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To: University of Hawaii Board of Regents

From: David A. Mihaila, University of Hawaii de facto alumnus

Date: February 22, 2017

Subject: Testimony Concerning Why White, Robel, And Ramaswamy Withdrew From The Manoa Chancellor Race—The Lost, Erased, And Invisible Record

Throughout the course of history events have been recorded—some accurate; some inaccurate—and in some cases events have been lost to history because they have not been recorded. The press release issued by University of Hawaii president David Lassner regarding why all three of the Manoa campus chancellor candidates withdrew from the race in the final stages of the selection process falls largely into the latter two categories because (i) the real reason why the three candidates all said “No” to the UH was not officially recorded; and (ii) the Pollyannaish press release was misleading to the extent that it inaccurately recorded this historical state event.

As is often the case, the corollary to the distribution of a superficially attractive communiqué is the even wider—and uncritical—distribution by the mainstream media concatenating links upon links into an unbreakable chain of misinformation until—presto!—untruths become the truth.

Contradictory to the administration’s positive spin, it is not a coincidence that all three finalists unexpectedly withdrew in the final stretch of a lengthy executive search. Operating from behind the curtain via communicating enlightening records, reports, and on-the-ground intelligence reflecting the less than stellar landscape and state of affairs within the UH bureaucracy, I was able to rationally persuade the candidates that the UH presented a poor pick. This is the real reason why all three finalists quit the race. Deciphering the staggering occurrence of the identical act of withdrawal by all three candidates, one could reasonably deduce that the finalists were implicitly protesting the UH administration’s record and tarnished reputation by electing to pull out of negotiations.

A resounding theme made known to the candidates was the UH administration's lingering historical record of injustice. Specifically, it has been assiduously documented that the UH administration has speciously withheld my lawfully earned diploma for twenty years. The attendant question, then, is why did three administrators outside the UH discern straightaway what administrators inside the UH have refused to recognize for two decades? The answer is clear—the UH administration is blinded by bias, favoritism, and closed-mindedness. In an administrative scandal implicating UH administrators, the UH administration erected various defense mechanisms to thwart external excoriation resulting in a bureaucratic state of denial.

The small cadre of senior-level administrators at the UH are abysmal at policing themselves. Does anyone think for a second that the UH executive administration will sue itself or find fault with its own actions? Elevate your consciousness, be magnanimous, don’t be petty and mean-spirited is
what I would write on the UH administration’s report card. If these changes come to pass, then the ominous clouds that have gathered over Bachman Hall for many years will begin to dissipate and peace will carry the day.
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####
Aloha Regents,

Please see attached. Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Best,
Amy

Amy McKee
President, Graduate Student Organization
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
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Date: February 22, 2017

To:  The University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents

Re:  Resolution in Support of the University of Hawai‘i President extending his dual capacity as President and Interim Chancellor of UH Mānoa

Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony. My name is Amy McKee, and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) and President of the UH Mānoa Graduate Student Organization (GSO), a governance body representing over 4,700 graduate students. I am writing on behalf of GSO’s Executive Council in strong opposition to the extension of UH System President David Lassner as Interim Chancellor of UH Mānoa.

The GSO Executive Council has strong concerns and reservations about the UH System President serving as the Mānoa Chancellor for the interim. While this may seem like a reasonable option and efficient in the short-term, we are not confident that a single person can serve in both capacities effectively. It would be a disservice to the students, faculty, staff, and campus and system community to have these two very important leadership positions filled by any single individual. The President's kuleana is to serve the 10-campuses in the UH System as the Board of Regents’ Executive Officer, while the Chancellor's kuleana is to advocate for and manage a specific campus, in this case, Mānoa. Having a single person serve in both capacities could lead to conflicts of interest, and we fear the System's needs will be prioritized over those of Mānoa, or vice versa.

The 2015 report1 from the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) to the Board of Regents on the structure of the UH System found that it is important to maintain a clear distinction between the roles, positions, and responsibilities of the Mānoa campus and the UH System. The report went so far as to recommend implementing a long-term plan to physically remove the UH System offices from the Mānoa campus in order to strengthen that distinction. Appointing the UH System

---

President as Interim Chancellor of Mānoa is in direct opposition to WICHE’s recommendations and threatens the autonomy of the Mānoa campus.

Therefore, we recommend rejecting President Lassner’s extension and appointing another individual to serve as Interim Chancellor of Mānoa. Below are some recommendations from the GSO Executive Council for individuals whom we believe are qualified to serve in that capacity:

- Peter Arnade
- Bob Cooney
- Susan Hippensteele
- Neal Miner

Mahalo again for the opportunity to provide testimony. We hope you will take our thoughts into consideration and encourage a distinct separation between System and Mānoa leadership.

Sincerely,

Amy McKee
President, UH Mānoa Graduate Student Organization
gsopres@hawaii.edu

Kepoʻo Keliʻipaʻakaua
Vice-President, UH Mānoa Graduate Student Organization
gsovvp@hawaii.edu
Date: February 22, 2017

To: Jan Naoe Sullivan
Chair of the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents

Re: Reorganization Proposal to Consolidate the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Office of Planning and Facilities and Communications Office with the University of Hawai‘i System Office of the Vice President for Administration and to Establish New Offices under the Vice President For Administration

Dear Chair Sullivan and members of the Board of Regents,

Mahalo for the opportunity to provide testimony. My name is Amy McKee, and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) and President of the UH Mānoa Graduate Student Organization (GSO), a governance body representing over 4,700 graduate students. I am writing on behalf of GSO’s Executive Council in strong opposition to the proposed reorganization of the UHM Office of Planning and Facilities and Communications Office with the University of Hawai‘i System Office of the Vice President for Administration and the establishment of new offices under the Vice President for Administration.

