**COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND BUDGET**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Date:** 24 Sep 2014

**Location:** Hawaii Hall 208

**Attendance:** [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

| **MEMBERS** | | **MEMBERS** | | **MEMBERS** | | **GUESTS** | **TIME** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ANGELO, Michael | P | GLAZER, Brian | E | POTEMRA, James | P | CUTSHAW, Kathy | 10:00-11:45 |
| BOULOS, Daniel | P | HARRIGAN, Rosanne | P | SAKAGUCHI, Ann | P | BLEY-VROMAN, Robert | 11:00-11:45 |
| CHIN, David | P | MANINI, Bonnyjean | P | VINCENT, Doug | P |  |  |
| CONWAY, Thomas | E | MCKIMMY, Paul | P |  |  |  |  |

| **SUBJECT** | **DISCUSSION / INFORMATION** | **ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CALL TO ORDER** | A. Sakaguchi called the meeting to order at 10:00. |  |
| **UHM BUDGET OVERVIEW** | VCAFO K. Cutshaw gave an overview of the UHM budget. KC distributed a handout with summary budget numbers for UHM. These included allocation totals by source (General, Tuition/Special, Other, etc.) and breakdown of these categories. It was not clear whether the numbers for extramural funding were totals or net after RTRF distribution. A wide-ranging discussion followed, and key points included 1) tuition increases are typically reported as a gross number, rather than net of waivers/scholarships, thus increases in income from tuition are less than the increase in tuition (1.7% compared to 5%, respectively); 2) agreements were made with the athletic department to provide in-state status for all UHM athletes; 3) there is budget line for “Manoa Operations” and this is a fund administered by the Chancellor’s office; 4) there is no relation between teaching hours and tuition fund distributions, and this is due to past policy with the State whereby S-funds were swapped with G-funds (and there are subsequently two types of S-funds); 5) faculty/staff get tuition waivers for classes, and many employees of the community colleges take classes at UHM (e.g., nursing), thus creating more students but not more tuition (this could be an area to address in the future, e.g., having community colleges bear this financial burden).  KC said that a budget review committee has been formed, and this committee will have representation from CAB (AS) as well as from the SEC (RB). The committee has been formed but has not yet met.  KC mentioned that there were few colleges operating “in the red”, and listed these off the record. She will confirm the numbers and report back.  The Interim Chancellor joined the meeting, and KC continued by addressing the questions sent prior to the meeting. These include:   1. At present there is no system in place to prioritize programs, thus no way to determine which or if programs to cut. The “campus prioritization” process of 2010 did not result in anything. 2. KC acknowledged that the VCAFO web site was outdated, and explained it requires manually accounting and data processing. Once this is completed the pages will be updated. 3. With the current accounting system it is difficult, maybe impossible, to track expenses by specific faculty tracks (e.g., CAB asked for S-funds going to I-faculty). Both KC and RBV acknowledged that the current reporting system is flawed (at best), and that UHM was in the process of working with ITS (S. Smith) to acquire a new system (aka business intelligence software). RBV stated that the present system is an improvement in the sense that they now have data, but at present there is no efficient or automatic way to report/query these data. 4. The allocation process is such that at the Deans’ level money can be moved around relatively easily, but no so at the level above that. 5. KC said there was no system in place for performance based allocations, and RBV followed up by stating this had been considered but there was no clear way to evaluate “worth to the UHM mission”. He welcomed input from CAB as to a way to do this. 6. The budget numbers are typically given to the units in August/September (KC said the FY-15 numbers were just sent around). 7. The parking rate change is awaiting a public forum, and KC did not think this would be done until after the election. 8. The renaming and rebranding of the UHM Security Office was included in, and funded through, their budget, but KC did not know the cost.   The discussion concluded with general topics, including the suggestion to provide “management training” for UHM executives, since typically E-level personnel rise from the ranks of the tenured faculty with little experience in management (e.g., balancing budgets). | A. Sakaguchi to keep CAB updated with respect to the UHM Budget Committee  K. Cutshaw to update VCAFO web site with current budget numbers as soon as the data can be processed |
| **NEXT CAB MEETING** | It was decided since there were no pressing issues the next CAB meeting (Oct. 8) would be cancelled, so CAB will meet again on Oct. 22nd. |  |
| **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** | The minutes from the previous CAB meeting were unanimously approved. |  |
| **ADJOURNMENT** | A. Sakaguchi adjourned the meeting at 11:45 |  |

Respectfully submitted by Jim Potemra

Approved on 22 October 2014 with 8 votes in favor of approval and 0 against.