First, I and the chairs of the College of Arts and Humanities thank our external reviewers [Dean Allan Chan, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences of Nanyang Technological University, Dean James Moy, College of Fine Arts of the University of South Florida, Dr. Bonnie Wade, former dean, College of Letters and Science of UC Berkeley, and Dean Tyler Stovall, College of Humanities of UC Santa Cruz] for their three day visit to assess our programs, for the perceptive evaluation of our self studies, and for the report they prepared. The reviewers' evaluation was shared with the College’s departments after which the chairs, Dr. Ruth Bingham, director of the AH-LLL advising center, associate dean Tom Brislin and myself met to discuss it. Chairs were also invited to submit separate responses to me if they wished to raise issues related to the review of their specific department. Several did, while others had no substantive responses.

**Strengths**

The reviewers noted that since the 2010 program review, the College of AH has done much to craft a stronger cohesive identity. Despite our obvious heterogeneity, there are two common denominators that encourage points of affinity: our Asia-Pacific location and our comparative and cross-cultural orientation. One arena not singled out explicitly by the program review is our deepening commitment to Native Hawaiian scholarship, including the hire of five Native Hawaiian faculty since 2012 and new curricular initiatives, including a degree program in Indigenous Theatre and a certificate in indigenous studies currently under preparation. Our liberal arts footing is a second source of unity for AH (shared with the College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature). We are mindful that in a university with many professional schools and research centers, AH and LLL contribute to the liberal arts essence of the campus. A university can be comprised of many different schools, colleges and centers but it cannot exist without the essential liberal arts disciplines which have anchored higher education traditionally. Yet another way AH has emphasized common interests is by encouraging collaborations among the arts and between the arts and humanities. We have taken several steps that have been singled out by the reviewers since 2010---advancements we will continue to embrace and extend. Initiatives include new cross-disciplinary certificate programs such as the proposed one in indigenous studies and artistic and scholarly collaborations like the fall event we started last year, The Abstract, that brings live performance in dance and music to the art gallery aligned around the opening of a new exhibit. In sum, the College will continue to support and deepen the strengths the program reviewers underscored.

**Issues and Concerns**

The reviewers noted criticism from faculty and students concerning the College’s fiscal health and its ability to support programing and faculty hires.
adequately. Such concerns are not surprising given the fiscal challenges UH Mānoa has confronted since 2010, including cuts to General Fund allocations from the legislature, unfunded mandates for faculty raises in 2012 and 2013, and an aging infrastructure with a sizable backlog of deferred maintenance. The good news is that the College of AH has remained fiscally solvent, but at a price, which has included tough choices about minimal reduction in lecturer allocations and the decision to leave some permanent faculty lines vacant. The dean’s office has worked carefully with chairs to minimize personnel reductions, and with good success I believe, since we have retained GAships and essential lectureships. As dean, it is my assessment that our college and the other three Arts and Sciences colleges have been historically underfunded relative to the professional schools and organized research centers on our campus. That said, I am also grateful for the extra performance-based money and SSH-generated extra G funds that have helped float the college over the last two academic years. I concur with the program reviewers in supporting the move away from the static model of historical-based budgeting on our campus---a move that has the support of the interim chancellor and the campus’ Vice Chancellors. UH Mānoa is in the early phases of what I hope will be meaningful budget reform in the way the university makes allocations to units, with performance metrics based on Student Semester Hours and mission support the two critical denominators.

The reviewers noted that the UH System’s strategic goals fail to embrace explicitly the liberal arts. True, they are crafted with practicalities in mind for the UH system at large, but embedded in them, perhaps not brightly enough, are support for academic programs, student support services, and the development of the academic curriculum. These academic goals and objectives are better discerned from the UH Mānoa strategic plan whose 2015-2021 matrices refines the UH Strategic Plan’s priorities. Many of the metrics in the Mānoa document address student and faculty support and research excellence. These can be found here: http://manoa.hawaii.edu/ovcaa/pdf/stratplan_matrix_draft_03122015.pdf

**College and University Organization**

The reviewers advocated for a Provost model for UH Mānoa, and expressed concern that the model of four Vice Chancellors was organizationally flat, while observing that the VCs work together well nevertheless. The reorganization of Mānoa’s executive structure is the responsibility of the Mānoa Chancellor and UH President. I support these efforts, especially the creation of a Provost position, as do almost all the campus’ deans.

