

# Kamehameha Schools Faculty Association

P.O. Box 894163, Mililani HI 96789

Hotline Number: 539-2450

## General Meeting

Thursday, May 15

3:45 p.m.

Performing Arts Band Room

### Why attend?

If you are a Kapālama faculty member, you receive a paycheck each week that is far larger than you would be getting if some of your colleagues had not risked their jobs to form a union. Next year your paycheck will be even larger. If you are contributing to our 401(K) plan, KS is giving you matching funds, up to a fixed amount. If you are treated in a way that violates our contract (CBA), KSFA will consult an attorney and our Grievance Committee will go to bat for you.

None of these benefits would exist without the selfless efforts of the KSFA Executive Board members and Grievance Committee members. The countless hours they spend in meetings and prepping for meetings are carved out of their lives to help all of us. We are benefiting financially because of them. Attending two meetings a

year and paying dues is the way we all acknowledge their efforts. It makes a statement. Not attending (or not paying KSFA dues) also makes a statement. Think about it. Which statement are you making?

— Jan Becket, Unit 11-12

### *what's inside?*

**Yet more clippings  
from the past ..... 2-3**

**Just cause:  
What's it worth  
to you? ..... 4**

**Broad-based  
admissions ..... 7-10**

# More clippings from not so long ago ...



# The Honolulu Advertiser

WEDNESDAY

July 29, 1998

Final Edition  
On Oahu 50¢  
© Copyright, 1998

## Study faults Kamehameha leadership

### HIGHLIGHTS OF THE REPORT

Peterson Consulting LLC conducted a study of the academics, management and operations of the Kamehameha Schools. Among the findings:

- President Michael Chun "has been unable to provide the schools with effective educational leadership" and "has lost the confidence of the board and staff."
- The Bishop Estate trustees ignore the needs and wishes of school

staff, students and teachers when making decisions.

- Administration "lacks a formal plan for achieving the schools' objectives and for tracking, measuring and controlling performance."
- There is "significant and public conflict" between the president and the trustees that has "adversely affected the image of the schools." The report said that "when internal battles go public, the institution and the students always lose."

### President, trustees cited for bickering

By Karen Peterson  
Advertiser Education Writer

Kamehameha Schools President Michael Chun lacks the skills to lead the school, and Bishop Estate trustees ignore teachers, students and parents when making decisions that affect their daily lives, according to a controversial report filed yesterday in Circuit Court.

The report's rating of student performance at the schools is mixed, giving acceptable marks to upper-grade students, but taking a more critical view of academics in the lower grades.

Peterson Consulting LLC wrote the report after spending more than four months studying Kamehameha educational programs from preschool through college level. The trustees hired the company in February at an estimated cost of \$400,000 to conduct an audit of the schools in response to a recommendation by court-

#### Inside

Trustee "Dickie" Wong objects to testifying on video.

▲ See story, Page B1.

appointed fact-finder and retired Circuit Court Judge Patrick Yim.

"The report is critical of my leadership, as well as the governance practices of the board of trustees," Chun said last night. "Unfortunately, Peterson fails to recognize the important connection between the two. Over the past five years, it has been increasingly difficult to lead the school."

William McCorriston, the attorney representing the estate, said: "There are two ways to react to this report.

One is to use it as a way to improve the school, and the other is to cry politics and avoid any critical review of the school that was mandated by Judge Yim's report."

# and yet more clippings ...

A-12 □ Tuesday, March 17, 1998

## Honolulu Star-Bulletin

Published by Liberty Newspapers Limited Partnership

▲▲▲

Rupert E. Phillips, CEO

John M. Flanagan, Editor and Publisher

David Shapiro  
Managing Editor

Diane Yukihiko Chang  
Senior Editor and Editorial Page Editor

Frank Bridgewater and Michael Rovner  
Assistant Managing Editors

A.A. Smyser, Contributing Editor

### Kamehameha union vote was justified

**T**HE vote of the Kamehameha Schools faculty in favor of forming a union is another slap in the face of the Bishop Estate trustees. Teachers said the 186-36 vote was not based on economic issues but on a need to protect the right to speak freely about school management and to have a larger role in policy decisions.

There have been many accusations from both the faculty and alumni of Kamehameha that trustee Lokelani Lindsey has created a climate of fear on the campus and foisted oppressive rules on the faculty and students. Lindsey even tried to intimidate a student leader in an attempt to fend off criticism.

