

Hawaiian, Asian, & Pacific Issues Focus (HAP)  
 Multicampus Articulation  
 March 22, 2007, 1:15pm - 2:45pm  
 Meeting Notes

Present

Dennis Chun, KauCC

Ross Cordy, UHWO

Colette Higgins, KapCC

Liko Hoe, WinCC

Mikahala Helm, MauiCC

Kaleikoa Ka'eo, MauiCC

Momi Kamahale, LeeCC

Spencer Leineweber, UHM

Kalani Meinecke, WinCC

Linka Mullikin, WinCC

Jan Petersen, HonCC

Suzette Robinson, MauiCC

Jean Shibuya, WinCC

Monica Stitt-Bergh, UHM

Molly Summers, KauCC

**1. March 1, 2007 meeting notes**

No changes. Clarification requested on assessment and student learning outcomes. The group agreed that student learning outcomes would be collaboratively developed after the articulation agreement was approved.

**2. KapCC's implementation plan**

Higgins presented KapCC's draft implementation plan to enter the HAP agreement. The plan covered each item addressed in the 11/21/2006 memo to CCAO from UHM VCAA Neal Smatresk. Higgins pointed out that the plan does not yet address faculty training nor HAP course proposal review procedures. KapCC will allow blanket HAP approval for HWST 107 sections, using a master syllabus that meets the HAP Hallmarks.

Discussion

- a. HAP Board: at KapCC it's an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate; members include faculty representation of the range (H, A, and P), a student counselor/advisor, and an "outside" member (currently a physics professor).
- b. On smaller campuses, representation of H, A, and P will be difficult.

**3. Review of draft articulation agreement**

Consensus on the following changes and clarifications. See the revised articulation agreement draft (dated 3/28/2007).

- a. The systemwide committee should consist of the HAP Board chairs. (Item A1)
- b. Add definition of "approved HAP program"
- c. The provision of "adequate budget" can be demonstrated by stating that the campus is willing to offer the classes and currently has faculty or is willing to hire as needed. (Item A2.1e)
- d. The Explanatory Notes should be revisited and improved once the agreement is approved. (Item A2.2)
- e. Student learning outcomes will be collaboratively developed by the systemwide committee and then assessment can take place as required by WASC. Campuses will agree to accept the student learning outcomes and to participate in any revisions. Until SLOs are in place, a statement of intent to assess is needed. (Items A2.4, A3.3a, A3.3b)
- f. Faculty development activities should aim to help faculty understand and apply the HAP Hallmarks. Sharing of information among experienced and prospective HAP faculty will be useful, particularly in conveying strategies for integrating H with A and/or P. Examples, models, and face-to-face discussions are encouraged. (Item A2.5)

- g. The Chief Academic Officer and President of the Faculty Senate should send statements of the adequacy of campus support for the HAP program with the request to have an approved HAP program. (Item A3.1a)
  - h. After discussing the course proposal review process (item A3.2a), the group decided to make no change to the draft agreement. Discussion centered on whether curriculum committees need to be involved in the HAP decision. At KapCC and UHM, the curriculum committees are not involved; the HAP designation signals an emphasis and the course content is not significantly changed in most cases (e.g., HWST 107 underwent a content shift, but not enough for the course modification process that requires curriculum committee review). Individual campuses can decide whether the HAP Board is associated with the curriculum committee. HonCC will experience the greatest change because their current HAP courses do not all meet the Hallmarks stated in Appendix A.
4. Next steps
- a. Next meeting scheduled for April 12. *Update: Because polycom rooms are not available on 4/12, the meeting has been rescheduled for **Thursday, April 19, 2007.***
  - b. Transition plan needed

*Prepared by Monica Stitt-Bergh, recorder*