



**COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND BUDGET**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**MEETING DATE:** 9 March 2017  
**LOCATION:** St. John 106  
**ATTENDANCE:** [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused; L=late]

MEMBERS		MEMBERS		MEMBERS		VISITORS	TIME
Brian Glazer (BG), Chair	P	Ann Sakaguchi (AS), SEC liason	P	Garrett Apuzen-Ito (GI), Secretary	P	David Lassner	1:30
Adrian Franke (AF)	P	Kara Miller (KM)	A	Douglas Vincent (DV)	P	GEC Stacy Roberts Dore Minatodani Shannon Johnson	2:40
Ruth Hsu (RH)	P	Robert Paull (RP)	L			Gen Ed Office Hokulani Aikau (Director) Wendi Vincent Lisa Fujikawa	2:40
Judith Inazu (JI)	L	Hyoung-June Park (HP)	L	Robert Cooney, (RC)	L		

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION / INFORMATION	ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	1:30 p.m.	
<b>APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES</b>	Minutes for 2/27/17: 8 in favor, 1 abstention 0 against.	
<b>President/Interim Chancellor Lassner Implementation &amp; planning of recent/pending/future</b>	AS has resigned from the SEC and has requested to return to CAB as a member.  BG: What is your vision for re-organizations and what can CAB and SEC do to facilitate? Lassner: There are 4 “Buckets” of reorganizations  <u>Bucket 1:</u> Combining System and Manoa offices.	



<b>reorganizations (1:35)</b>	<p>The move of UHM Planning and Facilities, and Communications to UH System has occurred and Lassner acknowledges opposition by CAB and UHMFS. The next planned re-organization is for Human Resources.</p> <p><u>RP</u> What about Human Resources? Lassner: there will be a single HR office rather than the current two layers. The BOR has asked how HR can be reorganized to reduce duplication of services, reduce fragmentation and distributed structure. Includes supportive services, high performance shared services. This re-org will be complex because it involves many unions. This ends “bucket” 1 of re-orgs.</p> <p><u>Bucket 4:</u> Internal re-org of student housing.</p> <p><u>Bucket 2:</u> Reorganization of Manoa. Current structure, dates back to early 2000’s, and is not optimal. Examples of how current structure is not optimal: Various issues are reported to the Chancellor (travel, IX, LGBTQ...). The separation between instruction and research is not helpful. Deans report to 3 different offices: OVCR, OVCAA, Chancellor. UHM has seen disturbing trend of 5 years of enrollment decline, with each year’s decline becoming larger and currently at 24-25%. Wants to focus on enrollment improvement in an integrated way. The team currently analyzing enrollment reports to the 4 different leaders at the vice-chancellors level. This separation hinders communication and effective implementation of common goals.</p> <p>VC for Students has offices that deal with campus climate, diversity, health, mental health primarily for students, international students but everyone on campus--including faculty and staff--needs to be served in some of these aspects (esp campus climate).</p> <p>Data: Organizations who handle data include VCAFO (Cutshaw), VCAA, space, ORS, VCS and these data are not always consistent, or consistently defined. Need to have these divisions work more closer together.</p> <p><u>Bucket 3</u> Academic structure of Manoa. Does the ORU structure still make sense? Need better integration of instruction with research. 17 different colleges report to Hawaii Hall and that’s too many. Some schools are smaller than some departments.</p> <p>Creating opportunities for inspiring programs that will draw more students.</p> <p>Social sciences (largest college) surveyed their students for desirable degrees: #1 was in Sustainability and #2 Criminology. What mergers and closures are needed? What new programs should form?</p> <p>Academic programs could become more competitive with more</p>	
-------------------------------	--	--



interdisciplinary and team-based. Travel Industry Management is small. Shidler is successful.

Asked about LLL/A&H discussions last year. No response from these Colleges. Meanwhile the interim dean is left wondering what's going to happen.

BG Asks about opposite interpretations of WICHE report: Admin tends to interpret as need for better integration between System and Manoa, but faculty interpret reports as indicating needed more autonomy for UHM.

Lassner agrees. The BOR appoints two positions -- President and BOR Secretary--BOR sees little value in supporting a (weak) UHM President and strong Chancellors where the President has no control over the Chancellor's actions.

RC Describes a case in which ORS was not especially responsive and suggests a Manoa office would better serve Manoa. He mentions a faculty member who feels like she's gotten in trouble by going above her school to address problem with ORS. About combining units: when TIM moved out of business it did better. What makes sense at the administrative level may not make sense on the ground to students.

Lassner: Improving ORS services will not automatically happen if it moves to UHM. Let's focus on improving ORS.

AS Notes that in Public Health, reducing to a program is not helpful even if administration costs are saved. Application for federal grants requires faculty to be part of an accredited School of Public Health so merges must take into consideration opportunity costs.

GI UHM faculty have concerns that centralizing UHM services with System will weaken UHM's voice or abilities to address UHM's specific priorities. How can you address that? Lassner: 1980's the faculty drove the move to combine the System and UHM. It can work either way and we've proven that. Lassner wants improved services.

BG: With you and Bruno doing multiple jobs, how can you effectively meet our needs and how can UHMFS assist? Lassner would appreciate constructive conversations of how to work better together to make these new organizations more effective.



**Marguerite Butler  
(MB)  
Requested changes to  
MFS Bylaws (2:20)**

JL: Are you suggesting we merge 3 VCA offices and vice-chancellors?