The GSO serves as an advisory body to the Chancellor of UH Mānoa. Shared governance is critical value we share within the UH System and UH Mānoa, and we have strong concerns that stakeholders who would be affected by this reorganization were not consulted. As an advisory body to the UHM Chancellor, it is important that the GSO is consulted in all matters pertinent to the operation of the Mānoa campus to ensure that the graduate student population is aware of and has a voice in any decisions of the campus that may affect them. However, the GSO has not been consulted in regard to this proposed consolidation of UHM campus offices with the UH system. By not engaging in prior consultation with the GSO and other affected units about this reorganization, this proposal circumvents any processes of shared governance and ignores the input of the very stakeholders whom this University is committed to serve.

The consolidation of UH Mānoa offices with UH System offices reduces the ability of the Mānoa campus to function autonomously. Furthermore, the proposed consolidation increases the responsibilities of UH System administration and faculty without any guarantee that the processes normally handled by
Mānoa campus offices would be carried out more efficiently. The GSO Executive Council stands in support of the Mānoa Faculty Senate’s resolution passed on February 15, 2017 in opposition to this proposed reorganization.

Mahalo again for the opportunity to provide testimony. We hope you will take our thoughts into consideration and encourage a distinct separation between System and Mānoa.

Sincerely,

Amy McKee
President, UH Mānoa Graduate Student Organization
gsopres@hawaii.edu

Kepo’o Keli’ipa’a’akaua
Vice-President, UH Mānoa Graduate Student Organization
gsov@hawaii.edu
In Support of President Lassner Continuing as the iChancellor for Manoa

Sarita Rai <sarita@hawaii.edu>  
To: Board of Regents <bor@hawaii.edu>, Randolph Moore <rgmoore@hawaii.edu>, Jan Sullivan <jansulli@hawaii.edu>

Dear Chair Sullivan and Regent Moore

This is Sarita Rai faculty member at UHM, a graduate of UH Manoa (BA, MA, and Ph.D) and proud of it. Needless to say I want the very best for the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa. I am also an executive member of the UHM Senate. This is my personal testimony.

In April of 2016, I wrote to the BOR supporting Dr. David Lassner’s appointment as the iChancellor of Manoa. I do not have any regrets doing so and I have no qualms about supporting him again for his continuation as the Chancellor of Manoa.

Both as a graduate, and then an employee of Manoa at the highest levels - Dr. Lassner is the correct and right choice for Manoa at this time. Manoa is in dire budgetary stress and frankly, needs to be reorganized so that it can be nimble and able to graduate students who are ready to succeed in the 21st century. Dr. Lassner, knowing the campus as well as he does, will be able to provide the leadership it needs to accomplish these goals.

I am pleased that the Chancellor search did not result in a new Chancellor for Manoa and will not support a new search anytime soon. The continuation of the appointment of Dr. Lassner is prudent and necessary.

Let me tell you my story to illustrate a point. After Dr. Lassner began as the Chancellor and his appointment of Dr. Michael Bruno as the VCAA - the campus morale has markedly improved. Because of this improvement for the first time in 8 years - I attended the Graduation Ceremony at Manoa in May 2016. It was a breath of fresh air to see Dr. Lassner leading the ceremony. Please let him continue as Manoa's Chancellor so that he may continue to do everything necessary to make Manoa a better place for research and learning. He is a man of his words and his actions follow. Again, such a positive change for Manoa.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarita Rai, Ph.D.
Director
University of Hawai‘i at Manoa Study Abroad Center

www.StudyAbroad.org
www.facebook.com/uhmstudyabroad
twitter.com/uhmstudyabroad

"Dare to Discover, Dare to Learn, Dare to Understand"
BOR testimony from Manoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee

1 message

Marguerite Butler <mbutler808@gmail.com> Thu, Feb 23, 2017 at 8:31 AM
To: Board of Regents <bor@hawaii.edu>
Cc: Faculty Senate UHM <uhmfs@hawaii.edu>, SEC <uhm-mfs-sec@lists.hawaii.edu>

Aloha, please see our attached testimony on behalf of the Manoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding the Manoa Interim Chancellor.

Thank you,
Marguerite Butler
Chair, Manoa Faculty Senate

Marguerite A. Butler
Associate Professor
Department of Biology
2538 McCarthy Mall, Edmondson Hall 216
Honolulu, HI 96822

Office: 808-956-4713
Dept: 808-956-8617
Lab: 808-956-5867
FAX: 808-956-4745
http://butlerlab.org
http://manoa.hawaii.edu/biology/people/marguerite-butler
http://www2.hawaii.edu/~mbutler
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RE: Interim Appointment Manoa Chancellor  
February 23, 2017

Aloha Regents and President Lassner,

In August of 2016 I stood before you to describe why Manoa needed a full-time interim Chancellor during the search for the permanent Chancellor, but that we, the faculty senate, would work with President/Interim Chancellor Lassner regardless of your decision.

