*Various individuals inside and outside the University community have provided comments in response to the proposed reorganization of the PBRC. Many of the comments reflect individuals’ subjective views and opinions, as such they are not addressed. However, the OVCRGE has responded to specific issues raised in some of the letters to provide clarification to this entire process.

- **Ulalia Woodside – Regional Director, Natural, Cultural, Community and Land Legacy Resources, Kamehameha Schools – Land Asset Division: March 29, 2010**

  Comment: “I have been advised that a consequence of the changes, as proposed, would be the elimination of funding for the Hawai’i Conservation Alliance (HCA).”

  OVCRGE Response: The proposed reorganization of PBRC would not involve elimination of funding for the Hawai’i Conservation Alliance (HCA).

- **Robert Blanchard – Professor, Psychology, College of Social Sciences: March 30, 2010**

  Comment: Both Dr. Blanchard (letter dated March 30, 2010) and the Dean of the College of Social Sciences (via phone) pointed out the need to increase administrative support in the College of Social Sciences in conjunction with this reorganization.

  OVCRGE Response: This has now been addressed in the proposal.

- **Daniel Rubinoff – Assistant Professor, Plant and Environmental Protection Sciences: March 31, 2010**

  Comment: Dr. Rubinoff expressed concern regarding the closing of the Greenwood Molecular Biology Facility.

  OVCRGE Response: As detailed in the proposed reorganization, there are no plans to close this facility. It is proposed that this facility report to the OVCRGE and will continue its cross-campus function.
• Ian Cooke – Professor of Zoology and Researcher, PBRC: April 1, 2010

Comment: “The availability of full- or part-time research positions has led to PBRC’s distinguished history as an initiator and incubator of innovative programs. These have included the Cancer Center, Center for Tropical Medicine, at least two programs for recruitment of minority students to research careers, and provided JABSOM with immediate research credibility to avert a threatened loss of accreditation by transfer in 2003-4 of PBRC researchers holding NIH grants and their labs to the medical school.”

OVCRGE Response: The accreditation of the Medical School is by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME). This is the national accrediting authority for medical education programs leading to the M.D. degree in United States Medical Schools. The LCME is sponsored by the Association of American Medical Colleges and the American Medical Association. The LCME Accreditation Standards (http://www.lcme.org/functionslist.htm) do not require a research component/credibility for accreditation. JABSOM was never in danger of losing accreditation based on research productivity and there was no transfer of researchers and their labs to the medical school to maintain accreditation. Though, it is true that for various reasons researchers have left the PBRC for positions in the Medical School and other units. Finally, there was a period when JABSOM did not have a grants management office, and a significant number of JABSOM faculty ran their grants through PBRC. As the Grants Management Office was developed in JABSOM, nearly all of these grants were transferred back to JABSOM. It is relevant that the faculty members holding these grants were always JABSOM faculty.

Comment: “At least with respect to Zoology, the transfers have not been discussed with the Chair or faculty.”

OVCRGE Response: The Vice Chancellor met with the Chair of Zoology over a year ago to discuss potential transfers.

• Daniel Hartline – Professor and Researcher, PBRC: April 5, 2010

Comment: “The ORU system at UH is unusual among university systems in this country, which makes the University of Hawaii especially attractive to researcher such as myself and is fundamental to UHM’s stature as a Carnegie I Research Institution.”

OVCRGE Response: It has been a decade since the Carnegie Foundation abolished the classification Carnegie Research Universities I & II and Doctoral Universities I & II. In 2000, they combined these into two categories. One included universities that awarded the doctoral in relatively large numbers in a variety of fields (Doctoral/Research Universities – Extensive), and the other included universities that awarded the doctorate in smaller numbers or in a more limited set of fields
(Doctoral/Research Universities – Intensive). This classification was again revised in 2005 to include RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity), RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity), DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities. This classification will be updated again in 2010.

