MINUTES

BOARD OF REGENTS’ MEETING

JANUARY 28, 2016

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Randy Moore called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. on Thursday, January 28, 2016, at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Campus Center Ballroom, 2465 Campus Road, Honolulu, HI 96822.

Quorum (15): Chair Randy Moore; Vice Chair Eugene Bal; Vice Chair Jan Sullivan; Regent Simeon Acoba; Regent Wayne Higaki; Regent David Iha; Regent Ben Kudo; Regent Coralie Matayoshi; Regent Michael McEnerney; Regent Barry Mizuno; Regent Randy Moore; Regent Jeff Portnoy; Regent Lee Putnam; Regent Michelle Tagorda; Regent Ernie Wilson; and Regent Stanford Yuen.

Others in Attendance: President David Lassner; Vice President for Academic Affairs, Risa Dickson; Vice President for Administration, Jan Gouveia; Vice President for Community Colleges John Morton; Vice President for Legal Affairs and University General Counsel, Carrie Okinaga; Vice President for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer, Kalbert Young; Vice President for Information Technology & Chief Information Officer, Garret Yoshimi; Interim UH Mānoa (UHM) Chancellor, Robert Bley-Vroman; UH Hilo (UHH) Chancellor, Don Straney; UH-West O‘ahu (UHWO) Interim Chancellor, Doris Ching; Leeward Community College (LeeCC) Chancellor, Manuel Cabral; Honolulu Community College (HonCC) Chancellor, Erika Lacro; Kapi‘olani Community College (KCC) Chancellor, Leon Richards; Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board of Regents, Cynthia Quinn; and others as noted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 19, 2015 REGULAR BOARD MEETING AND DECEMBER 9, 2015 SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Regent Mizuno moved to approve the minutes of November 19, 2015 regular board meeting and December 9, 2015 special meeting. Regent Kudo seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Executive Administrator and Secretary to the Board of Regents, Cynthia Quinn announced that written testimony from four individuals and late written testimony from nine individuals had been received and distributed to the board regarding the status of design and implementation plan for System and UHM Mānoa organizational changes and consolidations and the UH Cancer Center (the Center).

The following individuals provided oral testimony:
1. Michael Angelo, Chair of the Committee on Administration & Budget for UHM, summarized his written testimony opposing the proposed reorganization of the Office of the VP for Research & Innovation (OVPRI).

2. Dr. Charles Miller, member of the Hawai’i Society of Clinical Oncology Board of Directors and Hawai’i state representative to the American Society of Clinical Oncology, testified in support of the Center, and the importance of maintaining its National Cancer Institution (NCI) designation.

3. Bob Cooney, UHM Faculty Senate Executive Committee (UHMFSEC) Chair, summarized four resolutions recently passed by the UHMFSEC adopting foundation of quantitative reasoning general education core requirements hallmarks; opposing the proposed re-organization of the Office of the OVPRI; halting the use of academic analytics; and issuing a lack of confidence statement regarding Reed Dasenbrock as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of UHM; and a letter signed by the UHMFSEC requesting the board initiate an external investigation on administration’s handling of an alleged conflict of interest of the former Center director.

4. Marguerite Butler summarized her written testimony regarding insufficient faculty consultation on governance and requesting UHM Faculty Senate leaders be included as advisors or contributors for the proposed task group to investigate the evolution of governance.

5. Unhee Lim testified in opposition to the Center’s financial plans and in support of a new Center director, streamlining operations, regaining financial sustainability, and maintaining research excellence, and compliance with the 2011 National Institutes of Health financial disclosure regulations.

6. Stuart Donachie, Chair of the UHM Department of Microbiology, summarized his written testimony for shared governance and faculty consultation on program needs regarding the renovation or replacement of Snyder Hall.

7. Sladjana Prišić, Assistant Professor at UHM Department of Microbiology, testified about the impact the Snyder Hall renovation delay on her ability to do quality tuberculosis research and qualify for tenure.

8. Diane Ono summarized her written testimony regarding the importance of continued support for the Center and the life saving treatment her daughter received at the Center.