The faculty has in effect organized to defend itself against

Lindsey and her supporters among the trustees. This amounts to another vote of no confidence in the trustees' management of the schools.

Coincidentally, the co-chairman of the Kamehameha Schools Faculty Association, which will become the bargaining unit for the teachers, is Robert Holoua Stender, a relative of maverick trustee Oswald Stender. Robert Stender said the unionization "is not about money." He said, "We're doing this for school improvement. We're looking to work with the president, the administrators and the trustees to try to form a collaborative



Lokelani Lindsey

union to better our school."

It is that collaboration that has been so glaringly lacking at Kamehameha in recent years, resulting in an unprecedented revolt against the trustees. Union organization can sometimes lead to more friction but in this case it is clear that the faculty needed the protection that a union can provide. Ultimately this decision may lead to greater harmony on the Kamehameha Heights campus — if the move to oust the culpable members of the board of trustees succeeds.

### Kamehameha teachers should be unionized

The insistence on the part of Bishop Estate attorney Robert Katz that Kamehameha Schools' teachers cannot unionize because they are management is ludicrous. If ever a set of events vividly documented the need for teacher unions, it is the Kamehameha story that Hawaii has watched unfold over the past 11 months.

Management? These teachers haven't been able to send a note home until it had been reviewed by a trustee.

But it would be a shame to conclude that this was just the aberration of one misguided trustee. The problem is with a system that stacks all power on one side; it is not just with those who are at its helm at the moment.

Any system that forces 20-year Kamehameha teachers to wait until two weeks before school's opening to learn whether they still have jobs cries out for a union.

Any system that contractually obligates teachers to surrender the precious right of free speech cries out for a union.

MARY ANNE RAYWID

1/15/98

Star-Bulletin



Out of the loop

## **CORE ETHICAL VALUES**

# **Just Cause — How Much Is It Worth?**

### **KS-KSFA Collective Bargaining Agreement, Section 20:**

**“Covered employees shall be subject to discipline including discharge for just and sufficient cause such as....”**

**“The renewal of a covered employee’s employment for a new school term shall be at the employer’s discretion.”**

### **FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE OF FAIRNESS**

Next January we will be negotiating our fourth Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). As your representative in these matters, KSFA needs to keep you abreast of important issues so that your goals and priorities are our goals and priorities. There is plenty of time for us to discuss and receive feedback next school year on the standard items (pay, benefits, hours and conditions of work, etc), but we need to remind you about one fundamental issue of fairness that remains unresolved.

### **APPEALING TO REASON AND THEIR SENSE OF FAIR PLAY**

We had hoped to get this important issue resolved collaboratively and have been meeting with all levels of KS leadership throughout this school year. We believed we could show management it was in both of our interests to settle this cost-free governance issue by appealing to reason and their sense of fair play. We are still trying. But, time and options are running out and it appears likely that we may have to do some hard bargaining (perhaps very hard bargaining if you direct) next January.

### **SO WHAT’S THE PROBLEM?**

So what’s the problem? Management now claims that the CBA allows it to non-renew your employment at the end of each school year for many reasons and that this decision, regardless of the reason for termination, cannot be grieved (overturned by a neutral third

party). KSFA maintains that the CBA allows management to terminate for many reasons but disciplinary non-renewals are grievable and may be overturned by an arbitrator if they don’t satisfy the just cause criteria.

### **SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES**

KSFA believes KS’s position is fundamentally unfair and has serious consequences that our members need to understand. The worst case scenario has already happened. We have had a teacher who was within a few years of retirement non-renewed for disciplinary reasons. KSFA grieved that decision because we were certain management had not applied the just cause criteria correctly. Rather than let the arbitrator judge their case based on its merits, the KS attorney, relying on the second quote at the beginning of this article, claimed we had no right to grieve. We were very disappointed when the arbitrator agreed with KS’ position and refused to judge the case on its merits and allowed the termination of what he considered to be an “excellent teacher” to stand.

### **NEUTRAL THIRD PARTY**

We do not understand management’s reluctance to have their decisions reviewed on their merits by an expert we mutually agree upon. As classroom teachers we know all too well that the abuse of power and control has negative impacts on morale and productivity.

Why do our leaders insist on clinging to an imbalance of power that ultimately diminishes their ability to inspire?

KSFA will continue to meet with KS leaders in an attempt to resolve this critical issue. But, if we are unsuccessful, we will need to discuss this matter with you in much greater detail so that you will better understand what happened. Basically, before going to the negotiation table, we will need the answer to two questions from our members. How important to you is the right to appeal a disciplinary termination to a neutral third party? And, how hard do you want us to bargain? Think about it.