The reviewers suggested better coordination among the four colleges of Arts and Sciences. As AH dean, I agree. I think it dilutes the effectiveness and visibility of Arts and Sciences to have four deans without overarching coordination among them. Some universities with AS colleges have an executive or coordinating dean for them. But any change to the four college model is the responsibility of the Chancellor. I will continue to do my part to encourage partnerships among the four deans of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, and coordination where appropriate around common challenges like personnel costs, SSH and advising. On a related
matter, the reviewers noted the peculiarity of the configuration of departments in Arts and Humanities, including Communicology, with its strong social science profile, and the absence of the English Department—and languages too—in our overall departmental profile. Such an observation is understandable. The particular clustering of departments in LLL, AH, SPAS, and Social Science was the product of past choices and particular historical circumstances. I and the College are open to discussions about better and different academic configurations going forward, though on this matter, too, the responsibility for directing such conversations rest with the Mānoa chancellor. The effort to explore combining the Colleges of LLL and AH this past academic year yielded a fruitful conversation and laid out genuine practical roadblocks as well, including budget and the perceived loss of institutional identities that are well developed. The viability of this initiative will be enfolded in the interim Chancellor’s August 2016 charge to review the organization and structure of our campus more generally.

Enrollment and Fiscal Management

The external evaluators expressed concern about the slip in SSH the College has undergone since 2010 and the dip in number of majors, too. The numbers are clear, and well documented in the self-studies we prepared. In fact, the reason for the external evaluator’s focus on decline in enrollments is that we as a College highlighted the matter as of urgent concern. Following the program review, the College held a mini retreat organized by Associate Dean Tom Brislin with departmental chairs and associate chairs, among others, to begin to craft a strategy to bolster enrollments. With the help of the GE program and Ruth Bingham, director of our Advising Center, we took a two-fold approach. First, we discussed how AH can better position its departments to make a maximum contribution to the General Education curriculum. Second, we put ideas on the table to increase departmental majors and minors. Several were proposed, including increasing our online curricular presence (American Studies and now Religion are moving in this direction), more aggressive recruiting of incoming students, an added emphasis upon the support of double majors and minors, and new certificate programs. Our advising director Ruth Bingham strongly suggested we explore developing courses for the bumper crop of health sciences majors we have on our campus. This mini retreat was the beginning of what I expect will be a robust effort to bring our SSH and numbers of majors up. It’s a top priority.

Undergraduate and Graduate Issues

We thank the reviewers for underscoring our College’s commitment to the undergraduate experience—and for pointing out the campus’ improved time to degree and six year graduation rates. There was concern among the reviewers nevertheless that our departments are not robust enough in embracing undergraduate research as a priority. Undergraduate research is a priority, but the overall campus articulation of this commitment seems to reside in the university’s Honors Program. The College therefore should coordinate better and more
regularly with the Honors’ program on campus, where the locus of a lot of undergraduate research opportunities and funded support resides. I will begin regular meetings with the director of the Honors’ program, especially concerning undergraduate research opportunities in the arts and humanities. I will encourage better interaction between the Honors Program and deans of the instructional colleges more generally. At the same time, there is a role here too for the Vice Chancellor of Research. Michael Bruno is fairly new to the position and has already expressed a great deal of interest in the arts and humanities, including bolstering undergraduate research opportunities at UHM. He has proposed that undergraduate research become an important and new focus on the VCR’s office. This is therefore an opportune time to work with both the Honors’ director and the VCR to deepen our commitment to undergraduate research.

In their consideration of undergraduate advising in AH, the reviewers expressed worry about our ratio of students to advisors while at the same time noting the energy and excellence of our new Advising Center we share with LLL. Advising is in transition in AH and the other AS colleges a year after the dissolution of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences Academic Services in favor of a college-specific advising. Dr. Ruth Bingham, the director of the newly formed AH-LLL Advising Center, brings deep experience to the job of improving undergraduate advising and has made very important strides. As she notes, once our Center no longer advises some of the natural science majors (as shortly it will not), our advising ratios will move from 697 to 1 to 435 to 1. Our Advising Center has also been implementing best practices from other campuses including the use of peer advising and the introduction of new NOLEJ software. The quality of Undergraduate Advising is a top priority of AH, and we agree with the program reviewers that it should be the focus of abiding attention.

The reviewers noted the many strengths of our M.A. and doctoral programs. But they noticed that our funded graduate students are confronted with stipends that don’t match those of peer and benchmark institutions. They called for better campus support for our graduate programs and competitive, multi-year GA packages to recruit outstanding students to our programs. This is indeed a challenge, and one about which I will work with the Director of Graduate Studies. I am in favor of an increase in the GA stipend (though it was increased in 2013) and multi-year packages offered to the best applicants for doctoral programs even if it means, as it surely will unless the funding allocation is fundamentally altered, that we need to reduce the number of graduate students overall in our graduate programs.

