Meeting Notes – DRAFT
Monday, August 2, 2010 | 2:30 – 4:30 PM | CAS Dean’s Conference Room

Attendance: Leon Hallacher (CAS), Hank Hennessey (CoBE), Jim Mellon (DOS), John Pezzuto (COP), Marcia Sakai (CoBE-voting delegate), Jeff Scofield (FAO/Ex Officio), Mike Shintaku (CAFNR), Janis Shirai (SSSP-TRiO), Kalena Silva (CHL), Luoluo Hong (Chair/Ex Officio)

Meeting Goal: To discuss the following questions: (1) What should the share of need-based funds be for undergraduate and graduate/professional students? (2) How do we want to allocate the need-based awards (e.g., by capping a total dollar amount to be awarded to undergraduate and graduate/professional students respectively, by establishing a maximum award per student, by allowing both undergraduate and graduate/professional students to be eligible for all of the need-based aid without any caps or limits, or other ideas) (3) What formula or guidelines do we wish to use in allocating the achievement-based scholarships, keeping in mind that BOR policies require us to give priority to Hawaii residents? (4) What recommendations do we wish to forward to the Chancellor for consideration along with the actual allocation?

1. Meeting notes for July 29, 2010: Notes need to be corrected so that the numbering of the discussion items is sequential.

2. One member wished to clarify that while she did suggest that we retain Intercollegiate Athletics as an achievement-based unit recipient, it was a short-term recommendation, not a long-term strategic recommendation. The University should have a discussion about continuing participation in NCAA Division II, and perhaps considering moving to Division III instead to reduce the need for athletic scholarships.

3. Chair noted that the last meeting ended with a vote in favor of including graduate/professional students as eligible for need-based aid. It was noted that the percentage of need-based aid for 2010-2011 is 65%. Chair also raised the question of how much of the total funds we want to be need-based after 2010-2011.

4. The following proposal for the 2010-11 allocation was made:
   a. Keep the need-based percentage at 65%
   b. Division of Student Affairs would have the authority to determine how the need-based aid is awarded among all eligible students
c. Degree-granting colleges would each be allocated 25% of the amount of aid it contributes through tuition dollars and use the funds to award achievement-based aid as they see fit.

d. The remaining 10% of funds would be allocated centrally to award other achievement-based aid, e.g., Regents’ & Presidential Scholarships, Centennial Scholarships, Division of Student Affairs, possibly Chancellor’s Scholarships, etc.

e. Amendment to the proposal following discussion: Support for Intercollegiate Athletic scholarships would be proportionally distributed among the colleges using percentage share of headcount.

5. Record of Discussion About Proposal. Discussion occurred about this proposal, including how to determine the amount a college contributes to aid through tuition dollars, e.g., through percentage of headcount, percentage of SSH generated, or percentage of academic majors. To develop a projection for what the 2010-11 allocation could potentially look like, it was decided to use percentage of SSH generated as a model. It was pointed out that the proposal contradicts the agreement the Committee had previously reached about funds being allocated on the basis of proportionality (“club dues” model) versus funds going into a “pot” for reallocation (property taxes model).

The table below reflects the distribution of funds by unit if the proposed formula were used for 2010-11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>% SSH generated</th>
<th>Amount of Contribution to Tuition Aid “Pot” (15%)</th>
<th>25% of Amount (Proposed allocation for 2010-11)</th>
<th>Actual Allocation for 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$262,500</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFNRM</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>$74,092</td>
<td>$18,523</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>83.37%</td>
<td>$2,313,518</td>
<td>$578,380</td>
<td>$144,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBE</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>$215,618</td>
<td>$53,904</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>$171,772</td>
<td>$42,943</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The amount remaining to be allocated for other units to award achievement-based aid would be $382,500. This amount would not be sufficient to cover the amounts allocated to the other achievement-based awarding units in 2010-11. To address this, suggestions included:

i. Not funding “mandated” achievement-based aid at the level it has been funded in the past

ii. Applying different percentages (i.e., other than 25%) for different
colleges

iii. Allocating funds for Intercollegiate Athletics out of the CAS amount. If the latter approach were adopted, CAS would still have more funds ($193,380) than the amount allocated for 2010-11 ($144,500) but bear the entire responsibility for this amount.

iv. Allocating funds to the colleges to award athletic scholarships based on either headcount of student-athletes in the college or by distributing the aid to all of the colleges by SSH.

b. It was noted that if the Chancellor’s Scholarship were eliminated, the remaining amount would be sufficient. Suggestions made by the Committee included recommending that the Chancellor fund the program through another source of funds, or that each college decide if they want to “reserve” one or more scholarships each year for the Chancellor’s Scholars program. The Chair asked the college representatives to think about whether they would like to do this and, if so, how many scholarships would the college want and would they want to have the program continued to be administered centrally by the Division of Student Affairs through the Admissions Office. The Chair also said she would obtain the Chancellor’s opinion about the future direction for this scholarship program.

c. A concern about timing was raised, i.e., that if colleges were responsible for setting aside the funds to award scholarships such as Regents’ & Presidential, Centennial, and Chancellor’s Scholarships, it might be too late to award other scholarships (e.g., in late spring) since we often don’t know who or how many scholarship recipients there will be for these programs until that time. A suggestion was made to have Student Affairs award these scholarships for the students’ first year, then have each college award the aid for the students’ subsequent years.

d. Concerns were raised about UH Hilo’s continued participation in NCAA Division II intercollegiate athletics. The question was raised about whether this Committee has any say about the amount Athletics will be allocated in the future. The Chair asked that committee members send her questions about athletics that they’d like to have answered in a future presentation.

6. The Chair called for a vote on the proposed concept, as described in #4 above - note that this is NOT the actual 2010-11 allocation, just the "formula" for how to determine it. An actual proposal with verified figures still needs to be prepared for vote by this committee.

a. 7 voted in favor of the proposed concept
b. 0 voted against the proposed concept

c. Note that no representatives from Intercollegiate Athletics and the VCAA Office were present due to schedule conflicts.

7. Both the Financial Aid Director and the Chair noted that for this conceptual proposal to be implemented effectively there will need to be a major shift in how the colleges award achievement-based aid. The practice in the past has been to use achievement-based scholarships to reward continuing students, with little or no effort made to use the funds to strategically recruit students into colleges/academic programs and shape the entering cohort. This includes allocating scholarships that formerly were administered through International Student Services and the Admissions Office, since those units have been removed from the list of units receiving achievement-based aid allocations.

8. The Chair indicated that she would consult with the Budget Office and Institutional Analyst to review numbers/computations, and provide the committee with a proposal with actual figures for vote at the next meeting. (After the meeting, Hank Hennessey volunteered to run a projection based on the data he has.)

9. Members should keep the holds on the two additional dates sent out via e-mail. A future agenda item will be a discussion about the return on investment for the scholarship aid we allocate through Intercollegiate Athletics.

Respectfully submitted,
Jim Mellon & Luolu Hong
8/2/10