Lassner: No, but he wants to reorganize the structure. The current strawperson proposal is to create 4 offices in UHM: (1) Executive VC: integrating academics and research into one unit (2) Enrollment management, (3) Student and campus climate, (4) Finance and administration.

548 responses (nearly 1/3 of UHM faculty) to survey about whether UHM should or should not have an interim chancellor.

Problems: Many administrators have responsibilities but little authority. The 1999 and 2007 WASC reports point to same issues.

Asks that we continue to push the budget model originating from CAB and supported by UHMFS resolution.

Current academic finance plan is a revenue-neutral adjustment. Asks AS to distribute budget data from retreat of Deans, VCs and Chancellor. SEC and David Chin will begin running models based on data. Wants to provide alternative proposals to administration. Going to visit senators in Shidler Monday 1:30 to help and asks for participants from CAB.

Challenges faced by SEC this year motivate changes to UHMFS Bylaws: UHMFS was short of senators, due to natural turn-over and unexpected leaves. Unusually large number (nearly half) of new members. Many committees have not been able to make quorum.

List of proposed changes to MFS Bylaws:

1. Change 2-year senator terms to 3 years. Requirement of one year off the SEC before running for a second term.
2. 3-year transition team of Chair in SEC (chair-elect, chair, past chair).
3. Improve communication with college senates. Most college senates do not have members in MFS.
4. Move GEC to be a standing committee based on resolution in 2000
5. Don't limit committee number to 9. Have committee size reflect work load.

Concern that some senators miss too many committee meetings. Should there be another rule defining how many excused absences are allowable?

Requests some of the above changes occur in practice soon, and then consider changes to Bylaws next year.

Plans to let senators know as part of Chair's Report next week that when they run for elections this March for two years, it may change to 3 years after bylaws are changed.

RC Would it be better to allow senators to serve three 2-year terms instead of 2 3-year terms? Worries a 3-year term will dissuade people from running and



<p><b><u>Gen Ed Committee</u></b> <b>Stacy Roberts (chair)</b> <b>Dore Minatodani</b> <b>(UHMF Senator)</b> <b>Shannon Johnson</b></p> <p><b><u>Gen Ed Office</u></b> <b>Hokulani Aikau</b> <b>(Director)</b> <b>Wendi Vincent</b> <b>Lisa Fujikawa</b> <b>(2:40)</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Reorg of</b> <b>Student Housing</b> <b>(3:10)</b></p>	<p>reduce the pool of those willing. Asks for us to let SEC know of our meeting times. <u>BG</u> agrees.</p> <p>Stacy Roberts (college of Ed) chair of GEC: GEC is and has been functioning as a permanent committee not a standing committee. An important distinction is that permanent committees don't require 50% of members to be senators. There are 5 boards reviewing proposals for gen ed classes. GEC and the Gen Ed Office oppose the proposal to make GEC a standing committee; they were not consulted for this proposal. Wants any mention of Gen Ed in Bylaws be removed. GEC was asked to review Gen Ed program by SEC. They were not appointed until late into the semester because their selection was handled like a standing committee. The committee is complex and interacts with multiple organizations and addresses multiple roles. They are now evaluating how Gen Ed *should* fit in the campus structure, and they may conclude that it fits or does not fit as a standing committee of MFS.</p> <p><u>RP</u> Gen Ed was purposely not included in the By-laws.</p> <p><u>RP</u> What should CAB do? Clarify roll of Gen Ed and why it was not made a standing committee. Doesn't think there's a swell of momentum in UHMFS to move forward with the proposal.</p> <p>Discussion of roll of Gen Ed was passed in resolution in 2001 and then defined in a document that has been the guiding document posted on the Gen Ed website. It calls the committee a "Standing Committee" but has been functioning as a permanent committee. They are requesting that Gen Ed not be mentioned in By laws, allow them to complete the review, and then make a recommendation of how they can best function in UHM.</p> <p><u>Aikau</u>: Expresses numerous concerns about GEC being a standing committee. e.g., 8 members would be forced turn over next year and that would be bad.</p> <p><u>Minatodani</u>: Gen Ed can and will provide language for documentation but they request that SEC stop changing Bylaws that impact GenEd as they are currently undergoing program review. .</p> <p>CAB Vote on Resolution to Endorse SHS reorganization . 8 to approve, 0 against, 0 abstentions</p>	
--	---	--



<b>Proposed VPRI Reorg (3:15)</b>  <b>Other discussions</b>	<p><u>BG</u> discusses justification for resolution. CAB Vote on VPRI Reorganization to “Endorse with Reservations”: 7 to approve, 0 against, and 1 abstention.</p> <p><u>BG</u> should we form subcommittees to address changes in Bylaws?</p> <p><u>DV</u> Standard procedure is the first MFS meeting is to review proposed changes; second meeting is to review amendments, and then it is reviewed by the whole Congress. Suggests we review and prepare for first meeting this Fall.</p> <p>This began with CFS’s interpretations of filling vacancies in the SEC last Fall, and are making suggestions for revisions.</p> <p>It is agreed that CAB should propose changes to Bylaws this Semester.</p>	
<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	TBD	
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	3:30	

Respectfully submitted by Garrett Apuzen-Ito, Secretary  
Approved on 3/22/17 with 9 votes in favor of approval and 0 against.