Regardless, the proposed reorganization will not impact the UH position in the Carnegie Classification as no degree programs or faculty positions are eliminated. As Dr. Hartline notes, the ORU system is unique, and nearly all the universities formerly referred to as “Carnegie I Research Universities” did/do not have ORUs. The reader is invited to view the following website: http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/ for a further explanation of the Carnegie Classification.

Comment: Dr. Hartline goes on to suggest that his assignment to Zoology will “…decrease my value as a colleague since I will have limited contact with other PBRCers and PBRC programs that have been valuable resources in my professional capacities” and “…deprive me of the dedicated administrative support I need and the interaction with faculty that are most valuable to this future work.”

OVCRGE Response: The proposed reorganization does not prohibit Dr. Hartline from interactions with any faculty member at UH, and it does not limit his contact with other “PBRCers”. Likewise, Dr. Hartline will not be deprived of administrative support.

- Brad Jones – Associate Specialist, Computer Network Support Facility (CNSF), PBRC: April 5, 2010

Comment: “On page 8 of Dr. Ostrander’s proposal it is stated, ‘Administrative staff members, including the Computer Network Support Facility (2 individuals) will likewise report to new units.’ Other than that, there is little mention of the Facility.”

OVCRGE Response: Dr. Jones is correct that we did not provide details about the CNSF. This was intentional. The ultimate assignment of IT staff will be dependant on the distribution of the PBRC faculty and continued extramural funding. As Dr. Jones notes: “The RCMI Program is an initiative of the National Center for Research Resources (NCRR) at the National Institutes for Health (NIH). Funding for the CNSF during its eighteen years of existence has come primarily from the RCMI Program. In partnership with the federal support, PBRC contributes an administrative home, fiscal office support, space and partial salary for the Facility director (currently 75%).” The temporary positions for all members of the CNSF are indicative of the soft-money support of this program. We are awaiting an announcement from the NCRR to re-compete for this program. NCRR officials informed us during a recent site visit (April 8, 2010) that the anticipated announcement for recompetition has been delayed and it is not clear when it will move forward. Moreover, it is not unreasonable to expect that after nearly 30 years of RCMI funding that at some point
we will be expected “graduate”. This issue was raised relative to another NCRR program at UH-Mānoa (INBRE) by the site visit team. Finally, it is expected that the new PI of the RCMI effort will need to conduct a needs assessment based on announced potential NCRR funding levels and program priorities.

Comment: “The CNSF is comprised of more than two staff members so a plan for the future of the Facility should involve more than transferring position numbers to new units.”

OVCRGE Response: The CNSF is comprised of two full-time temporary employees (Brad Jones, Associate Specialist, Position Number 86166T and Stanford Togashi, IT Specialist, Position Number 77148T). Scott Niimoto (IT Specialist, Position Number 78455T) joined the CNSF as a half-time employee in 2008 and was moved to a full-time temporary position in February 2010 (at about the time the PBRC Reorganization Proposal document was originally prepared). Mr. Niimoto is funded entirely off of the RCMI grant.

Comment: Dr. Jones includes in his letter a selected list of research groups that the CNSF provides service to,

**Clients**

This selected list of research groups to which we have provided services over the past year:

- **PBRC** (all administrators, researchers, students and staff)
- **PBRC Core Facilities** (Biological Electron Microscope Facility, Greenwood Molecular Biology Facility, Electronics Shop, Carpentry and Machine Shop)
- **PBRC Research Training Programs** (MBRS, MARC, PRIDE, URM, NSF-ATE)
- **Department of Cell and Molecular Biology** (JABSOM)
- **Department of Tropical Medicine, Medical Microbiology and Pharmacology** (JABSOM)
- **Specialized Neuroscience Program** (JABSOM)
- **Cardiovascular Research Center** (JABSOM)
- **Neuroscience and Magnetic Resonance Research Program** (Queen’s Medical Center)
- **Hawai’i Center for AIDS** (Leahi Hospital)
- **Laboratory Animal Services** (videoconference support)
- **Department of Psychology**