It has been great for President Lassner to step in for the past six months, he’s learned a lot about the challenges and opportunities at Mānoa, and the Faculty Senate has built a stronger working relationship with him. All of these are good things, however, we’ve reached a point of diminishing returns with the current arrangement and to continue on while the situation at Mānoa is so precarious would be damaging.

The faculty are very concerned about this situation. After a vigorous discussion at Wednesday’s Mānoa Faculty Senate meeting we had a straw poll and the Faculty are strongly in support of having an interim Chancellor from Manoa (68%) or restarting the Chancellor search immediately (5%), whereas only 27% of faculty were in favor of an President/interim Chancellor. The faculty are strongly opposed to a dual President/interim Chancellor.

The positions of Chancellor and President are very different -- the Chancellor is akin to the Mayor of Honolulu, working with the city departments to keep the city running, whereas the President is like the Governor of Hawaii, who has overall responsibility for laws and policies across the state. The different jobs demand different kinds of individuals, but more importantly, no one is served well by one person doing both jobs.

At Mānoa, to make matters worse, we also have a split appointment between the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the VC for Research, second and third in responsibility, and both more than full-time positions. To President Lassner’s credit, he has asked the iVCAA to stand in for the Manoa Chancellor in meetings at the System level, but now we have one person serving at times three positions, which is simply not good for Mānoa and simply unsustainable. While the iVCAA/VCR is standing in as Chancellor there is no one devoting full-time to any of these roles.

Mānoa needs a full-time Chancellor to oversee the construction of better data systems, to oversee budgetary reform, to oversee the development of enrollment management, to oversee facility and academic planning and to prioritize deferred maintenance, and to rebuild trust among the faculty, staff, and students. We have experienced ongoing fiscal austerity for many years; morale is at an all-time low.

Most of all, Mānoa needs a Chancellor who is empowered with the authority to make changes at Mānoa and to lead us into the future. This is repeated over and over again in the Longanecker
report, as well as the 2007 WASC visit report, which we attach to this testimony. Maintaining an interim Chancellor/President for 2 years will threaten our WASC accreditation, as a strong campus leader is a central tenet of best practices for academic governance. The WASC report recognizes that the most important issues to resolve for Mānoa’s success is “devolution” -- transfer of personnel and offices from system to Mānoa in order to be able to execute needed changes and to be more accountable to and responsive to Mānoa needs. Both reports also recognize the need for clarity between the roles of Mānoa vis-a-vis System. It is increasingly clear that the reason why Mānoa’s leadership fails repeatedly is that the Mānoa Chancellor needs to have the trust and the authority from the System President to lead Mānoa. We need the same autonomy as other campuses in the system seem to have. The President must be able to trust the Chancellor to do their best to lead Mānoa to fulfill its destiny.

We recognize and appreciate that President Lassner is trying to do what is best for UH Mānoa. However, we have another option that we believe would provide a stronger position for all involved -- We recommend filling the Chancellor position in a permanent situation via a transfer of an existing E/M employee.

We have in mind a current EM employee who has garnered the trust of President Lassner and who has the full, unanimous support of the Senate Executive Committee, and broad support of the faculty at large. We believe this individual also has broad support of the Deans and Directors and we would appreciate an opportunity to build consensus for a viable solution to immediately stabilize Manoa leadership.

A permanent chancellor would be in a much better position to advocate for Mānoa’s needs and best interests in a time of renewal and reorganization. A permanent chancellor can also best oversee any needed reorganization at the Vice Chancellor’s levels. We have already had an interim Chancellor for 2.5 years, it would be extremely damaging to extend this situation for 2-3 more years. Furthermore, there are existing senior personnel within our community who could serve as interim VCAA and interim VCR while a search is underway for these positions. We have identified multiple individuals who would have the support of the faculty. We further recommend that these two VC searches begin as soon as possible so that we can regain the required level of permanency for these vital positions. Permanent Vice Chancellors should not be selected by an interim Chancellor. We would be happy to discuss our recommendations.

Thank you for considering our request.

Sincerely,

Marguerite Butler
Chair, Manoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee
REPORT OF THE
WASC SPECIAL VISIT TEAM
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MĀNOA

October 29-31, 2007

Special Visit Team Members:

Shirley Strum Kenny, Stony Brook University (Chair)
Scott E. Evenbeck, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis
Paula Lutomirski, University of California, Los Angeles

The special visit team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution according to Commission Standards and Core Commitments and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.
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Institutional and Visit Context

The University of Hawaii at Mānoa (UHM or Mānoa) is the flagship campus of the University of Hawaii System (UH system). It is the most research oriented of the 10 campuses, and is classified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research Extensive institution. In Fall 2006 it enrolled 20,357 students [14,590 full-time; 5,767 part-time]. Approximately 69 percent of Mānoa students are undergraduates, 57 percent are of Asian or Pacific Islander ancestry, and 56 percent are women. Mānoa offers 87 bachelor’s degrees, 87 master’s degrees, and 51 doctorates as of fall 2006. UHM also offers first professional degrees in law, medicine, and architecture.

The Western College Association first accredited the UHM in 1952. The Mānoa campus is currently accredited by the WASC Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. Fifty-four degree programs are also accredited by appropriate professional agencies.