9. Lilikalā K. Kameʻeleihiwa testified about the importance of academic freedom and shared governance; in opposition to the proposed UH System and UHM organizational changes and consolidations; the need for a strong UHM chancellor and immediate search to include faculty representation from the Kuali‘i Council; and the need for a Vice Chancellor for Finance position and Vice Chancellor for Research and a Human Resources department.

10. Juanita Liu, Professor Emerita at UHM School of Travel Industry Management, summarized her written testimony proposing separate Chief Executive Officers and governing boards for community colleges and baccalaureate universities.

11. Adrian Franke testified about the importance of proper management at the Center to ensure future success.
12. James Douglas testified about the importance of reinstating the Snyder Hall renovation, the impact of the deteriorating building on the quality of educational experience of students, research endeavors, and ability to recruit top faculty.

The following individual signed up to give oral testimony but did not testify: Scott Kuwada.

IV. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

President Lassner reported on the following news and activities of the month:

1. Regarding the legislative budget request, the board requested $16.2 million in new general funds and 76 positions, and the Governor supported $9.8 million and 59 positions. The Governor also supported $4 million for the Center; the entire research & innovation initiative; funding for the evolution of UHWO; equipment for the community colleges; and positions at the College of Tropical Agriculture & Human Resources added by the Legislature last year and were not part of the university’s budget request. Regarding CIP, the university requested $185 million in general obligation bond projects and the Governor supported $72.5 million, of which $60 million was for general capital renewal and deferred maintenance, which is not enough to keep up with annual requirements. If the Legislature funds the Governor’s request, the deferred maintenance backlog will increase over next year.

2. Regarding bills submitted as part of the Governor’s package, he noted that other entities submitted bills related to UH, and some will be supported so long as the board’s priorities are not displaced. Administration will discuss any legislation impacting the board with regents before the university takes a position.

3. Regarding the Atherton YMCA on University Avenue, Honolulu, there is a signed non-binding letter of intent between UH and UH Foundation (UHF). Perspectives have changed over time, and work continues regarding a proper lease relationship between UH and UHF.

4. Regarding an integrated academic & facilities plan, discussions have taken place between the VP for Academic Affairs and the chancellors, and discussions will continue with the All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC). The different unit missions are being taken into account to create a framework of collaboration, connection, and purposefulness. Leadership is addressing how to collectively meet the higher education needs of the entire state and unique communities served on each island without inappropriate overlap and redundancy. The missions of each unit, the range of academic programs, and appropriate placement of programs will be collaboratively reviewed. The goal is to articulate a framework in which academic program and facilities decisions can be made, and include current initiatives anticipated community needs in the 21st century, and how the university can best achieve those needs.

5. Regarding Title IX and the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) initiatives, with the $1.1 million legislative appropriation the university established a systemwide Office of Institutional Equity with a director and three staff responsible for
overseeing the university’s Title IX and VAWA efforts for all 10 campuses. Policy initiatives started, a new interim policy was implemented, and an initial training program was held at the UHM Campus Center.

6. Regarding the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) project. The Supreme Court asked the lower court to issue guidance to the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR). Guidance has not yet been issued, and the Attorney General and BLNR will determine what the next steps in the process are.

7. Regarding enrollment status, across the UH system the number of students filling out the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and PELL grants has increased. Despite Congress’ efforts to simplify the extremely onerous form, it has not yet realized the dream of a postcard FAFSA. In the meantime, UH deployed teams to help students complete the FAFSA, over the past 10 days through this weekend, at various public schools on all islands. There is a group primarily focused on enrolling Native Hawaiian students, with visits on Lāna‘i, Moloka‘i and Hāna to encourage greater enrollment from some of the most underserved communities.

In light of testimony received from UHMFSEC regarding their concerns over the lack of shared governance and consultation, President Lassner was asked about his relationship with the UHMFSEC, if appropriate information was being provided, and if appropriate interaction is taking place. President Lassner explained that there is a general set of activities that involve consultation between UHM administration and faculty. He primarily engages with the ACCFSC or its leadership for system issues, which meets periodically throughout the year. Recently, several meetings were held with the UHMFSEC, including one on January 18 to get feedback on the proposed UHM-System reorganization. He indicated the concern relates to expectations regarding the method and timing of consultation on the proposed reorganization being presented today, despite the hours spent consulting with them in the past few weeks before finalizing the presentation and any final proposal being formally consulted on. The Research Compliance Task Force recommended the OVPRI reorganization, and the proposal was publicly discussed last fall with the board and others. The UHMFS Committee on Research supported the formal proposal and the UHMFS Committee on Administration & Budget opposed it, and the UHMFS took the formal position of opposing the proposed reorganization. There can be disagreement during the consultation process, and the harder the issue, the less likely there will be universal agreement. For reorganizations that require board approval, he will fully inform the board on the positions and bring forth his best recommendation to the board.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Report from the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs

Academic & Student Affairs Chair Putnam summarized the committee report attached to these minutes (Attachment 1). No additional comments or questions from the board were raised.
B. Report from the Committee on Personnel Affairs

Personnel Affairs Chair Matayoshi summarized the committee report attached to these minutes (Attachment 2). No additional comments or questions from the board were raised.

C. Report from the Committee on Independent Audit

Independent Audit Chair Yuen reported the Committee on Independent Audit held a meeting on January 27, 2016. The committee supports the Center, and the status of the Center business plan is on today’s agenda for discussion. No additional comments or questions from the board were raised.

VI. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION & APPROVAL

A. For Approval

1. By Consent Agenda
   a. University of Hawai‘i System: Request to Approve Revisions to RP 5.201 Instructional Programs

   There being no objections to taking up the revisions to RP 5.201 Instructional Programs by consent, Regent Putnam moved to approve the consent agenda, Regent Tagorda seconded the motion, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

2. University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa: Request to Approve Donor Recognition Naming Opportunities for the Future William S. Richardson School of Law (WSRSL) Clinical Building

   Chancellor Bley-Vroman indicated that the law school is requesting approval of naming opportunities in the future clinical building. President Lassner explained this procedure is routine for new projects. UHF conducts a benchmark survey of comparable facilities around the country, considers the university’s other offerings, and provides a recommended schedule of sponsorship. This practice is not in place for all existing buildings, but will be done moving forward. Recent examples are Hawai‘i Community College - Palamanui, and the Information Technology Building at UHM.

   Regent Wilson moved for approval of naming opportunities for the future WSRSL Clinical Building, Regent Portnoy seconded the motion, and the motion carried upon unanimous vote.

3. Request to Approve the Establishment of the Endowed Professorship in the Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Women’s Health at the John A. Burns School of Medicine (JABSOM)

   Jerris Hedges, Dean of the John A. Burns School of Medicine, explained that the medical school has a faculty practice group called the University Health Partners
(formerly known as the University Clinical, Education & Research Associate), and the Ob-Gyn Department is one of the most active departments and the most integrated in the community. The physicians have elected to utilize a component of their annual earnings and towards an endowment to support the recruitment of a professor.

Regent Portnoy moved to approve the establishment of the endowed professorship in the Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology & Women’s Health at JABSOM, Vice Chair Sullivan seconded the motion, and the motion carried upon unanimous vote.

4. **Appointment of Task Group to Investigate the Evolution of Governance with Representatives of the Regents Emeriti, and Make Recommendations to the Board**

Chair Moore explained that this matter originated with Duane Kurisu, Chair of the Association of Emeritus Regents (AER). Former regents feel the current regents would benefit from their perspective on best practices. His recommendation is to appoint a task group whose charge is to meet with a group of emeriti regents and come back to the board with suggestions to improve board operations. He indicated this generous offer of support from the former regents was much appreciated. Board Bylaws state that task groups are appointed by the board with a specific charge and members. The proposed members are Regent Wilson (chair), Regent Kudo, Regent Acoba, Regent Sullivan, and Regent Putnam.

