasoning and critical thinking. The \$70k, along with some ESSER SEA funding, should be used for supplies to support these educational engagement activities.

By voting "no", you will signal to students that the Board of Education holds Kishimoto and her team accountable, expects improvements towards systemic efficiencies, and most importantly, sees and values students. We appreciate your consideration.



Testimony BOE <testimony.boe@boe.hawaii.gov>

Testimony in opposition of HR committee III.A Committee Action on Methodology for Compensation Adjustments

1 message

Warren Hyde <whyde808@yahoo.com>

Sun, Apr 11, 2021 at 11:09 AM

To: "testimony.boe@boe.hawaii.gov" <testimony.boe@boe.hawaii.gov>

Aloha e Board of Education human resources members,

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify in opposition of item III.A. Committee Action on Methodology for Compensation Adjustments.

It is shocking that Christina Kishimoto is making this request in a time where furloughs were on the table, elimination of vacant and temporary positions are happening and numerous employees in the DOE will be losing their jobs, and employees will not be receiving raises across the board. This is yet another feckless move by Kishimoto.

The \$70,000 she is asking for will create years of morale issues that the next Superintendent will take years to repair. This appears to be a thank you gift for those that lost their moral compass and protected Kishimoto at all costs, even when it hurt others. To date general education teachers are bitter about the bonuses given to SPED, hard to fill, and Hawaiian immersion teachers.

Leadership compensation adjustments are based on annual performance. You have one main job in the DOE, compulsory education which means children must be learning. The current data clearly shouts the failing of the leaders, school leaders, complex area superintendents, assistant superintendents, deputy superintendent and Kishimoto.

The highest amount of withdrawals from our schools tops over 7200 students. Seniors are not on track to graduate (notice the DOE is using Q2 data, when we are in Q4). The students in K-11 are not on track and some would argue should not be socially promoted to the next grade level. Very little learning was accomplished this school year. Simply put, annual performance of leadership inclusive of CAS, AS, DS is Unsatisfactory. The DOE should not be failing even one student and the DOE has failed the entire population of Hawaii.

The three points of the strategic plan have not been met. Should DS and AS evaluations be rated effective or above would mean these performance evaluations were arbitrarily done, biased, or a quid pro quo. This leadership ring should be providing clear strategy to the field and it was non existent. One word: Acellus. The DOE leadership has failed the population of Hawaii.

Should CASs receive a meets performance would also illustrate the bias or quid pro quo for students are not back on campus, students are not learning in their current environment, CASs were ineffective in leading.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify in opposition of item III.A. Committee Action on Methodology for Compensation Adjustments.

Sincerely,
W. Hyde



Testimony BOE <testimony.boe@boe.hawaii.gov>

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE Testimony Agenda Item IIIA

1 message

3396723 <3396723@protonmail.com>

Tue, Apr 13, 2021 at 9:19 PM

Reply-To: 3396723 <3396723@protonmail.com>

To: "Testimony.BOE@boe.hawaii.gov" <Testimony.BOE@boe.hawaii.gov>

Chair Takeno,

I'm writing in opposition to raises for HIDEO executives. In this time of economic uncertainty, where teachers and staff are being RIF'd it is irresponsible to provide raises to the highest echelon of the DOE. OSIP and OITS may be disbanded under the guise of cost savings, and although the \$70,000 earmarked for raises are a fraction of a percent of the DOE budget, the optics will be difficult to overcome.

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

Aloha HR Committee Chair Takeno and Members.

I am providing written testimony on agenda item II-A. Presentation on Department of Education's reorganization plan to preserve classroom instruction: temporary or permanent closure, consolidations, reorganization, restructuring, or merger of offices, programs, services, and positions for State Office, Complex Area, and School levels.

Entertaining a discussion on a reorganization plan based on the current Superintendent's and Assistant Superintendents' visions, seems to conflict with agenda item III-B in the General Business Meeting. If it is expected that no new permanent leadership, including directors, be appointed until a new Superintendent is on board, why consider a reorganization plan right now -- even if only for discussion? The work involved in a reorganization and the undue stress on staff from possible changes in work duties, location, and supervision seems premature and unnecessary at this time.

However, having been an employee and manager in one of Hawaii's executive branch departments and having a background in public sector management and organizational change, I am offering the following comments for the sake of the discussion:

Based on the agenda materials provided, it appears that four state offices are planning reorganizations which could result in an increase in personnel and required salary budgets.

