**COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND BUDGET**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Date:** 30 January 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), Vice-chair | P | Garrett Apuzen-Ito (GI), Secretary | P |  |  |
| Adrian Franke (AF) | A | Kara Miller (KM) | P | Douglas Vincent (DV) | P |  |  |
| Ruth Hsu (RH) | P | Robert Paull (RP) | P | Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa (LK) -SEC Liason | P |  |  |
| Judith Inazu (JI) | P | Hyoung-June Park (HP) | P | Robert Cooney, (RC) | L |  |  |

| **SUBJECT** | **DISCUSSION / INFORMATION** | **ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CALL TO ORDER** | 1:00 p.m. |  |
| **APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES** | Minutes for 1/26/16 and 1/18/17 approved, Minutes for 1/3/17 tabled for next meeting. |  |
| **Resolution on Gouveia Proposal** | We are discussing final wording on resolution  “Therefore, be it resolved”….there was extended discussion on this item.  BG and GI express their personal view of disagreement from the resolution.  AS reminds us the email sent to us by Marguerite about the quick time-line required by System for the construction of a new building, with insufficient time for faculty to review plans. BG questions why the UH Chancellor’s office did not assist with communications and GI reminds that such capital improvements are handled by System anyway and won’t be affected by the re-org.  RH expresses confidence in Gouveia, but indicates that the proposal fails to address deep structural issues of power concentrated in the hands of the president, and this proposal does not provide convincing arguments that UHM will get what it needs. This is a weakness of the proposal. This proposal is not a way to address the deep issues involved. RH would like to see more specific plans for how improvements will be made.  LK presents her thoughts that chancellors should be elected by the faculty. If we’re going to go with a UHM chancellor then we must give the chancellor more autonomy from the president and firing a chancellor should be approved by the faculty.  RP states that he views the proposal as not well written. RP is not necessarily opposed to some aspects of the merger but what is documented in the proposal is insufficient.  RH suggest we should make a resolution indicating what we really want in a proposal. But others indicate that this material is provided in the proposal checklist.  JI reminds us that JG indicates that it is very difficult to produce detailed information such as timelines. Do we want JG to spend her time writing the perfect proposal or doing the important work?  RH disagrees. She feels that JG does not understand the day-to-day needs of faculty.  Voting to end discussion. Vote for the resolution: 7 in favor, 3 opposed. The resolution moves forward. | **BG will present our resolution about the Gouveia proposal to the UHMFS** |
| **NEXT MEETING** |  |  |
| **ADJOURNMENT** | 2:25 pm |  |

Respectfully submitted by Garrett Apuzen-Ito, Secretary

Approved on 2/17/17 with 9 votes in favor of approval and 0 against.