FINANCIAL AID & SCHOLARSHIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Notes
Wednesday, May 19, 2010 | 2:00 – 4:00 PM | Chancellor’s Conference Room

Attendance: L. Hong (Chair), R. Hirokawa (CAS), D. Irvin (Athletics), S. Jarvi (CoP), J. Mellon (DOS), M. Sakai (CoBE), J. Scofield (FAO/Ex Officio), M. Shintaku (CAFNRM), J. Shirai (SSSP-TRiO), K. Silva (CHL)

1. Because the representative from College from Pharmacy requested significant changes to its content, draft notes from May 5, 2010 and May 12, 2010, meetings will be revised by the Chair and distributed for review/comments again.

2. Since this Committee has been unable to reach a consensus for the 2010-11 Financial Assistance Allocation, for this meeting, Robert’s Rules of Order will be followed.

3. Chair submitted a draft proposal (attached) for the 2010-11 Financial Assistance Allocation, reflecting all changes discussed and agreed to from the previous two discussions of the Committee.

   a. Randy Hirokawa moved to accept the proposal. Jim Mellon seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

   b. Sue Jarvi proposed an amendment to the proposal: “Reallocate $104,184 ($17,364CoP non-resident tuition x 6 students) from the Pacific Islander students scholarship line to the College of Pharmacy line to cover the costs of the tuition differential for 6 CoP students from Guam. This motion as seconded by Marcia Sakai. Floor was opened for discussion.

      i. Based on the UH System definition of “Pacific Islander” students from Guam are not eligible to receive a tuition discount; however, they do qualify for federal financial aid programs, including Federal Work-Study and student loans such as Pell Grants. However, the definition is in part based on whether the territory has a four-year baccalaureate-granting institution. Guam does not have a pharmacy program.
ii. It was noted that to maintain the ratio of 60:40 of need-based to merit-based aid, monies from a need-based allocation cannot be moved to achievement-based allocations.

c. Sue Jarvi asked to edit her amendment to: “Reallocate $104,184 ($17,364CoP non-resident tuition x 6 students) from the Pacific Islander students scholarship line to a new need-based allocation line for purpose of covering the costs of the tuition differential for 6 CoP students from Guam. Randy Hirokawa seconded the motion.

i. The large increase of Pacific Island student scholarships is due to two factors: a new cohort of PI students entering UH Hilo who require the tuition assistance coupled with departure of PI students who were “grandfathered in” under the old definition of PI.

ii. Committee members were unsure if they were willing to establish an allocation line specifically for Guam students; this might open the door to other student constituencies and their advocates seeking a similar kind of allocation.

iii. There was some sentiment that if we wished the definition of eligibility for Pacific Islander student tuition assistance to change, then we should submit a request to the Board of Regents. It may not be UH Hilo’s prerogative to change the definition on our own.

iv. Randy Hirokawa called the question; Mike Shintaku seconded this. The amendment as proposed failed in a vote of 1 yes – 7 no – 0 abstain.

d. Committee members agreed that we need to identify our institutional values/priorities and then outline a plan for how to operationalize those via the financial assistance allocation. The Chair strongly suggested that the shift be made with new allocations, rather than reallocating among existing lines. Some philosophical questions that this committee will need to resolve include:

i. Do graduate/professional students have the same level of entitlement to grant/scholarship aid as undergraduates do? Similarly, what is UH hilo’s commitment to providing institutional support to graduate/professional students? Note that at UH Manoa, funding to support graduate assistantships is not subject to BOR formulas requiring 60% to be need-based; they fund it from additional tuition revenue.

ii. Do non-resident students deserve as much subsidy to the cost of education as resident students do?
iii. Is the 15% taken from collected tuition dollars regarded as a “tax” (whereby every entity pays into a collective pot but doesn’t necessarily receive the same exact benefits) or “club dues” (whereby each contributor receives the same package of benefits)? (This metaphor was contributed by Mike Shintaku.)

e. Jeff Scofield noted that this committee previously agreed that achievement-based scholarships would not be “keyed” to tuition levels. This was to ensure that other scholarship programs would not compete with the Regents’, Presidential, and Chancellor’s Scholars programs, which do cover full resident tuition.

f. Dexter Irvin called the question; Randy Hirokawa seconded this. The proposed 2010-11 financial assistance allocation was passed in a vote of 7 yes – 0 no – 1 abstain.