At the time of the last WASC Special Visit Team in March 2003, UHM was emerging from a difficult period. With the appointments of Dr. Evan Dobelle in 2001 as President of the UH System and Dr. Peter Englert as Chancellor of UH Mānoa in 2002, the institution was prepared to move ahead; Dobelle had a bold vision for the UH System, and Mānoa figured centrally in it. The 2003 Visit Team commented that UHM had addressed and solved or was in the process of addressing the remainder of the leadership, organizational, operational, and political challenges that had caused such great concern during the 1999 visit. Accordingly, the report written by the WASC 2003 team, chaired by John B. Simpson, was an optimistic one. On July 1, 2003, WASC Executive Director Wolff wrote to Chancellor Englert requesting a March 2005 Progress Report that would address: Planning; Leadership and Governance; Financial Management and Resource Allocation; and Educational Effectiveness and the Assessment of Student Learning. These four areas remain the focus of the 2007 Special Visit Team.
Visit Context:

Following a March 2004 WASC Special Visit to the UH System Office that had been requested by President Dobelle, the WASC Commission expressed its serious concern that “the leadership at Mānoa has been clearly stymied in its ability to truly manage the Campus” and called instead for a Special Visit in the fall of 2005.

The visit was rescheduled for March 2007 due to major leadership changes at the system and campus level: President Dobelle resigned and left office in 2004, and Dr. David McClain was subsequently named Acting and, eventually, permanent President; Chancellor Englert stepped down in 2005; and, Denise Konan was brought in as Interim Chancellor of UH Mānoa in August 2005. The visit was moved to October 2007 after it became apparent that the search for a permanent chancellor would not be resolved before March 2007. In April 2007, Virginia Hinshaw was selected to become Mānoa’s Chancellor, and she indicated that she would take up her post on July 1, 2007.

Quality of the Institutional Report and Supporting Evidence:

UHM prepared a Special Visit Report in January 2007. After the postponement to October and based upon advice from WASC Executive Director Wolff, they provided the team with a Supplemental Statement describing major changes since the preparation of the January 2007 report. The team was concerned with the Supplement’s lack of specificity about the new administration’s support for the positions taken in the Special Visit Report, but these concerns were resolved during the visit.

Description of the team review process:

The team members worked with ALO Dr. Peter Quigley to ensure that they would meet, individually and collectively, with individuals and groups of campus constituents on issues of
importance for the review. In addition to the Supplemental and Special Visit reports and past letters from WASC, the team found the following documents to be most helpful:

- Defining Our Destiny, 2002-2010
- Institutional Proposal, November 2006
- Departmental Assessment Updates on Web
- University of Hawaii at Mānoa Self Study Outline for Program Review, revised June 2006
- Response to the Task Force White Paper on Assessment at University of Hawaii at Mānoa, August 6, 2007

Team Findings, Analysis and Recommendations

I. Leadership and Governance

Since previous WASC Commission reports expressed serious concerns about Mānoa’s leadership structure and clarity of roles and responsibilities between the system and the campus, our team examined these questions very carefully. We have found that the UH System has moved forward to address issues related to campus autonomy and the development of a number of new policies concerning the relationship of the campus to the system office. We feel that the leaders of the Mānoa campus and the UH System have the opportunity now to let the campus grow and develop into the flagship research university it can be.

Members of the campus administration, faculty, and staff are more than ready for a period of administrative stability in which to develop and implement important campus initiatives. They feel, to use the Chancellor’s words, that this is “Mānoa’s moment.” Chancellor Hinshaw appears to have garnered great good will from the campus. She is a firm believer in shared governance and a practitioner of it in her former positions. She also is committed to open communication and transparency. For example, she now has routine meetings with the Deans
and Directors and the Senate Executive Committee, a process that has enabled good
communication between various sectors. It is also helpful that she supports and will pursue the
plans developed before her arrival and that she is pushing for added funding in crucial areas.
The campus is clearly willing to extend to her the courtesy and respect that will allow her to
proceed successfully.

The team found near unanimity about the need to move forward on the Mānoa agenda
now that Chancellor Hinshaw is in place. There is a sense of optimism about the future, which is
connected with feelings of good will toward her and the President of the UH System, campus
and system-wide recognition of the need for greater clarity between the system and campus
offices, and the continuing devolution of responsibilities from the system office to the campus,
now in process.

This year will determine the administrative structure of UH Mānoa. The Chancellor is
considering whether to create a deanship of Arts and Sciences to replace the four deans who
together comprise leadership for the Colleges of Natural Sciences; Social Sciences; Languages,
Linguistics, and Literature; and Arts and Humanities. The larger question of what is the right
size and configuration for Mānoa must be considered in the light of new directions, growing
interdisciplinarity, and future strengths. The searches currently underway for the Vice
Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) and Dean of Medicine must be successfully
completed and additional searches for the Director of the Pacific Biosciences Research Center,
Dean of Natural Sciences, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, and Dean of
the new School of Hawaiian Knowledge will be required. Enrollment management (recruitment,
financial aid, admissions), is organized under the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs;
currently the initiative resides with Dr. Francisco Hernandez, the Vice Chancellor for Students.
The Chancellor should use the recruitment and selection of a permanent Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to rethink the structure, direction, and expectations for that office. We urge her to ensure that Mānoa enhances and expands programs for indigenous Hawaiian people, including an appropriate range of academic courses and research programs that could help to create a more supportive pipeline for young Hawaiians to enter fields such as Medicine, Law, and the professoriate in greater numbers. This should be considered a special mission both in Academic Affairs and in Student Affairs. Increasing the number of indigenous Hawaiians in graduate programs should be recognized as a special responsibility for the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the academic deans in order for Mānoa to meet its diversity goals.