Regent Wilson moved for approval of the appointment of a Task Group to Investigate the Evolution of Governance, Vice Chair Sullivan seconded the motion, and there being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

B. **For Information Only**

1. **University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa: Status of the Cancer Center Business Plan**

Chair Moore noted that the Committee on Independent Audit met yesterday afternoon and suggested the matter be deferred for more committee work. For the benefit of those who were unable to attend the meeting, he summarized what occurred at the committee meeting. The committee received written comments from 12 individuals, and oral testimony from 22 individuals. Public comments were generally supportive of the Center and retaining the NCI designation. President Lassner explained that the university did not request a legislative appropriation for the Center during the 2015 Legislative Session because it was unclear whether or not legislative support would keep the Center solvent. The recent $5 million request to the Legislature was made because he was satisfied that the Center’s interim director had identified a plan of success for the Center. Regents expressed disappointment that the consultant’s reported dated October 16, 2015 was not furnished to the committee earlier than last week and administration explained the rationale for not releasing the report earlier. Time was spent discussing the proposed business plan going forward and the consultant’s reports. As a follow-up, the committee voted 3 in favor, 2 opposed, to
request the board appoint a task group to review the plan and the report with administration and independent reviewers to get a perspective that some regents felt was more objective. Because the appointment of a task group is not on the agenda today, it will be done at the February board meeting. Since the proposed plan and report was not discussed, there was general agreement that regents would submit questions to Secretary Quinn for distribution to administration, with answers provided at the next meeting of the Committee on Independent Audit.

He recommended this matter be deferred because it needs to go back to the Committee on Independent Audit for full discussion. There were no objections.

At 10:24 a.m. the board recessed. The board reconvened at 10:32 a.m.

2. Discussion on Process for Setting a New Tuition Schedule

VP Dickson explained how a decision on the new tuition schedule will need to be made, including the length of the schedule. She provided a powerpoint presentation to orient the board on the tuition setting process and guiding principles and data.

She noted that Hawai’i does not have a state-funded financial aid program like most states often do, and any state-funded financial aid students receive, with the exception of the $3 million UH receives for B+ Scholarships, comes from tuition revenue. The executive policy sets the minimum levels for financial aid, although many are higher.

She explained that value of higher education in the U.S., and indicated that data shows people with a higher education degree or certificate make more money, tend to be healthier and more productive, make better decisions, improve their lives, tend to live out of the poverty level, tend to be more engaged in the community, volunteer more, pay higher taxes, make better decisions and are more involved in their children’s education, and vote. Data supports the public and private good for education and why the state should fund higher education, and also why individuals would want to pay for higher education.

Questions, concerns and comments were raised regarding whether other states fund debt service and fringe benefits like Hawai’i; if the extra contribution for state-funded health benefits were included in the numbers; a verbal explanation and summary of the difference between the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Peer Group and Benchmark Group; what was included in annual expenditures; whether there were line/lines in the financial statement used to generate the expenditures or was it separately generated off information that is not part of the financial statements the board receives; if the data is compiled consistently every year; the reason for the large spike in annual expenditures at UHH in 2009; the amount of student input that has taken place on the proposed tuition schedule and the plan for student involvement going forward; the need to put together a summary of the proposed tuition schedule that is easily understood and clearly communicated; what were the assumptions on ratios of tuition to state funding going forward; what the university thinks is an appropriate
amount of student financial assistance; whether the tuition proposal will include numbers associated with each recommendation (e.g., UHM, UHH/UHWO, and the community colleges); and whether the projections included any potential increase in student athletic fees.

VP Dickson agreed to confirm whether the data for other states included debt service and fringe benefits. UHM Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Reed Dasenbrock explained that the UHM had a remarkably stronger portfolio than the other peer institutions (e.g., Colorado State University, Mississippi State University, Oregon State University, University of Arizona, University of Illinois at Chicago, University of Kentucky, University of New Mexico, University of South Florida, University of Utah), and benchmark institutions were largely aspirational with similar research portfolios, but considerably more selective than UHM (e.g., University of California-Davis, University of California-Irvine, University of California-San Diego, University of Colorado, University of Iowa, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of Pittsburgh, University of Tennessee, University of Washington). Director of Institutional Research & Analysis Pearl Iboshi explained that about 30-40 institutions contribute data to IPEDS, which is an automated process that allows self-selection of peer institutions based on variables such as size and Carnegie Classification. She added that many of the members of the UHM Benchmark and UHM Peer groups are also in IPEDS. Administration agreed to furnish a written summary of the differences between the three types of groups. Benchmark groups were not included for UHH, UHWO and the Community Colleges.