On faculty and staff positions the reviewers noted concern by everyone that faculty lines are sometimes not replaced after retirements and resignations and that several departments have staff shortages. This is indeed the case. I, as dean, am committed to allocating faculty and staff positions where there is a clear need and demand, but only if resources are available to fund them. Since the last program review, the College has hired cautiously because of two reasons: the dip in SSH and overall enrollments (which translates into the need for a somewhat smaller permanent faculty size) and, more urgently, because of inflationary trends in personnel expenses and a fairly static budget allocation (though this is undergoing
review and change). The College is poised to begin a new cycle of faculty hires, but the number of faculty lines will depend upon the College’s overall SSH.

The reviewers recommend more travel, grant and research support for faculty. All three are important and I concur. I have been working to raise the Dean’s travel and development fund for the college, and am working with new VC for Research Michael Bruno, to increase travel grant and research seed money support for the Arts and Humanities. As noted, he is a supporter of the arts and humanities, and so I remain optimistic on this front, even within this era of scarcity.

Finally, the reviewers suggest that the UH Foundation dedicate a full time development officer or even two to AH. I believe a single development offer for AH is both realistic and important, and have advocated it as dean. At this time, AH is unable to partially fund the salary for this position, and so we continue to share our Foundation fundraiser, SaraLyn Smith, with LLL and the Library. A single position for AH makes a lot of sense. I am committed as dean to helping to fund our own Foundation officer should our budget improve and permit it.

### Priorities

1) A core priority in the next three years is attention to SSH and the size of majors in all AH departments. The general education retreat the College held in June was a first step in addressing how to better position the Arts and Humanities in terms of enrollment. We expect to grow our College’s participation in General Education offerings. But we must confront the challenge of declining sizes in majors. Several departments—American Studies, Music, Art, and History among others—have redesigned their websites and introduced new courses and pedagogies—in an effort to attract more majors. History, Art and Art History, Communicology and Theatre and Dance are also departments which are currently expanding digital and online offerings. Departments with courses defined as having a poor student success rate—world history and world religions to take two examples—are on task working with the OVCAA on strategies to address student academic improvement. In the next three years our goals are to grow the size of majors, expand our presence in the University’s General Education curriculum, and become more active in Outreach College summer and extension programs, especially with online courses.

2) After three years of little hiring, the College has stabilized its budget and expects to hire faculty over the next three years, with seven positions being sought for 2017. Authorization for faculty hires will depend, as it always has, upon curricular needs. But SSH will also matter too in determining which departments receive positions. SSH will therefore be one factor in assessing the need for positions in departments. Unless the College can increase enrollment, its permanent faculty size is likely to be less than it currently is now. Some departments may have to reduce faculty size while others (Religion for example) are at a critically low threshold and need some modest growth.

3) Art and Humanities depends on development work for support. A goal in the next three years is to work with the University Foundation to fund a stand alone
development officer for the College. If the College budgets permit it, the dean’s office is committed to cost sharing this position with the University Foundation. While AH’s fundraising record is solid, there is much room for improvement.

4) Facilities is in transition on our campus, and UH System will involve itself more in tackling deferred maintenance and new capital improvement projects. Two projects are imperative for our College over the next two-three years. The first is the 2016-17 renovations of Kennedy Theatre, a much needed upgrade. The second is a permanent home for ACM. Whether the recently vacated KHET building on campus, with its two studios, will be renovated or whether a new upper campus space for ACM is now the preferred option is not yet clear. But imperative is that this fast growing major move from its status as a provisional program to a permanent program and that it secure facilities to accommodate its academic mission.

5) In 2012-13 faculty in the College of AH and LLL spent considerable time in putting together a proposal for a campus Humanities Center. I believe this effort has traction and could find modest preliminary funding as our two colleges’ budgets stabilize. Working with the interim dean of LLL, I am committed to getting this effort off the ground to strengthen research and academic support for the arts, languages and humanities on our campus.

6) Academic Advising is central to student success and retention and enrollment too. Our Advising Center is still fledgling, and we expect to improve, as noted above, the advisor to student ratio and implement new best practices around student advising and mentorship to improve retention and graduate rates. Better advising will also affect positively priority number one concerning SSH.