The team found faculty governance to be generally successful in operation. There is a Faculty Senate that meets regularly, and Chancellor Hinshaw meets with the Executive Committee and her own top administrators on a regular basis. Of the 15 schools and colleges, 11 have Faculty Senates, and there is a Senate for Student Affairs (these professionals have faculty positions and can earn tenure). The college senates are actively involved in curricular matters. The team heard no complaints about the way faculty and shared governance are now working, either from professors or from administrators.

It will be essential for UHM’s planning to entail open consultation at the department, decanal, and Senate levels. The Senate Executive Committee is eager to be involved. The Faculty Senate Committee on Administration and Budget (CAB) expressed a desire to be the “faculty voice.” The Team feels that such an effort on the part of the faculty should be encouraged and made part of the priority setting and decision making process. Simultaneously, the problem of high faculty turnover and its attending problems (e.g., salaries, physical facilities,
housing) will need to be addressed. These issues raise difficult financial issues, especially due to the high cost of faculty recruitment packages across the United States.

Given the history of the campus and the system, during which both were administered by a single President, there is a need for clarity about the separation of duties between the system and the campus. In the past, the two were so intertwined that this is not an easy task. The discomfort with the conflation of the authority of the UH System with that of Mānoa was exacerbated by the UARC controversy, in which a number of faculty and students perceived system interference with a campus issue. Although the UARC issue has been addressed, there can be no doubt that it made the issue of conflation of authority a front burner issue. The distinction between campus and system areas of authority must be clarified.

A process called “devolution,” which entails the transfer of administrative responsibilities, along with the staff and budget needed to perform them, from the system office to the campus, is widely perceived as providing opportunities to solve some difficulties of the past. This has already been accomplished in the financial and human resources areas. The Team found that this is working very well. Anticipated benefits—improved information, better timing, and greater responsiveness to campus needs—have been realized. Mānoa has a new generation of leaders who want to take on added responsibilities that are essential for meeting the goals they have established for the campus. The team believes they expect, accordingly, to be held accountable, and thus the team urges the UH System leadership to work closely with the campus to investigate further areas where devolution should take place.

The most important area for this to occur is research administration. The team heard about serious problems with the UH System’s Office of Research Services. Some faculty members indicated that the infrastructure, policies, procedures, and systems are broken; they are
not able to know accurately their expenditures or balances because data is managed now in two systems; research activities are run through the Research Corporation of the UH. Despite the advantages of this approach, the resulting two systems make reporting difficult. Contract renewals are treated like new contracts, multi-year delays in contracting leases occur, and the federal government is not billed in a timely manner. This last problem means that UHM could potentially lose funds if the government closes out contracts before all costs are billed. This is an area that is planned for devolution, but it has been delayed until the VC for Research returns to his post full time after serving as Interim Dean of Medicine. Because of the costs, however, campus and system leadership should consider an immediate transfer of responsibility. Failure to resolve these issues will challenge the campus’s ability to achieve the goal for increasing contract and grant volume by 10% as stated in Defining Our Destiny.

Further, the Team recommends that three other areas should be considered for devolution: procurement, disbursement, and capital planning functions that relate to implementing R&M projects. In all three cases, extra time, additional coordination, and unnecessary oversight, e.g. duplicative review of travel reimbursement requests, were mentioned as serious problems. Moving responsibility to the campus would be an important improvement. Furthermore, purchases over $25,000 now follow cumbersome state purchasing regulations. The Team urges the campus and system leadership to work with UH system or state government officials to raise this requirement if at all possible. Consistent with practices at other institutions, the state and the UH System can use post hoc audit approaches to ensure that policies are being followed in all these areas.

Payroll is an area about which the team heard of serious problems, ranging from delays in initial payments to new employees to failure to receive total earned wages. The Vice Chancellor
for Administration, Finance and Operations described steps that will improve the first problem. Because the payroll is run by the State, there are complications in addressing such problems. Payroll must be both timely and accurate; we suggest that this may be an issue for the upcoming capacity and preparatory review.

II. Planning

The 2003 special visit team found a strategic plan, *Defining Our Destiny, 2002-2010*, that laid out appropriate directions for UHM. The Commission agreed, further indicating that “it will need to be aligned and adjusted to address the directions set by the new campus leadership, by budgetary considerations, and by new opportunities.” Concern was expressed around “alignment” of that plan with the directions of new campus leadership and with system priorities. This team focused its consideration of planning around this message from the Commission.