4. Chair suggested that this Committee continue meeting over Summer 2010, rather than waiting until Fall 2010 to reconvene, since all members are on 11-month appointments. This would allow us adequate time to fully vet some of the relevant issues before the 2011-12 financial assistance allocation needs to be decided. The proposal is for the Committee to meet twice a month until its work, is done, at a time to be determined by the Chair based on member availability. Sue Jarvi called the question; Randy Hirokawa seconded it. The motion passed in a vote of 8 yes – 0 no – 0 abstain.

5. Housekeeping: Jeff Scofield reminded members that the Colleges need to submit the list of their achievement-based scholarship recipients to his office by June 15th. In addition, UH Hilo policy dictates that a student cannot receive tuition-based aid in excess of the amount of tuition that s/he is assessed.

Note: A request was made by the College of Pharmacy representative to include her materials as part of the record. They are attached to these notes.

Respectfully submitted,
Luoluo Hong
May 23, 2010
## UH Hilo Financial Assistance*

### Opportunity Grants (need-based) - mandated as 60% of financial assistance allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>$1,700,000.00</td>
<td>$2,055,608.00</td>
<td>20.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander Scholarship</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $100,000 for students of Hawaiian Ancestry; $100,000 for resident graduate/prof students in FY 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total for Need Based</td>
<td>$1,950,000.00</td>
<td>$2,505,608.00</td>
<td>28.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Achievement Based - designated as 40% of financial assistance allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Scholars</td>
<td>$247,536.00</td>
<td>$286,272.00</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Ag., Forestry &amp; NRM</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>$123,000.00</td>
<td>$144,500.00</td>
<td>17.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>$18,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>21.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Hawaiian Language</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Student Affairs</td>
<td>$31,460.00</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>-49.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Office</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential &amp; Regents Scholars</td>
<td>$29,460.00</td>
<td>$51,120.00</td>
<td>73.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>$366,500.00</td>
<td>$385,000.00</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Scholarships</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>488.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Programs</td>
<td>$104,000.00</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Office</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total for Achievement Based</td>
<td>$1,123,956.00</td>
<td>$1,319,392.00</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRAND TOTAL

| GRAND TOTAL                              | $3,070,000.00 | $3,825,000.00 | 24.59% |


**Approved / Disapproved:**

---

Rose Tseng, Chancellor  
Luoluo Hong, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Date: _______________  
Date: _______________

*Per UH System policy, 15% of tuition revenue from prior year must be allocated to financial assistance.*
19 May 2010  
Proposal for reallocation of FA&S funds  
Submitted by : Sue Jarvi

1. Reallocate $104,184 ($17.364 x 6) from Pacific Island students Scholarship to CoP to cover costs of tuition differential to 6 CoP students from Guam.  
Justification: Pacific Island scholarship funds are not allowed to be directly awarded to Guam students. If these funds are allocated to the CoP, the CoP can award to Guam students. Keeping them in the Pacific Scholarship fund eliminates any possibility of eligibility for Professional Guam students. 

2. Reallocate the Athletics funds to the five Colleges.  
Justification: If Athletics students are top scholars, they should be top candidates for these funds. It is important that the formula to determine reallocation of these funds to each College incorporates % tuition contributed by each student within each college. Each student is contributing 15% of their tuition dollars to this FA&S fund and each student deserves equitable access to all (or as many as possibly) Scholarship opportunities. These funds then allocated to each of the 5 Colleges would then need to be fairly distributed to both undergraduate and graduate/professional students housed within each College. 