OVCRGE Response: The majority of these programs is biomedically oriented and involves support of the John A. Burns School of Medicine (JABSOM) departments/units. To this end, a tentative assignment of the CNSF positions (Brad Jones – 86166T, Stanford Togashi – 77148T, Scott Niimoto – 78455T) is made to JABSOM.
• Suresh Patil – Emeritus Professor, PBRC: April 5, 2010

Comment: “The vice chancellor’s office would dissolve the Core Facility and merge it with other units. This would be a major step backward because this facility make possible the widespread use of diverse tools involved in molecular biology research. No other laboratory can take its place. I urge the administration to not only maintain the Greenwood Molecular Biology facility but to enhance its capabilities by financially supporting it on a permanent basis.”

OVCRGE Response: As was stated in the original proposal, the Greenwood Molecular Biology Facility will report to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education. This facility has been supported by State funds and will continue to be in the future. The facility will not be dissolved.

• Luc Rougee – PhD Candidate, Kewalo Marine Laboratory, PBRC: April 12, 2010

Comment: “The argument has been made that ‘existing faculty members have been advised of opportunities to move their programs to a number of locations at UH Manoa to include the Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology (HIMB) as well as multiple locations on the main campus.’ While this reason is sound in theory, it is neither practical nor realistic. Resources and space on the UH Manoa campus and HIMB are severely limited, making relocation of a complete laboratory at KML to another location unfeasible. Building regulations and space will not allow the installation of large saltwater tanks in order to perform our research. Additionally, providing only a fraction of the space will limit the resources that are needed in the lab to complete the research.”

OVCRGE Response: Resources and space are available to move occupants of the Kewalo Marine Laboratory (KML), and there are no building regulations that would prevent the installation of large saltwater tanks should they be necessary.

• Other Comments/Letters

Comment: A number of students and former students have suggested that the statement “no anticipated impacts to students” is erroneous owing to their participation in Dr. Kaneshiro’s NSF K-12 Grant, which was administered through PBRC. Similar comments were raised relative to other student training grants.

OVCRGE Response: The abolishment of PBRC will not impact these training grants. These and similar grants have been administered through various other units at UH. Placement in or the existence of PBRC is/was not a requirement for funding.
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education
Response to April 5, 2010 Memo from the Pacific Biosciences Research Center Executive Team
May 28, 2010

A group of faculty and staff from the Pacific Biosciences Research Center (PBRC), identified as the PBRC Executive Team, has provided a document in opposition to the reorganization proposal. The closing of PBRC is not a trivial matter and it has been the subject of extensive consideration and discussion over the past few years. For many, the closing of a faculty member’s unit, one that they have identified with for many years, goes to the core of what it means to be a faculty member. At a minimum it is viewed as disruptive and at worst it is viewed as a violent attack on the individual’s character and being. While neither is intended, it is understood that both are in play.

The document from the PBRC Executive Team is wide-ranging and covers a variety of topics and views. Many of the issues raised are subjective viewpoints (e.g. potential impacts of the closing of PBRC on future funding opportunities) that have been discussed in multiple venues over the last few years. Individual subjective views are not likely to be modified though further discourse and as such the comments herein are focused on the objective issues raised. The document states that the faculty, staff, and students are unanimous in their opposition to the proposal to abolish PBRC. It should be noted that this question was never put before the entire membership of PBRC and that the claim of unanimity is not consistent with conversations between the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education (OVCRGE) and some individuals within the PBRC.

Detailed below are the responses of the OVCRGE to the primary points raised in the document from the PBRC Executive Team. The original document posted by the OVCRGE and responses from PBRC and others have primarily used terminology reflecting a “reorganization” of PBRC. Subsequently, within a few days of posting of the original proposal, the OVCRGE was informed the term, “abolishment” should be used instead of “reorganization” to describe the proposed action. As abolishment is a form of reorganization, both terms are technically correct. Nonetheless, as abolishment is more consistent with the intent of the proposal it has been included in the revised proposal. Again, this is not intended to offend, and since nearly all correspondence submitted in response to the proposal use the term “reorganization,” both terms will be used interchangeably in this response.