*Defining Our Destiny* laid out a direction and goals for UHM that were based on strong campus-wide consultation across all constituencies—faculty, students and staff. Now four years later, this team finds that further planning has taken place for the WASC Institutional Proposal (for a Capacity and Preparatory Report in 2009 and an Educational Effectiveness Report in 2010). It establishes three serious themes: (1) Building a Mānoa Community in Support of Student Success; (2) Campus Renewal to Support the Mānoa Experience; and, (3) Reform Campus Governance to Promote Communications and Student Success. These themes generally subsume the initiatives that were articulated in *Defining our Destiny*, and they articulate more realistic timelines and indicators of success. While this is not a formal strategic plan in the traditional sense, in the minds of the Vice Chancellors and key faculty leadership groups, it has superseded *Defining Our Destiny*. There is a consensus among the Vice Chancellors and the new Chancellor
that, although these are plans they inherited, they embrace them and will support them. In fact, one administrator said that the Institutional Proposal “supersedes” *Defining Our Destiny*. This support lends credence to the efforts of many devoted faculty and administrators over the past several years and augments the growing sense that some stability is now possible. We believe that the Chancellor will work hard with the deans and the faculty to move it forward.

The team wishes, however, to add a note of caution to this positive situation. The Institutional Proposal was designed for WASC. It is a very good model for the reaccreditation process, but it is not comprehensive. Important issues are not represented, including the library, graduate student support, and research. For planning to be a successful underpinning of change, these and other emerging issues will need to be comprehended within ongoing plans writ large.

The team met with a group of faculty who are members of the WASC Steering Committee that was appointed in 2005 to develop the WASC Institutional Proposal and now oversees its implementation. This group includes students, administrators, two Faculty Senate representatives, and a cross section of faculty members. Their enthusiasm for the process and their expectations for the outcomes are exemplary of the positive aspects of how strategic planning has been handled most recently at Mānoa. This group managed a broadly inclusive and highly attended town-meeting process that led to the Institutional Proposal and maintained the spirit of consultation that began with the development of *Defining Our Destiny*. Their desire to continue to support the implementation of the Institutional Proposal should be supported enthusiastically and leveraged by the UHM administration and Faculty Senate.

**III. Financial Management and Resource Allocation:**
Sound financial management and resource allocation requires strategic planning on both the campus and System level. Planning must address how the University can begin proactively to solve the oppressive problems caused by deferred maintenance. In order to attract the best faculty and students, buildings responsive to and respectful of the needs of campus citizens are an absolute necessity. From dormitory to classroom buildings, the damages caused by unperformed deferred maintenance must be contained and overcome.

Faculty renewal planning will also be a serious challenge for UHM. Considerable optimism flows from the prospect of multiple faculty retirements in the coming years and the inherent opportunity for new appointments. The Chancellor has made it clear that faculty lines freed by retirements will not automatically return to the colleges from whence they came, as has been true in the past. The plan for redistributing rather than automatically returning some lines to the Deans from whose budgets they come seems to have been clearly communicated and generally accepted.

It is important that this retirement surge provide the opportunity for the campus to grow and strengthen those areas that will determine its future strength and eminence. Currently their faculty profile is such that as many as 400, roughly one-third, of their faculty will reach retirement age in the next few years. Although recent faculty salary increases are likely to lead many faculty to stay on to maximize retirement benefits, early planning for this turnover is key to UHM’s future. It provides an opportunity to build academic program quality by reinforcing strengths and shrinking areas of weakness and to reconfigure the shape of academic programs to increase student success.

Enrollment planning is another critical need. In *Defining Our Destiny*, benchmarks of 5% undergraduate and 15% graduate enrollment increases were set forth. The Institutional Proposal
did not set overall goals, but it does aim to increase Native Hawaiian enrollments to 15%.
Student enrollments must be a major factor in faculty renewal planning to ensure that the faculty
 can mount needed educational programs, and enrollment is now a major financial issue for UH
 since UH has imposed significant tuition increases. Unplanned enrollment fluctuations can cause
 serious financial problems and/or pressures on a stressed campus infrastructure. Enrollment
 planning is an area in which consultation with the UH System leadership will be essential,
particularly given planned growth at the West Oahu Campus. Mānoa and the UH system should
 also develop plans and programs to raise student retention and graduation rates. WASC
 applauds the UH President for signing on to the National Association of System Heads
 commitment to double graduation rates for minority students over the next five years. While this
 engages all campuses, Mānoa will need to pay attention to its student retention, which has been
 problematic, and graduation rates, especially those from underrepresented groups.

The Commission expressed significant concern over “clarity regarding the amount of
resources and rationale for their allocation from the UH System to each campus, including the
Mānoa campus.” UHM “should work toward the development of an appropriately transparent
and timely budget process, which is defined by clearly understood policy and by alignment of
resource allocation with campus strategic goals.” Through discussions with the VC for
Administration, Finance and Operations and the Interim VCAA, representatives of the Faculty
Senate Executive Committee (SEC), and members of the Faculty Senate Committee on
Administration and Budget (CAB), the team was pleased to find that significant progress has
been made on this front.

An important underpinning for recent improvements was the work of the Mānoa Budget
Advisory Group (MBAG), an administrative committee with faculty representatives, which made
recommendations about fixing systems to enable reasonable transparency in the budget process. That group, which is no longer meeting, felt that the campus needed clear, accessible, and timely data to enable basic understanding and to support consideration of budget improvements, such as new allocation formulas, zero-based budgeting, revenue center management, etc.