3. Triple the amount of funds dedicated toward graduate and professional students within the Financial Aid dollars to $300,000 of the total $2+ million proposed.  
Justification: Each student contributes 15% of their tuition (e.g. Guam and non-resident CoP students = $4,961, x 45=$223,245; Hawaii CoP students = $2,480 x 45 = $111,600) directly to these funds we are proposing to "fairly" allocate. Our 6 Guam students contributed $29,766 towards that $100,000 they are now eligible to apply for. I am sure most of our 45 Hawaii residents are also eligible for Financial Aid and they contributed $111,600. How about all the other Graduate students in other programs also needing Financial Aid? I don’t have the numbers and tuition for all graduate students at UHH, but it is no doubt substantial. $100,000 is not enough.
May 5 minutes:

Comments and Minutes updates:

2a. If UHHSA students are invited to attend these meetings, shouldn’t graduate and professional students also be represented?

2a,b. The committee and others should be aware that this is really the third year in which the CoP students have had no representation. For the 2008 and 2009 meetings, CoP was not invited to participate. In 2010, the decision on the current allocation was really made last October when Athletics started their recruitment efforts (according to Dexter). I chose to abstain from “voting” on the current proposal as there is obviously no chance of re-allocation of funds. Athletics knew how much they were getting last October 2009; there was nothing to vote on since the current allocation was a done deal in fall 2009.

2c. This FA allocation process is supposed to be transparent and we have been encouraged to share this information with others. When CoP students read statements as in 3b (at the end) they will go ballistic. If the committee adopts the “taxation” philosophy, this means that our CoP students have been subject to 3 years of ‘taxation without representation’. The Tea Party and the American Revolution will seem minor compared with the riots the CoP students will have. If Graduate and Professional students don’t have equitable and fair access to these scholarship funds, they should not have to contribute. The 15% take from the top should not apply to these student tuition dollars. I know there are some at UH who do obviously not support the CoP or its students, but the CoP is strongly supported politically, by many at UH and also by the community. Bad decisions such these have long-term (and possibly legal) ramifications which will only serve to reflect poorly on this institution and administrators.

4b. As was previously requested, please include in the minutes the issues raised regarding Attachment E, your formulas for allocation of merit-based aid. The major issues are: 1. the funds for Athletics need to be included and if Athletics is to continue receiving scholarships they need to be subject to the same formulas as others. 2. Any calculation based on the $8500 allocation to Cop is inherently flawed as this in an extreme underestimate.

4d. Please include in the minutes that the proposal presented indicated a need for both merit-based and need-based scholarships totaling approximately $500,000.

Missing from the May 5 minutes is the discussion regarding the disproportionate sum awarded to athletes. The following point was discussed:

The justification provided for the large amount allocated to athletics appears largely historical. It was explained that the reason for the large amount is due to the transition from tuition waivers to actual dollars at some point in the past. Since athletics had a large number of non-resident students being supported at the time, this was converted into a dollar amount that was substantially higher than others, and has remained so. It was brought up that the funds going to
Athletics are needed to recruit top students into the athletics program. This rationale was questioned by members of the committee.

May 19 minutes:

3b, 3c, insert document submitted by S Jarvi as an attachment. The additional proposals (2 and 3) were not brought to the table because it became apparent that the funds in the allocation proposal were not subject to re-allocation since the initial allocation was decided on last Fall (2009). The document should be included in the minutes.

Again, discussions regarding the disproportionate amount of funds allocated to Athletics is not included. It was brought up that the funds going to Athletics are needed to recruit top students into the athletics program [but so does everyone else]. It was stated that Athletics also raised $700,000 themselves [so why do they get so much more??]. Recruitment vs scholarship was discussed. Again, the formula for allocation HAS TO INCLUDE the total funds and athletics students need to be subject to the same formulas as everyone else. There is no justification for this special treatment of athletics.