— KSFA Executive Board



*New faculty members (and a few old ones): please consider filling out and sending this form to Human Resources. Auto dues deduction saves our treasurer time and effort.*

## AUTHORIZATION FORM FOR DEDUCTION OF UNION DUES/SERVICE FEE OUT OF WAGES

I, \_\_\_\_\_, an employee of Kamehameha Schools (“KS”) voluntarily agree to have KS take out of my wages regular monthly dues as established by the Kamehameha Schools Faculty Association (“KSFA”) in accordance with its Constitution and Bylaws, or a regular monthly Service Fee not to exceed KSFA’s regular monthly dues for its members as certified to you in writing by KSFA, and to turn over to KSFA any and all such monies on the following conditions:

1. This authorization shall become effective upon the date set forth below and cannot be cancelled for a period of one year from this date or until the termination of the existing collective bargaining agreement between KS and KSFA, whichever occurs sooner, unless cancelled sooner as provided in Section 2 below.

2. I agree and direct that this authorization shall be irrevocable for successive periods of one year each, or for the period of each succeeding applicable collective bargaining agreement between KS and KSFA, whichever shall be shorter unless:

(a) I cancel this authorization by written notice to KS at any time or within ten days after the expiration of any such one year period; or

(b) In the case of the expiration of any applicable collective bargaining agreement between KS and KSFA during any such one year period, I cancel this authorization by written notice to KS at any time during the period following the expiration of the applicable collective bargaining agreement and ten days after the effective date of any new agreement.

3. This authorization is subject to sufficient wages being available to comply with all other required deductions and existing federal and state laws. This authorization shall be suspended during any period in which there is no collective bargaining agreement in effect between KS and KSFA. This authorization shall end if my employment with KS ends. This authorization is made pursuant to the provisions of Section 302(c) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Employee Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

SS# \_\_\_\_\_

Receipt of the foregoing authorization is acknowledged:

Employer \_\_\_\_\_

## Viewpoints

Items on these pages do not represent official positions taken by KSFA

### Assumptions and consequences

# Broad-based admissions: the sequel

**(NOTE: This article was inspired by Walter Williams "Different Visions, Different Policy" from the March 12, 2003 edition of the Conservative Chronicle.)**

Does it surprise you that decent people seeking the same goal often propose opposite solutions? Some argue that political alignments involving a clash of classes or personalities (such as: teacher vs administration, "haves" vs "have nots", or Chun vs McCubbin) cause these divergent solutions. Broad-Based Admissions (BBA) is a current Kapalama campus example where two sides, one favoring lowering the admissions standards and one not, both claim the high ground in attempting to do the right thing for the beneficiaries of Pauahi's will. Both groups are positive they are right. Yet, only one can be. Either admissions standards will be lowered or they will not; the wisdom of that decision will be determined by the results.

Why do two groups both expressing concern for Hawaiian children advocate vastly different means to help them? I doubt the cause is primarily political. I believe it is because they have vastly different assumptions about how the world works. Call them values, beliefs, or visions, they are the fundamental assumptions upon which all arguments are based.

The following example from Mr. William's article clarifies the power of assumptions to influence conclusions:

"Consider what might have been an argument between two Spaniards in A.D. 1399. One person's initial premise is that the earth is flat, while the other's initial premise is that the earth is round. The person with the flat-earth premise would argue that it's impossible to sail west from Spain and reach India. The person with the round-earth premise would argue the opposite ... The internal logic underlying both arguments, given the initial premises are flawless. After all, if the world is flat, and India lies to the east of Spain, sailing west from Spain means that somewhere along the way you're going to fall off the earth. By contrast, with the premise that the earth is round, of course one could sail west and reach India. Here's the point: Given the initial premises, both arguments are flawless, internally consistent and believable to their adherents."

