Hawaiian, Asian and Pacific Issues (HAP) Systemwide Board
Meeting Summary

Wednesday, May 1, 2019
11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. Bachman 203

Present: Kapena Shim, Chair (UHM), Debbie Halbert (UH System), Kalawaia Moore (WCC),
Alapaki Luke (HonCC), Christine Beaule (UHM, GEO), Betty Ickes, Vice-Chair (LCC), Maya Saffery
(UHM), Craig Perez (UHM), Sheela Sharma (UHM, GEO), Kristle Carter (UH System), Kawena
Komeiji (UHWO), No‘el Tagab-Cruz (HAW) and Kiope Raymond (UHMC) -- Keahiahi Long (UHM)
and Monica Stitt-Bergh joined at noon.

Campus updates
HonCC had two renewals, UHM had many new courses and renewals, WCC had all renewals,
LCC had all renewals and no new courses. HawCC approved 4 courses, which are 3 instructor-
based and 1 course-based. Ickes asked if the UHM syllabi could be posted somewhere so
others can use them as resources to develop more HAP courses. UHM would need to get
permission from the instructors to share them; however, if syllabi are available online on the
department websites of the instructors, a link to the various syllabi could be provided.

Review and discuss the draft revised Explanatory Notes
UHM’s HAP Board proposed revisions to the explanatory notes that incorporated the changes
from the Fall 2018 systemwide meeting and additional changes that UHM’s HAP Board made in
Spring 2019 to further clarify how “Asian” is interpreted in the HAP Hallmarks. These changes
are in two Google documents, V1 (marked up version) and V2 (clean version). The revised
explanatory notes are proposing two substantial changes: (1) interpreting “Asian” be more
inclusive allowing for non-indigenous Asian perspectives, (2) replacing the use of “indigenous”
with “Hawaiians, Asians, and Pacific Islanders” to account for the proposed inclusive
interpretation of “Asian” and because indigenous is implied by the use of Hawaiians and could
be implied by the use of Pacific Islanders. UHM’s HAP is advocating for a more broad
interpretation of “A” because they often struggle to see proposals that include an “indigenous”
Asian perspective and often see the comparative “Asian” be more from the perspectives of first
generation Asians and Asian Americans. They have also received feedback from faculty that
indigenous voices may not be in the scholarly record of their disciplines.

The board discussed the proposed inclusive “Asian”, the original HAP intent of “Asian”, and
concerns that the changes could jeopardize the integrity of HAP. Alapaki shared that the
original intent was to provide the opportunities for students to learn the connections Hawaiians
and Pacific islanders share with Austronesians who migrated across the Pacific and the
commonalities shared, such as in origins, canoe plants, and religion. Shim and Saffery shared
that Hallmark 1 asks for intersection of Asian cultures, and as such, can be interpreted to allow
for a broader interpretation of “Asian” but that Hallmark 2 reminds us that we also need to
include indigenous voices. Ickes shared that the goal of HAP is that when students graduate,
they graduate with the worldview HAP courses provide that are not often present in the
dominate mainstream narratives, and that it is important for the group to ensure that HAP maintains that goal, to not put holes in it by moving too far.

The board decided to not make a decision on the proposed explanatory notes and changes until other campus boards had a chance to review and weigh in. The group decided to include a footnote to clarify the use of “Pacific Islanders” that says, “Indigenous to Micronesia, Polynesia and Melanesia and Pacific diaspora.”

ACTION: BOARD MEMBERS - Share the proposed explanatory notes with your campus boards for review and feedback. Share V2 (the clean version), V1 (marked up version to show changes), and the explanation and discussion on these changes provided in this meeting summary.
ACTION: SHIM - Add footnote to clarify the use of “Pacific Islanders”

Support from System Office
With the departure of Susan Nishida in Fall 2018 and the vacant system positions filled by Debbie Halbert and Kristle Carter, members gave feedback on how the system can better support the group to provide continuity that Nishida did for years. Shim asked that the system continue to write the meeting summaries and schedule future meetings that Nishida did in the past. Some concerns were raised that the board needs to meet more regularly to accomplish work and was open to meeting at other campuses and/or meeting online. Another concern raised was to revisit the terms of the chair and whether the chair can be a campus board member rather than a campus board chair. The committee will need to review the charge.

