

## **Process Committee**

Summary Points of Meeting

October 31, 2008

Hawai'i Hall Room 309

8:00 am – 9:30 am

Attendees: Alan Teramura, Mary Tiles, Ashley Maynard, Gregg Geary, Ming-Bao Yue, Jaime Sohn, Peter Crouch, Christine Sorensen, Klaus Keil, Keith Sakuda, and Ann Sakuma.

Not in Attendance: Brian Taylor, Walt Niemczura

Washington State University's Process Overview Timeline (Academic Program Prioritization):

- Academic review process started due to budget cuts and also because the University was up for 10-year accreditation.
  - According to the Chronicle, WSU has a \$250M budget and underwent a five percent (5%) cut in the FY03-05 biennial budget. UH Mānoa's budget is \$325M.
  - Assume that talks began in FY06 to handle future cuts. Formulated criteria and matrix to assess programs and facilitate recommendations.
- Phase I identifies principles. Preparation for reviews took less than two (2) months.
- Departments used matrix to rate programs and reach decisions.

Seriousness must be attached to getting process done in order to meet established principles for UH Mānoa. State of Hawai'i had an \$800M surplus three (3) years ago. At the recent MET meeting, it was forecasted that the State will be \$900M short by the end of the next biennium FY10-11. State may have to cut further than anticipated to balance the budget by this time. Some departments are aware of the seriousness.

Process is needed for UH Mānoa to prioritize and determine which areas to invest in. Need to identify what is important for the University, its objectives and mission.

UNLV had a 4.5% budget cut this year and is expecting a 14% cut next year. To meet this cut, the University will need to cut temporary and instructional positions and have all tenured positions teach two additional courses per year. Even doing this, UNLV will be unable to offer 40% of its present courses.

WSU proposes to reduce the number of courses by 20% and increase the number of courses taught by senior faculty. Many mergers and consolidation of programs are proposed, rather than outright eliminations of programs. Consolidations can save money in the long run.

UC Davis looking at a \$28M-43M cut in their budget. A one-time return of RTRF is being considered. Drastic measures in drastic times. Decisions not made strategically but out of necessity. Highlights difference between short-term and long-term process.

Reviews can point to dissolving departments that no longer fit with the objectives and missions of the University. In the past, UH Mānoa eliminated the General Sciences Department, merged Public Health with Medicine and merged the School of Information and Library Sciences with the Department of Information and Computer Sciences.

In light of our projected future budgets, we may need to conduct a comprehensive review across campus to eliminate duplication and unnecessary courses. Review courses and keep only those that are necessary and sound for students to take in order to graduate. No frill or optional courses. This will require less faculty and staff.

UH Mānoa will lose some faculty and staff thru attrition and retirement over time.

Carry forward funds are sitting only in Mānoa and thus, it looks like Mānoa has money. It is critical to identify priorities for Mānoa to move forward constructively. Need to unify and have a common voice. Currently, Mānoa is too fractured.

Departments and units can fight and protect what they have OR they can prioritize and eliminate what is not necessary. What do we want to be best in? Units need to identify their priorities and needs to show they are delivering on these priorities for programs to be kept.

When there is a vision, people rally around it. Provide departments with criteria and matrix to review and recommend which programs to keep. Establish guidelines for faculty to minimize duplication.

Some units may get more funds while others may get cuts based upon campus-wide priorities to fulfill the University's mission and strategic plan. Need to weed out weak programs and build up those that meet the vision and mission of UH Mānoa. Strategic decisions need to be made at the department level. This has never been done before and is much needed for Mānoa.

In the past, Mānoa went after all the good ideas and tried to excel in as many areas as possible. Not a good approach because will never be great in any, especially as resources decrease.

Peter Quigley's group is trying to prioritize academic programs and is driven entirely by WASC. They have not yet developed a priority matrix and do not cover student services, research, etc.

This Process Committee is for the entire Mānoa campus and the framework and prioritization criteria can also be used for WASC accreditation.

Committee to look more carefully at WSU's process to see what areas will work for Mānoa.

How should decisions be made at Mānoa? The process to decide may clarify and be useful for units. Good to have guidelines. Recommend to have input by Department of Decision Science (now called Information Technology Management).

Units will rate their programs.

Recommendations for consolidations and eliminations will be made at higher levels with appropriate consultations. There will be a feedback mechanism at every level.

Overarching principles and prioritization criteria should be established and shared with the units BEFORE they review and rate their programs. Parameters need to be given to units before they can contribute constructively.

UH Mānoa is a state institution and must meet state needs. It is also a land grant University and thus, research is important. The University is situated in Hawai'i and thus, the culture and influence of Hawaiiana also plays a key role. Appropriate questions must be asked at each level for wise decisions to be made.