I like this example for a number of reasons. Not only does it illustrate the total dependence of conclusions upon initial assumptions, it also shows that widely-accepted assumptions can be completely false. Obviously, the two Spaniards would make no progress in settling their differences until they reexamined their assumptions. I believe

assumptions supporting important decisions should be minimized and satisfy all of the following conditions:

### FIVE TESTS FOR GOOD ASSUMPTIONS

1. They must be necessary to complete the argument. (Rationale: If they are not essential, then the uncertainty created by the assumption is unnecessary and shouldn't be introduced.)
2. They can't be proven or the proof is too long or difficult. (Rationale: Since they are essential and cannot be obtained by any other method, the uncertainty is unavoidable.)
3. They must be beyond the control of the decision-makers. (Rationale: If the condition can be created or controlled, it's a goal, not an assumption. Just make it happen.)
4. They must be widely accepted as true and have never been proven false. (Rationale: If the assumption is not credible, then neither will be the argument.)
5. They must be explicitly stated. (Rationale: Since they are essential, they need to be available for examination.)

Let's apply this reasoning to the BBA debate and assume that the proponents are honest people solely motivated by the practical goal of doing the most for Hawaiian children. If you are an advocate, you cannot justify your position only by noting the positive effects on the beneficiaries of the change. In order to believe BBA is superior to the status quo, you must also believe that the benefit experienced by the new admittees will outweigh any reduction of benefits to the displaced and remaining students. Similarly, if you oppose lowering admissions standards, you must believe it will fail this test.

How can these conflicting beliefs be defended or reconciled? Certainly not by conducting phone surveys of the *feelings* of those with conflicting beliefs or hidden agendas or by designing studies that "discover" obvious results that point toward a preferred solution (such as the surprising conclusion that lower ability students will experience some benefit from an intense increase in educational assistance). If we are going to avoid the fate of the flat-earth believers (who now look rather foolish) and avoid making a decision that all of us will later deeply regret, we must explain our positions more logically. It's time to lay all the cards on the table and explicitly state: the problem, the alternative solutions and their assumptions. As change is always more uncertain and often more risky and costly than maintaining the status quo, it's normal for the advocates of change to bear

## Viewpoints

Items on these pages do not represent official positions taken by KSFA

the burden of proving that the current way is fatally flawed and that their course of action is the best alternative. So far the advocates of BBA, after months of selective investigations (the study, the phone surveys, admissions experiments, and various meetings) designed to support their change, have yet to offer a comprehensive argument that the current (actually previous) admissions practice is flawed and that there is a compelling need to lower admission standards.

In the absence of a BBA argument, let's attempt to understand their position by looking at the internal logic and evidence presented so far by the advocates. This would be a lot easier if we weren't confronted by the ominously preordained sign of the solution being clearer than the problem. Once it was understood that "broad" meant replacing higher-performing students with lower-performing students and that it would not increase the number of students we assist, the basic thrust of the only solution being considered was clear. However, the problem that it was supposed to solve has yet to be stated coherently. While this relieves the authors of the BBA solution of the potential for failure (should their solution not have the intended effect), it does cloud the decision process with uncertainty and suspicion. In the absence of an explicit definition, we must infer from the hints provided what the problem is in order to analyze the validity of and necessity for their solution. It's a shame because people who don't favor the solution and lack a definition of the problem are likely to misunderstand the authors' view of the problem. As best I can tell, the authors of the BBA concept believe that under the current admissions policies, some of the beneficiaries of Pauahi's will (the lower-performing Hawaiian children) are being unfairly treated. That's pretty vague and probably incomplete, but, if I were to be more specific, I'd just be guessing. With such a sketchy definition, it is impossible for me to assess the necessity for a solution. However, assuming I have stated the problem approximately correct, I am anxious to examine the validity of BBA after constructing the best possible argument in support of it.

Probably the best way to construct a valid argument in support of BBA would be to start with what we are most sure of (the results expected by the BBA advocates) and work backwards in logical steps through the evidence to the assumptions required to complete their argument. The goal of the construction is to make the best use of the evidence in order to reduce reliance upon assumptions and minimize uncertainty by satisfying the five tests stated earlier. The BBA advocates could make either a moral/political argument or a practical argument. In the first, they must argue that lowering admissions standards will better satisfy the political goal of providing more equal access to all potential beneficiaries. In the second, they would make the case that BBA will better serve the actual needs of students because

the benefit experienced by the new admittees will outweigh any reduction of benefits to the displaced and remaining students.