The Executive Summary (page 2) of the PBRC Executive Team response states that the reorganization proposal is, “Factually incorrect, exaggerated, presenting in a false light and unfairly discredits PBRC”. These claims are repeated a number of times in the document but are largely unsubstantiated.
Clearly, minor errors were introduced into the original reorganization proposal and not everything was adequately addressed. This process has been made more difficult, as noted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) when they stated, “It concerns us greatly that we are getting independent communication from both the OVCR&GE and the PBRC Executive Committee. As an example we have been told by Dr. Ostrander that each PBRC faculty member has been asked to identify a proposed homebase for their position so as to best accommodate the needs of the faculty member. On the other hand, we have heard form PBRC members that they did not respond to Dr. Ostrander’s request as supplying the information may imply that they agree to the reorganization…”.

On page two the statement is made that; “The proposal was prepared without substantive consultation and fails to address the ‘temporary’ faculty and staff”. Consultation is often viewed as “non-substantive” or “inadequate” when significant differences persist. There has been consultation with members of PBRC, the SEC (over three years), Faculty Senate Committee on Research, Faculty Senate Committee on Administration and Budget, and at multiple meeting between the Vice Chancellor and PBRC Senior Faculty facilitated by an Ombuds Officer. Consultation continues to this day. Moreover, the PBRC Executive Team document notes on page 16, “The Reorganization Process, per Administrative Procedure A3.101, does not require the proposal to address faculty and staff in non-permanent positions”. This latter statement by the PBRC Executive Team is correct. Many of the individuals in non-permanent positions are subject to the direction of more senior faculty (e.g. on their grants) and it was not viewed as either productive or appropriate to place these individuals in compromising positions by “second guessing” where they would move. As also noted above, most tenured faculty members of PBRC have not wanted to engage in a detailed discussion of a reorganization. The Vice Chancellor has maintained from the earliest discussions of this potential reorganization in 2006 that he would work with individual faculty and staff to identify department and programs best suited for their skills and interests.

A reoccurring theme in the PBRC Executive Committee response, first mentioned in the Executive Summary, is the fiscal stability of PBRC viz-a-vie grants and state fund appropriations. The original and revised proposal standardizes grant award amounts on the basis of annual expenditures so that it is directly comparable to state fund expenditures. It is not meaningful to compare one year of state funding expenditures with the total of 1-5 year grant awards projections. Moreover, the numbers presented in the OVCRGE proposal for grant awards were and still are based on grants to PBRC faculty (permanent and temporary) that are run through PBRC. It is not appropriate to include awards from non-PBRC faculty as a measure of overall PBRC productivity. While it is noted that the PBRC fiscal office does handle awards from individuals outside of PBRC, the merits of a potential reorganization of PBRC should not be based on the activity of administrative units within PBRC.
The planned closing of the Kewalo Marine Laboratory (KML) in 3+ years is raised in a number of instances in this document. The closure is a facilities issue and is not related to the proposed reorganization. Moreover, to date the four (4) KML faculty using the facility have not been willing to engage in substantive discussions of lab relocations (within or outside the context of a reorganization), thereby making budgeting impossible. Nonetheless, based on preliminary discussions and the availability of seawater at multiple locations at Mānoa this is a resolvable situation and the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority (HCDA) has also expressed a willingness to assist with moving costs.

Page three, under the heading “PBRC Opposition to Reorganization Proposal,” statements are made indicating that dispersing PBRC’s grants management support personnel seriously threatens the future of PBRC faculty to obtain extramural funding. This statement is not substantiated by what commonly occurs at Mānoa. Each year the UH-Mānoa faculty outside of PBRC are awarded hundreds of millions of dollars in research and training grants. These include grants from the same federal, state and private agencies that provide grants to PBRC faculty.