- Office of Fiscal Services
The Office of Fiscal Services' proposed reorganization would be considered more of a functional business alignment than a full reorganization. Two additional FTE, a director, and a realignment of staff to make reporting lines official and recognized by collective bargaining and the department are resulting in minimal increases compared to the proposed efficiencies it would create.
- Office of Information Technology Services
Information on the Office of Information Technology Services' reorganization plan is broad and does not communicate much of what the future organization would look like. Based on the published Plan of Organization, the office currently has six branches that seem to be organized around technical functions. The proposal seeks to reorganize based on product.

The number of products and positional needs will determine the size of the organization -- more products could mean more branches. Reorganization should include in-depth analysis of costs and effectiveness before it commences. It should align to a comprehensive technology plan that includes roadmaps, milestones, timelines, and performance indicators for success and accountability. The 2019 plan seems to be an executive summary or framework and recent plans for 2020 and 2021 do not appear to be available to the public.

- Information on the Office of Facilities and Operations is also broad and does not communicate much of what the future organization would look like. Based on the published Plan of Organization, the office currently has six branches and one standalone unit.

It is unclear whether this office plans to create new branches or standalone units for planning (currently under Facilities Development Branch), asset management, inventory

management, which would potentially increase positions and salaries to a significant level. Food Services and Health and Safety seem to already exist in current capacities. Therefore, reorganization should include in-depth analysis of costs and effectiveness before reorganization commences.

- The Office of Student Support Services plan creates more sections and a new branch. Depending on current staff levels, it seems there will be an increase in section administrators and a new branch director, which would probably need to include director support staff. This would be a cost increase and possibly a position increase. The current organizational structure within the office has two large branches with many staff, compared to other branches in other state offices. Therefore, reorganization should include in-depth analysis of costs and effectiveness before reorganization commences.

Mahalo for your consideration of these comments.



April 15, 2021
Human Resource Committee

Dear Chair Takeno and Members of the Committee,

We are commenting on item III. A., Committee Action on methodology for compensation adjustments for Department of Education leadership employees (Deputy Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents, and Complex Area Superintendents) Leadership compensation adjustment, projected amount of funds required for adjustments, and source of funds for adjustments.

We do not support a compensation adjustment for the DOE's leadership team at this time for the following reasons:

We acknowledge that the Deputy Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents and the Complex Area Superintendents have been working extremely hard this past year to address challenges confronting our schools during the COVID-19 pandemic. We also recognize that through the American Rescue Plan, the DOE will receive a significant amount of federal funds to help our school system recover from the effects of the pandemic. We, however, feel that it is not the right time to consider a salary increase amidst the uncertainty over the DOE budget. Our understanding is that schools will still be operating with a 2.5% budget reduction, and that positions have been eliminated at both the school and state level. There are still a number of unfunded liabilities such as workers' compensation and unemployment insurance. There will also undoubtedly be more expenses at the school level to address the reopening of schools and the ongoing pandemic. Until we have a clearer picture of the budget situation, we suggest that this action be deferred.

In addition, there appears to be a lack of clarity and transparency in the evaluation process. For example, the Superintendent's memo dated April 15, 2021 states that the ratings of the Deputy Superintendent and Assistant Superintendents "were based on meeting specific performance outcomes linked to the implementation of the Board and Department's joint three-year Strategic Plan." Our understanding is the "joint three-year Strategic Plan" is also known as the Promise Plan, but we also understand that the BOE has not approved the Promise Plan. We, therefore, do not understand what Strategic Plan is being used as the basis for the evaluation. Furthermore, it appears that the Complex Area Superintendents' ratings are based on both the "Strategic Plan" and "Complex Area Plan," but it is unclear what those plans are. We cannot know what criteria is being used because we don't know what these plans are. Also, it is not clear who is performing the evaluation, whether it is the Superintendent alone or by a committee. We believe these issues need to be clarified before any action is taken by the BOE.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,