### A MORAL/POLITICAL BBA ARGUMENT

A moral/political argument should make the claim that, regardless of impact on the school, lowering admission standards is the right thing to do because, as potential beneficiaries of Pauahi's will, lower-performing students have as much right to an education as higher-performing ones. In addition, not only are lower-performing students discriminated against by the current competitive process and underrepresented at Kapalama because of it; they also have more to gain and learn than more competitive students. As this is a moral/political argument, it appeals to our sense of how the world works which, as stated earlier, includes all those assumptions (values, beliefs and visions) we base our arguments upon. The phone surveys were an attempt to quantify this moral sense without actually identifying the nature or examining the consequence of our assumptions. But, as these assumptions determine conclusions, they need to be examined. While there are many assumptions the BBA authors may be making, I can think of at least four critical assumptions needed to support their position that they may or may not have considered. The first two involve priorities. The third addresses the moral need for representation, and the last comments upon the motivational influence of Pauahi's will.

The first assumption I believe the BBA advocates need to make in order to support their moral/political argument is:

**More equal access for potential beneficiaries (all Hawaiian children) is more important than increasing actual access for the same beneficiaries.**

*In keeping with the new open spirit at Kamehameha, the Faculty Forum at the end of each newsletter is open to those who wish to communicate with the rest of the faculty. Please feel welcome to submit a piece. Viewpoints expressed here do not represent official positions taken by KSFA.*

## Viewpoints

Items on these pages do not represent official positions taken by KSFA

This assumption is necessary because the per student cost for lower-performing students is significantly higher. Given KS' budget restrictions, we will actually be narrowing the reach if we lower admissions standards. This is a serious consequence that requires that a very strong argument to justify this assumption. However, the BBA advocates are not asking for equal access, only more equal access. They want to lower the standards a little, not remove them entirely; and they want to accept only students with "potential." Aside from being a criterion with tremendous potential for abuse, this is hardly an egalitarian principle. How do we know when we have achieved the morally correct lower level of inclusion? Maybe we are there already.

The second assumption involving priorities is:

**More equal access to potential beneficiaries is more important than increasing the actual benefit to those beneficiaries.**

In other words, it's more important to put a Kapalama diploma in the hands of lower-performing students than it is to insure the recipients of the diploma receive a quality education. This assumption needs to be made if the second argument (BBA will better serve the actual needs of students) is unpersuasive.

The third assumption is:

**Lower-performing students is a group of beneficiaries that should be "represented" on the Kapalama campus.**

Clearly the BBA advocates conclude that the competitive process constitutes an unfair discrimination against a group of beneficiaries. However, due to limited resources, Kapalama can accommodate less than one tenth of the potential beneficiaries, so some exclusion process and criteria are required. The competitive process is fair and serves many useful functions. It insures that some of those most ready for an education (a necessary condition for a highly productive school) are accepted and that student leaders will be available as examples for other students. District quotas temper the competitive process and insure geographic representation. The case for geographic representation not only has governmental precedents (the Senate, the House, Neighborhood boards, etc.) but it also consists of constituents who identify with and take pride in their group or community. Furthermore, it's healthy for a school if the students socialize with a mix of cultures from the various communities. However, it is not clear that all groups should be "represented" at Kapalama. What about lazy or immature students or those with an inclination to fight, steal or abuse drugs? Such students definitely need improvement, but should a certain percentage of slots be reserved for them? Unlike geographic groups, I doubt if lower-performing students identify with or take pride in their group. Belonging to a geo-

graphic group is not a problem, but being a member of a lower-performing one is. The purpose of admitting them at Kapalama would be to remove them from their under-represented group and place them in an over-represented group. Once that move has transpired should we expel them in order to make space for another under-represented group? That's essentially the effect of BBA on the current student distribution. Low performance was once a disqualifying admissions criteria. BBA would make it a qualifying criteria. What justifies this 180 degree shift? I think the BBA advocates have a problem with this assumption and have some explaining to do.

My final assumption that is necessary to complete a logical moral/political argument is:

**Abandoning the competitive admissions criteria will not adversely affect the motivation of Hawaiian children to improve themselves.**

This assumption is necessary to address the concern that if competitive admissions is a positive influence that encourages self-improvement, then its termination might have some unintended affects. It's a legitimate concern. If they "let anyone in," why should a child strive for excellence in order to get in? If the standard for acceptance is low before a child is accepted, the standard for performance after acceptance will be more difficult to raise. If there is no struggle to get in, will acceptance be valued as something earned and to be preserved by hard work, or will it be perceived as a right where a student is owed an effortless education? The dependent attitude it creates could become much like that caused by government-assistance programs, where in order to qualify for a benefit the applicant has to fail (and thereby demonstrate need). Since we would be rejecting more successful in favor of less successful students the comparison to the welfare analogy is too close for comfort. If self-improvement is not being encouraged, what kind of behaviors will broad-based admissions spawn? As many more students apply to than attend Kapalama, the motivational influence is a powerful force for self-improvement in the Hawaiian community. The affect of BBA upon motivation is something that needs to be studied rather than assumed.