Pages 3-5 include discussion relative to the closure of KML, and reassignment of faculty to other units suggests this will entail building new seawater facilities. This is not necessary as UH has multiple seawater facilities and these options have been discussed with KML faculty. Likewise, as has also been discussed previously with KML faculty, assignment of faculty to academic units does not require that those same units provide seawater facilities. This entire process continues to suffer from the unwillingness of most PBRC faculty to discuss alternatives to the present arrangement.

Pages 5 and 6 include a discussion of a recently developed academic research theme of biodiversity. The Interim Director initiated efforts at Strategic Planning for the PBRC after unsuccessful efforts to hire a Director. The result of that process was that the PBRC faculty endorsed continuing the model of many different research, training, and service programs each lead by 1-2 faculty, though similar programmatic efforts continued to exist elsewhere on campus. In early 2008, in response to the December 2007 statement of the intent to close PBRC and move the faculty and staff into other existing units with similar interests, some faculty within the PBRC announced a focus in biodiversity. A day-long biodiversity symposium was organized in 2008 and continues. However, to date, the individual research efforts of the faculty have remained unchanged as evidence by publications and proposals. For example, it is noted by the PBRC Executive Team (page 6) that a proposal for a comprehensive study of the Ala Wai Watershed was submitted in response to the Sustainability Initiative announced by the OVCRGE in late 2008. The proposal (Sustainability Science and Practice in Hawaii’s Mountain-to-Sea Ecosystems: Developing a Model for Achieving Sustainability in Coupled Human-Environment Systems) was prepared by a tenured PBRC faculty member and a PBRC APT employee.
(according to the cover page). Fifteen UH-Mānoa School/Departments and 31 other organizations are listed as participants. In addition to the principal investigator (PI), four (4) tenured PBRC faculty members are included in a list of 16 UH-Mānoa researchers that have “agreed to participate in the project”. The proposed effort is not indicative of a biodiversity vision emanating from the PBRC faculty. The PBRC Executive Team states that the proposal was not funded and that, “…related applications to extramural sources are under development”. To date none have been submitted. A single proposal to an internal university competition in a 2-year period is not suggestive of a focused biodiversity initiative for an organized research unit (ORU). A focused research theme for any unit should create synergies that allow for the sum of the efforts to be greater than the individual parts. There is no evidence that this is happening with the PBRC biodiversity initiative.

Pages 6 and 7 are critical of the OVCRGE’s presentation of data relative to the size of PBRC and PBRC grant volume since grant activity is included only for those faculty members (permanent and temporary) with positions in PBRC. The OVCRGE does not believe it is appropriate to include, in an evaluation of PBRC, awards from other units that utilized the PBRC grants management office. While the PBRC grants administration group has been very supportive of faculty outside PBRC, the perceived strength of this administrative unit is not an appropriate justification for maintaining the ORU.

On page 7 and 8 the questions/concerns relative to the OVCRGE plans for the filling of vacant positions and future hires is discussed. Presently, vacant positions across the campus are being held to address the significant cuts to the UH-Mānoa budget from the legislature. As noted by President Greenwood in her May 10, 2010 letter to the UH community, cuts to the UH System are in excess of $112 million dollars. Mānoa’s share of these cuts is about $70 million. The holding of positions is not unique to PBRC and it is not clear when these positions or future vacancies will be filled. The assertion that they may never be filled, while not desired, is possible. The budget cuts are permanent and real while salaries, utilities, and other costs continue to rise.

