Budget Prioritization Workgroup (BPW)
Summary Points of Meeting
September 25, 2009
Hawai‘i Hall Room 309
8:00 am – 10:00 am

Attendees: Kathy Cutshaw, Reed Dasenbrock, Gary Ostrander, Francisco Hernandez, Alan Teramura, Ann Sakuma, Annette Chang, Carl Clapp, Christine Sorensen, David Chin, David Duffy, David Lassner, David Ross, Debra Ishii, Denise Antolini, Marla Acosta, Myrtle Ching-Rappa, Nancy Foster, Tim Merrill, Tom Bingham, Tom Ramsey, Mangmang Brown, Maenette Benham, Peter Crouch, Klaus Keil, Vance Roley, Leon Richards, Gregg Takayama, Mike Unebasami, and Barry Weinman.

The group decided to have the sub-committees meet Fridays from 8:00 am to 9:00 am and to have the whole group convene in Hawai‘i Hall 309 from 9:00 am to 10:00 am. The sub-committees can include others in the campus community as appropriate. Ann will publish the objectives and membership of each sub-committee on the BPW website along with the academic department data.

Data Analysis Sub-committee (Peter):

- Step 4 wording finalized per handout.
- There are four (4) spreadsheets the committee reviewed which include two (2) types of groups:
  - Teaching revenue based units
  - Research revenue based units
- Data is based upon filled positions.
- Quantitative markers used to provide threshold values for review of outcomes and discussion.
- Recommend to clearly reflect titles and assumptions on the chart and eliminate “suggested review” column.
- Data reveals possible issues and is a base for departments and programs to review and analyze their respective situations. Recommend the BPW come up with a process for the departments and units to provide feedback and recommendations. Enable the departments and programs to explain the data and to prioritize.
- The purpose of the data is to begin the process of analysis and to incorporate input from schools and colleges. How can UH Mānoa become more efficient?
• What is done within the school or college will be the responsibility of the Dean and faculty. Thus, the data will be shared with the Deans after clear titles and assumptions are built into the spreadsheet for their internal analysis. To ensure proper understanding of figures and assumptions, a briefing to Deans will be provided. Recommend the Deans report back any anomalies and trans-college recommendations for the committee’s review.

• This sub-committee will present the information to Deans on Monday, October 5, 2009 for internal analysis.

**Position Control (T. Bingham):**

• Centralized control vs. decentralized control.
• The sub-committee is currently checking with peer institutions on best practices. Few schools, if any, rely on legislative distribution of positions. Thus, best practices can only be guidelines at best.
• Legislature passed Act 188. A committee is looking at formula based funding for higher education. Draft recommendation is being prepared. Formula funding might change the way positions are created and managed.
• Recommend getting rid of the count system. One issue is how fringe benefits would be budgeted and managed.
• The University currently relies on legislatively appropriated positions.
• The Chancellor’s office currently holds 52 counts to meet campus priorities but has no funds to fill them.
• Schools and colleges also need flexibility to manage their departments.
• This sub-committee is looking for a balanced model, whether by percentage or other means. A combination of centralized and decentralized control.
• Retirements will also enter into the equation. Understand UHPA did a survey on retirement. Results unknown. HR System will soon be going out with a survey to personnel eligible for retirement.
• If anyone knows of a University that operates much like UH does using counts, please contact Tom Bingham (bingham@hawaii.edu)

**Revenue Sharing (Kathy):**

• Could a similar model to RTRF be developed for tuition?
• This group will be looking at tuition revenues and recommending appropriate distribution.
• There was a prior model of tuition dollars based upon SSH – lasted only for one (1) year.
• If anyone is aware of universities using a good model, please contact Reed (rdasenbr@hawaii.edu) or Kathy (cutshaw@hawaii.edu)
Redundancy:
- Focusing more on student services – advising, tutoring, etc. Members are currently investigating each area. Also looking into course redundancies.

Other Discussions:
- This committee will be reviewing recommendations that move across colleges (trans-college), including redundancies, and will only be making recommendations to the Chancellor. However, questions can be asked of the Deans and faculty regarding their respective units.
- Efficiencies and reorganization are medium and longer term objectives. How do we get the Deans to have a more qualitative discussion?
- Merging may not incur great cost savings but it will help move the campus toward meet priorities.
- Suggest prioritizing based upon the top 20 things each member believes should be reviewed and then roll that out.
- Propose the BPW take a few months to review “small schools” and share what is being reviewed with the campus community. Another area for review is cross college inefficiencies. Discuss the above two topics two (2) weeks from today at the October 9th meeting. Will also discuss enrollment goals.
- OVCAA reviewing core courses:
  - How efficiently are we delivering core classes?
  - Computing the number of seats needed based upon student enrollment.
  - Gathering information on registration attempts.
  - Where do courses need to be added? Where are the under-enrolled courses?

Next Meeting: Friday, October 2, 2009 in Hawai‘i Hall 309 at 9:00 am.