



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND BUDGET
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: 6 December 2016
LOCATION: Hawaii Hall, Room 208
ATTENDANCE: [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS		VISITORS	TIME
Brian Glazer (BG), Chair	P	Ann Sakaguchi (AS), Vice-chair	P	Garrett Apuzen-Ito (GI), Secretary	P		3:00 pm
Adrian Franke (AF)	P	Kara Miller (KM)	P	Douglas Vincent (DV)	E		
Ruth Hsu (RH)	P	Robert Paull (RP)	E	Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa (LK) -SEC Liason	P		
Judith Inazu (JI)	P	Hyoung-June Park (HP)	P				

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION / INFORMATION	ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON
CALL TO ORDER	3:00 p.m.	
APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES	3:20 p.m.	
VP Jan Gouveia (JG) proposal to merge the UHM Office of Planning and Facilities and Communications into the Office of the Vice President for Administration	<p>We structured the discussion around each of the sections (A-F) of the proposal that were assigned by various members of the group to lead.</p> <p>Section A. Communications-BG expresses his support for the merge of Communications</p> <p>AS mentions concern that the merge of the Office of Communications with the OVPA is against the recommendations of the WICHE report for a clear distinction between the UHM Chancellor's office and the UH President.</p> <p>RH expresses concern that a central Systems Communications office may not adequately represent UHM communications. Individual units within UHM have their own needs for communications and those may differ in priority to needs of System and so she questions whether the UHM priorities will be addressed. The second concern is whether the</p>	Ann will ask Brian to request another meeting with JG, Jan 3 or 10.



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

merge will increase cost. What is the real motivation for the merge? What's broken that needs to be fixed?

LK also expresses questions about whether UHM communications needs will be met by System. It not clear that a full re-org is needed to streamline functionality of communications.

LK suggests that we support the restructuring of the UHM- Office of Planning and Facilities (OPF) and see if that works before the merge with Communications. Of JG is successful in improving Planning and Facilities, then we adding Communications later could be considered.

AS replies with a concern about re-organizing around the skills of individuals; instead such a re-org should be more about general functionality. Will it work when JG is no longer at the helm? GI suggests that we should take advantage of the expertise by JG and Donna Kiyosaki (DK) so the UH and UHM can move forward with the state legislature.

GI and LK suggest that many of the new questions being raised should be answered by JG. We decide to ask for another meeting with her.

Section B- System Integration (Manoa OFP, OCI, OHR) AS conveys an experience in which data (not related to Communications or OPF) from the Systems data base was requested, but was eventually not produced. Will the same problem occur with a centralized system as is being proposed?

JI suggests the re-org is aimed at clarifying the roles of System versus UHM

HP suggests the cross fiscal check with or without the action should be made in advance. The problem given in the proposal simply indicates the lack of adequate software. Therefore, based upon the cross check, the right software that allows DOES to connect the UHM and Systems offices is to be pursued.



GI points relays the issue explained by JG that often maintenance-level work orders begin in OPF but then as it is realized that they are large-enough jobs to become “capital improvements”, then the work order is recreated in the System office of Capital Improvements, and often information is lost in the transition.

KM would like to see words describing long-term impact of the re-org.

Will the re-org really be budget neutral? We might anticipate that with greater responsibility to the VP, that person could argue for a higher salary.

Also, there is concern that there will be a large, permanent loss of funds from UHM.

Section C) Office of Planning and Sustainability

AF notes that it practicality and efficiency demands that the people on the ground should be at the campus level. The coordination among the campuses should be centralized in one office. Job duties and responsibilities need to be very clearly defined

RH- Who is responsible and accountable for each campus?

Section F-Facilities and Business Office KM agrees with RP’s assessment (sent via email). KM questions whether some of these functions can be handled in current structure. KM is generally supportive of the merge of OPF but concern is the long-term functionality.

D-Office of Operations and Facilities

JI emphasizes that each campus should have its own office to prioritize and handle OPF functions and perhaps System should just facilitate.

GI’s summary of (some of the) main concerns:

- Loss of \$ by UHM
- Will priorities of UHM be adequately handled if all of those UHM functions are handled by a System’s office
- Skepticism about budget neutrality and so what will really be the cost?



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

	Next Meeting tentatively set at Jan 3 and 10	
ADJOURNMENT	5:18	

Respectfully submitted by Garrett Apuzen-Ito, Secretary

Approved on 1/30/17 with 8 votes in favor of approval, 0 against, and 1 abstention.