The document suggest that two faculty members are about to retire in PBRC. The OVCRGE is aware of one temporary faculty member that has a 0.3 FTE in PBRC and one tenure faculty member (0.5 FTE, Zoology and 0.5 FTE, PBRC) that have stated their intent to retire on June 30, 2010. Salary savings from these two retirements will go toward the budget cuts. It is also the understanding of the OVCRGE that another tenured faculty member with a 0.5 FTE in JABSOM and 0.5 FTE in PBRC will retire at the end of the year. Paperwork is in process for PBRC to release 0.5 FTE to JABSOM in return for a 0.5 FTE from JABSOM so that a current 0.5 FTE tenured faculty member in PBRC can go to 1.00 FTE.
Pages 8 and 9 suggest that the proposed reorganization will dilute research productivity and collaboration. Research productivity and collaboration is initiated and driven by the individual faculty members. The reorganization of PBRC will not result in elimination of faculty from their current space (NB: the closure of the KML is not related to the reorganization and is a separate facilities issue). Most faculty members in PBRC have R appointments and none have required teaching responsibility (the exception being for faculty that have a portion of their appointment in another unit). Faculty will not be expected to teach if they move to a unit that has degree and certificate programs. Concerns were also raised about the potential combining of PBRC faculty with units that are “primarily instructional”. UH-Mānoa has major units with I, R and S faculty that are collaborative and productive (e.g. JABSOM and SOEST). All PBRC permanent faculty are tenured. As such, the issues raised relative to promotion and tenure are not relevant. Finally, it is not uncommon for a faculty member at Mānoa to move from a unit that is primarily research (e.g. an ORU) to a unit with significant instruction or vise versa. As has been done in the past, at the time of the move the details relative to post-tenure review and any other relevant matters can and will be addressed.

As mentioned on page 9, it is correct that the loss of control of RTRF disbursement along the lines of PBRC priorities is a possibility with this reorganization. It is also suggested this may lead to less investment in research infrastructure. While neither PBRC priorities nor the term “research infrastructure” are defined, it should be noted that RTRF expenditure is mandated by state statute to be for research and training. This has been and will continue to be the practice at UH.

Page 11 includes a discussion of perceived detrimental impacts on students. The training of students by PBRC faculty can continue as it has regardless of the administrative unit the faculty member resides. Training grants awarded to PBRC faculty can be awarded if the faculty resides in another department. It should be noted that other Mānoa units have training grants. Likewise, training grants at nearly all other universities exist in units that are not ORU’s.

Mention is made of the endowment funds that PBRC has to support graduate student scholarships through the Ecology, Evolution, and Conservation Biology Graduate Program (EECB). As noted on the EECB website: “The EECB graduate specialization is an interdisciplinary, University of Hawai‘i-wide program offering opportunities for degrees in the departments of the College of Natural Sciences, the School of Medicine, the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, and the School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology. It draws on the resources of over 55 faculty with research skills in many specialized areas, and allows students to tailor their M.S. or Ph.D. research programs to their own interests and needs. To be admitted to the EECB program (which is not an academic department but an interdepartmental program) you must first be
accepted into a graduate program in one of the academic departments (Botany, Zoology, Geography, etc.). The first step, therefore, is to apply to an academic department. On your application to that department you can indicate EECB as a specialization.”

The EECB is a unit of the Center for Conservation Research and Training which is a program within PBRC. Two of the 55 listed EECB faculty (from across campus) are tenured faculty in PBRC, and their ability to participate in the EECB program and continue to distribute the scholarships funds would not change with the reorganization.

**REORGANIZATION PROCESS**

Page 14 and 15 include a claim that Step 1 of the Mānoa Reorganization Process were not followed. The Vice Chancellor notified members of the PBRC Executive Committee in December of 2007 of his intent to move forward with a reorganization of PBRC. This had been discussed prior to December 2007 with both the PBRC Executive Committee and the SEC. The Mānoa Reorganization Process (A3.101) quoted in the PBRC Executive Document was created in August of 2008 and revised again in June of 2009. Simply stated, the Mānoa Reorganization Process (A3.101) did not exist when the PBRC reorganization process was initiated. Since the inception of the process the OVCRGE, with the agreement and approval of the Mānoa Faculty SEC has been following the appropriate steps of the new process to include agreement at which step the OVCRGE formally entered the new process (see email from David Ross, SEC Chair, below).