Cheri Nakamura
HE'E Coalition Director

HE'E Coalition Members and Participants

Academy 21
After-School All-Stars Hawai'i
Alliance for Place Based Learning
American Civil Liberties Union
Atherton YMCA
*Castle Complex Community Council
*Castle-Kahuku Principal and CAS
*Education Institute of Hawai'i
*Faith Action for Community Equity
Fresh Leadership LLC
Girl Scouts Hawai'i
Harold K.L. Castle Foundation
*HawaiiKidsCAN
*Hawai'i Afterschool Alliance
*Hawai'i Appleseed Center for Law and Economic Justice
*Hawai'i Association of School Psychologists
Hawai'i Athletic League of Scholars
*Hawai'i Children's Action Network
Hawai'i Education Association
Hawai'i Nutrition and Physical Activity Coalition
* Hawai'i State PTSA
Hawai'i State Student Council
Hawai'i State Teachers Association
Hawai'i P-20
Hawai'i 3Rs
Head Start Collaboration Office
It's All About Kids
*INPEACE
Joint Venture Education Forum
Junior Achievement of Hawaii
Kamehameha Schools
Kanu Hawai'i
*Kaua'i Ho'okele Council
Keiki to Career Kaua'i
Kupu A'e
*Leaders for the Next Generation
Learning First
McREL's Pacific Center for Changing the Odds
Native Hawaiian Education Council
Our Public School
*Pacific Resources for Education and Learning
*Parents and Children Together
*Parents for Public Schools Hawai'i
Special Education Provider Alliance
*Teach for America
The Learning Coalition
US PACOM
University of Hawai'i College of Education
Voting Members () Voting member organizations vote on action items while individual and non-voting participants may collaborate on all efforts within the coalition.*

Human Resources Committee

April 15, 2012

Testimony

III.A Recommendation for Action

OPPOSE: NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION TO SUPPORT

A. Compensation Adjustments and Source of Funds

1. Please identify those receiving compensation adjustments and those who are not. Not by name but by position. This request is not subject to HIPAA.

2. If the request is denied, then I **WILL NOT SUPPORT** this Action Item.

3. However, if the request is permitted then the following applies;

3a. I support the same performance evaluation methodology used for calculating the SY 2019-2020 adjustments be utilized again.

3b. I support the funding to implement this pay adjustment that is calculated to be no more than \$70,000, and the Chief Financial Officer has accounted for this cost in the Department’s central salary budget for all general funded employees.

3c. AS LONG AS this money is coming out of the Department’s central salary budget **AND NOT FROM Federal funds due to President Biden’s \$1.9T American Rescue Plan (aka COVID-19 Relief Bill) that provided specific and significant funding to the Department.**

Please breakout the pay adjustments as follows;

Department Position	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Deputy Superintendent	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Assistant Superintendent (1)	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>

Curriculum and Instructional Design	
Assistant Superintendent (2)	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Facilities and Operations	
Assistant Superintendent (3)	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Fiscal Services	
Assistant Superintendent (4)	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Information Technology Services	
Assistant Superintendent (5)	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Strategy, Innovation and Performance	
Assistant Superintendent (6)	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Student Support Services	
Assistant Superintendent (7)	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Talent Management	

Department Position	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
Complex superintendents	
(1) Honolulu <i>Kaimuki-McKinley-Roosevelt</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(2) Honolulu <i>Farrington-Kaiser-Kalani</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(3) Central Oahu <i>Leilehua-Mililani-Waiialua</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(4) Leeward Oahu <i>Pearl City-Waipahu</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(5) Leeward Oahu <i>Nanakuli-Waianae</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(6) Windward Oahu <i>Castle-Kahuku</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(7) Windward Oahu <i>Kailua-Kalaheo</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(8) Hawaii Island <i>Kau-Keaau-Pahoa</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(9) Hawaii Island <i>Hilo-Waiakea</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(10) Hawaii Island <i>Honokaa-Kealakehe-Kohala-Konawaena</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(11) Maui <i>Baldwin-Kekaulike-Maui</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(12) Maui <i>Hana-Lahainaluna-Lanai-Molokai</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(13) Kauai <i>Kapaa-Kauai-Waimea</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(14) Central Oahu <i>Leilehua-Mililani-Waiialua</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(15) Leeward Oahu <i>Pearl City-Waipahu</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>
(16) Leeward Oahu <i>Nanakuli-Waianae</i>	0% <input type="checkbox"/> 2% <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5% <input type="checkbox"/> or 3% <input type="checkbox"/>

ACCORDINGLY NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

1. Three of the category "Deputy and Assistant Superintendents" are not eligible for the compensation adjustment. Please Notate on table as 0%.
2. Two of the category Assistant Superintendents are not eligible for the compensation adjustment. Please Notate on table as 0%.