The members of the SEC with whom we spoke, some of whom served on MBAG, agreed that the VC for Administration, Finance and Operations is making serious progress to address the MBAG recommendations by developing financial systems that will support data analysis. While problems still remain with space data, there is also good new energy in the facilities area. The faculty sees that there is openness on the Chancellor’s part to share information about budgets and allocation decisions with the campus. She does this in meetings with the deans, Senate groups, departments, and the Mānoa Executive Team (MET), the Chancellor’s leadership group that now includes the Chair of the Mānoa Senate. The VC for Academic Affairs has also established a “Planning Day” retreat for campus leaders; the Chancellor also participates in this information sharing exercise. Further improvements in financial data and reporting are underway; there is a new willingness to look for alternatives; and there is faculty trust in the administration.

The team believes that there is insufficient funding for Repairs and Maintenance (R&M). This situation was created largely during the past ten years when the campus sustained serious budget cuts. During that time, UHM leadership, presumably with support of the UH President, decided to avoid cuts in faculty lines. Instead, permanent reductions were made in R&M and in staff support across the campus. The legacy of those decisions remains in the form of a huge deferred maintenance backlog, with unacceptable conditions in student dormitories, faculty offices and classrooms. The budget to support R&M is down to $1.8 M from about $5.5 when
the budget cuts began, and the Vice Chancellor for Administration, Finance and Operations indicated that staffing for R&M, also reduced, is insufficient. This area of the budget should be an essential focus for the capacity and preparatory review.

The campus needs (1) a larger operating budget for repairs and maintenance, (2) additional operating funds when a new building comes on line, and (3) capital improvements to create a more operationally efficient physical plant, such as more efficient building systems. Also, giving the campus greater ability to manage its own capital projects would move the agenda along. The Chancellor appropriately has these capital areas as a clear top priority, and we strongly recommend that she pursue this with the UH President, the Legislature, and the Governor. Failure to fund R&M at an appropriate level now will only result in added future costs. Knowing that the improvement of the physical campus will take time, it is imperative that the upgrading begin immediately.

The last WASC team noted that the UHM federal overhead rate was extremely low. This has been renegotiated and increased. Work will continue to improve upon these recent federal overhead rate increases. Space data is being collected to identify rooms used for sponsored research, and electrical metering of buildings is being added to enable the significantly higher cost of electricity in research labs to be documented. Water metering will be a later step. These data will enable Mānoa to present an indirect cost proposal that justifies a higher overhead rate. The Campus Services Department is developing the data that the UH System Office of Research Services will use. There is agreement among all those with whom we spoke that this is moving forward as quickly and deliberately as possible.

The last state budget did not fund UHM’s library request, even though it had the UH System’s highest priority. Understanding that the library suffered from so much flood damage,
the Chancellor has now made it a top priority for Supplemental 2009 funding. The team urges
the Chancellor and the UH President to continue to lobby for adequate library funding for the
state’s only research university. The Capacity and Preparatory Review should pay particular
attention to the issue of resources for the library.

IV: Educational Effectiveness and the Assessment of Student Learning

The team paid special attention to the assessment of student learning, general education,
and to how UHM is setting the foundation for student success in the first year and sustaining the
priority of these efforts in an enhanced research environment under the leadership of Chancellor
Hinshaw. The Commission wanted to ensure that such efforts “become more systemic and
embedded within the campus culture.” The team found significant progress and a firm plan for
moving forward with regard to continued build-out of the assessment infrastructure, deepening
campus understanding of the value and methodologies of assessment, and creating opportunities
for dialogue within the campus to improve courses, pedagogy, and student learning.

The Commission called for the campus to embed systemic assessment of student learning
outcomes including general education outcomes, within the campus culture and to incorporate
assessment into departmental reviews and to assess graduate programs. The team found that the
campus has made significant progress with such assessment although implementation across
departments is very uneven. The campus has moved forward in remarkable fashion in recent
months to include some form of assessment for nearly all degree programs. The team observes
that some of the assessments appear not yet embedded in faculty culture or to move toward
authentic assessments of student learning. The team does not advocate a uniform template for
assessment. The recent and anticipated provision of resources to work with faculty will
significantly enhance this work and build the foundation for the comprehensive review later in this decade. With many faculty retirements anticipated in the next few years, it is imperative that the campus develop programming ranging from new faculty orientation through ongoing workshops and faculty support, for extending this work. Since new faculty at a research university give first priority to their research careers, it is imperative to inculcate a culture of evidence, stressing the scholarship of teaching, with new faculty. Rarely does a campus have such a turnover in faculty and the opportunity to invite ongoing faculty to work with new faculty in such support for student learning and assessment.

The Special Visit team was asked to focus on general education assessment and faculty involvement. It is clear that the campus has made significant improvement in articulating and assessing general education. General education at the campus is consistent with standards of WASC. It extends across the entire undergraduate experience, including the major. Faculty development and support will strengthen the work. Faculty leaders, including faculty who participated in the campus revision of general education for the campus in the 1990's, continue their leadership with the curriculum.

Program reviews are undergoing some revision in order to shorten the time needed to complete a review. The team observes that the assessment of student learning and the reporting of outcomes and improvements made as a function of assessment should be completed annually. The program review, conducted perhaps every 5-7 years, is then a time for a more comprehensive review, involving internal and external reviewers who have the benefit of the self-study and whose visit to campus provides the program and the administration with intensive feedback which should result in program improvement, going beyond the annual reporting on student learning and assessment. With so many programs subject to review by professional
accréditation bodies, the team recommends attention to the articulation of such visits with the program reviews conducted by the campus.