There is also an assertion of a conflict-of-interest on the part of the Vice Chancellor or has also served as the Interim Director. The role of the Interim Director and Vice Chancellor is not in conflict as in both cases it promotes the best interests of the faculty and university. Occupying the position of Interim Director does not necessitate that the Vice Chancellor maintain or support an administrative structure that he views as sub-optimal. Specifically, a conflict-of-interest is cited relative to the Mānoa Prioritization Process. The Prioritization Process was undertaken after the Vice Chancellor had announced his intent to reorganize the PBRC. During this process, at the level of the PBRC, the Vice Chancellor deferred to the members of the PBRC Executive Committee that participated in the process. This was their opportunity to make their case. At no point did he communicate that his views had changed. It is noteworthy that the Prioritization Process also occurred in parallel with the discussions between the PBRC Interim Director/Vice Chancellor and PBRC Executive Committee (with the assistance of the UH Mānoa Ombuds) about the future of PBRC.
Finally, it is worthwhile to review the text of the referenced email from David Ross, Chair of the Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee. David wrote on December 15, 2009:

Hi Gary,

Thank you for meeting with us yesterday.

After you left, SEC and the CAP chair discussed the situation further. Our current recommendation is that you inform PBRC with one week's notice (or longer if you like) that you intend to enter M3.101/A3.101 at Step 2, and that they have that lead time to select someone to replace you as their interim director. We then recommend that you enter at Step 2, and that your reorganization proposal conform to the specifications there with respect to the type and completeness of information required.

The advantage of adhering unambiguously to process is that it offers a way to move forward based on the merits of the proposal. Process exists not only to protect the unit and the University from imprudent or capricious decisions, but also to provide an opportunity for meritorious proposals to gain faculty and community support.

Sincerely,
David

There are two salient points. First, there is the recognition that the OVCRGE consulted with and followed the direction and recommendation of the Mānoa Faculty Senate when formally entering the A3.101 at Step 2. Again, the A3.101 was a process that was created in August 2008, after the Vice Chancellor had initiated steps to reorganize PBRC.

The second point was that the SEC also recommended that the Vice Chancellor select someone to replace him as the Interim Director. In response to this email, and consistent with UH practice, the Vice Chancellor asked the Interim Associate Director of PBRC to consult with the faculty and provide him with the names of 3-5 faculty members that are willing to serve in the capacity of Interim Director regardless of the results of the reorganization process. Three names were provided. However, the individuals nominated were not acceptable for one or more reasons to include unwillingness to serve, unrealistic expectations of support, unwillingness to meet with the Vice Chancellor or otherwise not qualified. As long as PBRC is an ORU the position of Director/Interim Director is outside of the collective bargaining unit and whomever serves will be in an “Executive Position” as defined by the University of Hawai‘i. Though requested by the Vice Chancellor a few months ago, and discussed with the Interim Associate Director of PBRC, no additional names have been provided.
Page 16 includes a discussion centered around the premise that impacts on non-permanent personnel are not addressed. The PBRC Executive Team document notes on page 16 “The Reorganization Process, per Administrative Procedure A3.101, does not require the proposal to address faculty and staff in non-permanent positions”. This latter statement by the PBRC Executive Team is correct. Many of the individuals in non-permanent positions are subject to the direction of more senior faculty (e.g. on their grants) and it was not viewed as either productive or appropriate to place these individuals in compromising positions by “second guessing” where they would move. As also noted above, most tenured faculty members of PBRC have not wanted to engage in a detailed discussion of a reorganization. The Vice Chancellor has maintained from the earliest discussions of this potential reorganization in 2006 that he would work with individual faculty and staff to identify department and programs best suited for their skills and interests.

On page 17, one non-significant correction was noted that was made to the abolishment proposal within a few days of posting to the website and more than three weeks before the PBRC response. Briefly, after the “reorganization proposal” was posted on the website, the OVCRGE was notified that the term “reorganization” was correctly used when the reporting line of a unit was moved from one administrative unit to another without reassignment of faculty. It was further pointed out that the correct term for what the OVCRGE has posted was “abolishment”. The correction was immediately made and no other text was changed in the proposal. At the same time, the reference to an appendix that was never included in the proposal was deleted from the cover memorandum. An Appendix 8 was never prepared for this document since the reference was intended to describe the BJ/BT Impact of Positions table which is already included as an attachment.