Election of 2019-20 Chair & 2019-20 Vice Chair
Kalawaia Moore will serve as Vice Chair for 2019-20. Betty Ickes will serve as Chair for 2019-20.

Other items
Beaule from UHM’s GEO shared that the office is compiling teaching and learning resources for HAP and other GenEd designations that will be made available online to instructors to help them develop HAP courses and to students to help them reinforce HAP learning. She asked the board to help by sharing any teaching and learning resources they would like to add. Beaule also shared that she was unable to get, after following up numerous times, any of the assessment data from UHM’s HAP SALG pilot assessment project.

Direct and Indirect assessment discussion with guest Monica Stitt-Bergh
Monica Stitt-Bergh facilitated a discussion with the board on assessment directions and possibilities for HAP at the system level. Keahiahi Long, UHM HAP board member and librarian at Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies joined the meeting because at the last meeting, the board was interested in exploring the idea of a systemwide assessment pilot for a HAP course taught at all campuses that is articulated, such as HWST 107.

Stitt-Bergh shared that at the national level, the spectrum of assessment is very broad with much variety. Some focus on assessing student learning overtime using a portfolio for example, while others are using only survey data for self-reporting. Stitt-Bergh then shared her
philosophy of assessment is that it should benefit the students by demonstrating what they learned, and that it should benefit the faculty to help them learn about themselves as teachers and the learning of their students. Assessment should have value beyond grading and be a tool that can be used as evidence to demonstrate to other stakeholders. Assessment should also have a purpose and can vary depending on the resources and time available.

Stitt-Bergh shared a number of ways in which assessment can help inform the systemwide board on the HAP Focus designation. For example, assessment can be used to demonstrate what students can and cannot do with the student learning outcomes, assessment can help us understand if our current policies such as the hallmarks are resulting in the kind of learning we expect in the classroom, and assessment can help us determine the kinds of teaching resources to develop to support course development. Stitt-Bergh also shared different ways we can do assessment, such as analyzing syllabi and student work.

Board members shared some of their ideas around assessment, such as looking to see that students have developed a critical awareness and understand the background of HAP related issues, thinking about what our expectations should be when instructors answer assessment-related renewal questions, and pulling relevant assessment data from course assignments. Stitt-Bergh suggested that one approach is to view assessment as professional development. Reach out to faculty to ask them to give examples of excellent and weak student work to learn what the assignments tell about the hallmarks from the perspectives of students and faculty, and how that correlates with the HAP board perspectives. Another approach is to use the proposal form as a teaching tool explaining to faculty what HAP areas students are weak in and ask them to write or check box what they are doing in those areas to improve student learning.

Stitt-Bergh asked the board what kinds of assessment would be most effective and useful to get started with, such as gather sample assignments, evaluate how hallmarks are working for students and faculty, evaluate student learning on SLOs, improve proposal forms to better explain assessment, review relevant information from course evaluations, develop teaching resources such as signature assignments and rubrics, assess the learning and proficiency of students as it relates to transfer, and use faculty syllabi and assignments to review hallmarks.

Stitt-Bergh asked the board what role the systemwide group wants to have in assessment and how involved they want to be. Some members expressed that they don’t want to dictate assessment at the campus level, but instead, ask the campus boards what works for them and what they want to do.

ACTION: BOARD MEMBERS - Get feedback from campus boards on what kinds of assessment would be appropriate for the system to undertake.

Next meeting TBD.

HAP website: [http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/aa/aapp/HAP.html](http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/aa/aapp/HAP.html)