### A PRACTICAL BBA ARGUMENT

A practical argument should claim that the benefit to the new admittees would outweigh any reduction of benefits to other students requires hard data, and is much more difficult to support. It is more like a wish than a serious argument. It is probably being suggested to soothe those who subscribe to the moral/political argument as long as BBA does not do too much damage to the quality of education at Kapalama. The bubble group study was an attempt to fill this need for hard data. The problem is it doesn't support the practical argument for BBA. The fact that by extensively changing its normal program Kapalama was able to moder-

## Viewpoints

Items on these pages do not represent official positions taken by KSFA

ately improve upon what might be done in the DOE proves nothing about the potential for success of BBA. The study made no attempt to evaluate the cost of the special treatment provided the bubble group nor did it address their impact on the other students. Another major difficulty in using the bubble group study as evidence to support BBA is that the bubble group was for the most part actually a bubble. This group of lower-performing students required special treatment and did not mix uniformly with other students (like the BBA students will) but passed through the Kapalama system in their own self-contained bubble. Without evidence, one wonders how we could be asked to assume that admitting a larger percentage of lower-performing students will be good for them, the displaced students and the remaining students. In fact, the opposite appears more likely. It seems more probable that if they are less ready, they will experi-

ence less growth than those more academically inclined. And, as lower-performing student tend to be less industrious, less disciplined and less mature, it's unlikely that their contribution to the school climate will be more positive than the students they are replacing. Without hard data or credible assumptions, the practical argument is baseless.

### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it seems that the BBA advocates, like the flat-earth believers, have become the victims of their own assumptions. Like the two Spaniards seeking the best way to India, the only way we will be able to settle our differences is if we reexamine our assumptions. It's time to explicitly state the problem, the alternatives and the assumptions and let reason prevail.

— Bill Follmer, Unit 9-10

## The Strategic Plan needs revision

Three years ago I was on the stewardship committee that helped to shape Section 5 of our Strategic Plan. At the time, we came to the conclusion that we could not separate stewardship of land from stewardship of assets, and turned in a final report that made this statement in its introduction:

*As members of an educational institution that teaches humanistic and spiritual values to our students, it is incumbent on us to model stewardship of both land and investment assets in a manner consistent with our core values, educational philosophy and evolving world view.*

In its "Detailed Findings" section, the same document asks KS to

- *Adopt and implement, publish and follow an ethical investment guideline for KS assets and economic partnerships that reflects core values and meets generally-accepted principles for socially-conscious investing followed by churches and other institutions across the nation.*
- *Adopt and publish guidelines to insure that investment of KS assets and economic partnerships reflect core values.*

Our detailed reports, of course, were condensed. The "Draft Strategic Plan" published on 8/29/00 kept that idea but moved it under Goal Five:

- *Develop and implement ethical investment policies and practices that are consistent with our core values.*

I was disappointed that the editing removed any reference to publishing those policies. However, it was gratifying to see that the basic commitment to ethical investing remained. However, Goal Five of our final Strategic Plan

greatly diluted that commitment:

- *Develop and implement prudent investment policies and practices that are consistent with the trustees' fiduciary duties and Kamehameha Schools' values.*

One wonders if those KS values prohibit investment money from supporting third world child labor and sweatshops. Nike, Disney, Mattel and scores of other US corporations import goods made by children. Some of these underage workers in Bangladesh, China, El Salvador and the Philippines are paid a tenth of 1% of the eventual sales price in the US, not a living wage even in the third world.

Similarly, US chemical companies export pesticides banned in the US to third world markets, where they cause birth defects and health problems for workers. Ironically, the same pesticides sometimes come back to us in imported food.

Do we all agree that KS money should support arms industries, tobacco, alcohol or strip mining? If the Arctic Wildlife Refuge is opened up for oil drilling, should KS money support the oil companies that profit from it? These are all discussions that have never been held. Perhaps they should be.

Of course, there is not one set of ethical investment guidelines; there are many. Our affiliate, The United Church of Christ, follows its own ethical investment guidelines. Harvard, Stanford, Oxford, the state of California and New York City have each developed their own. Institutions that do practice ethical investment, however, publish their guidelines.

Why not KS?

— Jan Becket, Unit 11-12