Mānoa’s response to the Task Force White Paper on Assessment points out that “one size fits all, top down implementation does not work.” The team strongly supports this observation in the context of strong professional schools with expectations coming from professional accreditation bodies and with a wide range of undergraduate and graduate degrees that is very comprehensive. The response to the Task Force White Paper also makes the point that, while progress has been made, there is still much to do. Their report stresses the role of the faculty in the articulation and assessment of student learning. The team underscores the importance of faculty working in their departments and schools in articulating and assessing student learning. It is critical for the faculty to own and lead these processes and for the administration to provide the necessary resources.

The team strongly supports the implementation steps outlined in the report (establishment of working group, appointment of a fully released faculty member, the addition of two staff to support assessment, the addition of an institutional research staff member (already in place), a request for $300,000 budget line, and a $100,000 budget line immediately (already in place).

The team understands that the campus may be migrating to new software to support the electronic portfolio. We urge that the faculty consider whether adaptations of such software for identifying student work performed as a normal part of class (high stakes work) be identified for inclusion in an electronic portfolio which might become, for students and for the campus, a personal product for students which might be useful in documenting their work for graduate school or employment, and which at the same time might provide the campus with authentic evidence in its assessment of student learning.
The Institutional Proposal's call for improving advising is central to WASC's standards dealing with educational effectiveness and assessment of student learning. The campus has a strong foundation in the Freshman Programs and in the Student Success Center, and the learning communities program has had significant expansion. George Kuh, in a summary of his work on student engagement, has highlighted the strong and consistent relationship of two factors with student engagement, which is seen as key in enhancing student learning. These two are experience with diversity, which is part of the fabric of life on the campus but which remains a key priority for enhancement, and participation in learning communities, which are a programmatic effort provided by the campus, particularly important on a campus where many students are commuters and do not have other contexts for connections with faculty, advisors, staff, and students. The Freshman Programs Office has outstanding programs in place with plans for extending the work with entering and transfer students. The addition of five new advisors will make significant impact. Richard Light's work has reinforced the critical importance of advising in supporting student learning. The WASC team recommends that the campus continue to emphasize advising and to enhance means for connecting students with their advisors.

The team applauds the significant contributions the Student Success Center has made to student life in a very short time. Students themselves reported their enthusiasm for a space without air-conditioning, where they could bring food and study alone together. Data on student use of the facility show that it has already become central to student life, confirming the comments of student leaders on campus. The team understands that $300,000 in funding this year and $400,000 on an ongoing basis is needed to sustain this work. Programs in the building, including the Honors Program, appear to be central to enhancing student learning and academic achievement.
The team believes that continuing attention to enhancing the “Mānoa Experience” for students is warranted. The unique history and culture of the campus are rich for students who, themselves, when asked about what is most important about the campus, state “diversity” and “being here” and “the culture here.” Such diversity and history, coupled with the fact that the campus is a major research university, provide unmatched opportunity, in the Asian century, for making an impact on students well beyond the capability of other campuses.

The team applauds campus plans to develop a set of indicators (a baseline dataset, performance metrics, data relative to program reviews and the strategic plan, and comparisons with peer and national data) to support institutional planning and improvement. The new STAR program developed for providing data is outstanding and is a model for other institutions.

Summary of Findings and Major Recommendations

Not unlike the last special visit team, this team found the University of Hawaii at Mānoa at an important crossroads with new leadership, difficult goals, and financial limitations. But this team senses a new and positive energy. We noted a universal desire for stability and saw continuing evidence of forward progress, even after all the perturbations that have occurred. Every group with whom we met felt this was now possible. We applaud the appointment of the new Chancellor, who brings a welcomed openness, a belief in the promise of the institution, and a new eagerness to communicate broadly and work collegially with all of Mānoa’s constituencies.

We make the following recommendations, and urge that the Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness teams review progress in these matters:

1. The President and the Chancellor should continue to define and communicate the respective roles and responsibilities of the UH System and Mānoa, and maximum
authority should be delegated to the Chancellor, especially with regard to continuing devolution of responsibilities to Mānoa.

2. The Chancellor should ensure that Mānoa's planning is fully comprehensive, incorporating library, graduate student, and research issues with the other essential matters now covered by the Institutional Proposal, and Mānoa's planning process should be more attentive to State and UH issues. Furthermore, the UH System planning must be more clearly integrated with campus planning and priorities.

3. Adequacy of financial resources is a serious matter especially with regard to campus facilities, library support, program assessment and student support (including graduate students), and upcoming faculty renewal. The Chancellor has rightly emphasized these needs, and the President should actively support them for the long-term benefit of the State of Hawaii. At the same time, system and campus leadership must manage existing resources wisely and attend to problems such as those we described in the management of federal contracts and grants

4. Significant progress has been made in articulating and assessing student learning outcomes, particularly general education, and a structure is now in place to support faculty in their work with assessment. The campus rightfully stresses the importance of advising, and plans to expand the number of advisors should be pursued expeditiously.

5. Mānoa should continue to focus on and clarify the Mānoa experience, particularly valuing diversity and the Hawaiian culture, and should incorporate this area into the campus' research enterprise.