Administration clarified that expenditures data are instructionally-related expenditures that the institution was spending and do not include cost of living. VP Young explained that the numbers in the presentation were developed independently, and not drawn from the financial statements. The data is based on individual program budgets for each campus and what the individual departments spend, which at best relates to the spending plan budget that the regents approve as the amount allocated at the campus level. The campuses then allocate funds to the individual programs, and that expenditure comprises the data. They trust the accuracy of the individual programs compiling the data.

Chancellor Straney explained the large spike in annual expenditures at UHH in 2009 was due to the School of Pharmacy costs for faculty, equipment and instruction that slowly decreased as students graduated. He noted that none in the peer group bear expensive programs such as School of Pharmacy or College of Agriculture. Costs are coded expenditures determined by the budget office, aggregated by object code, category and fund, and reported to IPEDS, as defined by Governmental Accounting Standards Board rules.

Regarding student input, VP Dickson explained that meetings have been held with the Student Caucus, which is comprised of the heads of student governments from all 10 campuses, and after the tuition schedule proposal is drafted, campus and community meetings will be held on every campus in March and April. Feedback will be reviewed and revisions made. Meetings will also be held with the All Campus Council of Faculty
Senate Chairs. VP Dickson agreed to develop a simplified summary of the tuition proposal that helps the public and various constituencies better understand the process and the interface with UH goals and needs.

Regarding assumptions of ratios going forward, VP Dickson explained that the assumption is that UH will be in line with what other institutions are doing. President Lassner explained how peer tuition is reported because the university wants to determine if they are becoming anomalous from a public policy perspective or from a competitive position. Hawai‘i had a policy through the 1990s of extraordinarily low tuition, which has increased as state appropriations decreased. When the economy was difficult during 2008 to 2013, the ratios for almost every state in the country changed substantially due to decrease in state appropriations per capita and subsequent increase in tuition to support the cost of education. Receiving additional state funding would put the university in a position to potentially consider lowering tuition or increasing financial aid. The percent of education paid by the student varies by campus, and tuition at research universities generally covers more of the cost of education than community colleges. This is a general statement of public policy that most states look at for public higher education, but numbers vary by state.

Regarding the appropriate amount of student financial assistance, President Lassner explained that EP 6.204 sets a 10% minimum for UHM, and UHM currently provides a total of 27%, half of which is needs-based. Administration chose to maintain the commitment to need-based aid as a percentage basis so that when tuition increases, need-based aid must continue at the same percentage.

Each tuition recommendation will include specific numbers, and if not approved, the tuition schedule will remain at the FY17 levels until changed by the board. Increases in fees such as athletics are reflected as part of the cost of attendance and not reflected in tuition. If the board opted to reduce tuition, the consequence would be reflected in a decreased operating budget, or, if done in an emergency situation, reductions within the units.

Regarding any potential increase in student athletic fees being included in calculations, VP Dickson explained that she is focused on tuition and any potential increase in fees would be part of the cost of attendance.

Vice Chair Sullivan noted her concern about the approach using historical and peer data as outdated when setting a revenue source. She noted that the data shows that UH had been following board policy that states that “every qualified Hawai‘i resident shall have an opportunity to pursue postsecondary education within the university system. Since tuition and mandatory fees are critical to access, they shall not be so uniformly high that they prevent qualified residents from attending a campus of the university.” As of 2014, 85% of students are residents. The UC system in California has the exact opposite trend, and what they have done with their tuition schedule has resulted in residents going to school elsewhere because it is less expensive than attending the public campuses.
However, 54% of local high school students go to college and the rest do not. The mission of the Hawai‘i Graduation Initiative (HGI) is to capture more of that population into the university system. She had reviewed the Student Costs of Living, Tuition & Debt at the University of Hawai‘i study done in May 2014 by the Hawai‘i Educational Policy Center (HEPC) which mentioned a 2012 survey where the top five reasons for UHM students dropping out were all related to costs (e.g., tuition & fees not affordable, needed to earn money, encountered unexpected expenses, received inadequate financial aid, cost of living too high). This affects retention, which is another issue because it is not clear how that will be impacted. The study mentioned a survey conducted by Eduventures which found that when the resident tuition price point goes beyond $9,000, there will start to be significant declines in enrollment. UH tuition is currently well beyond $9,000, and enrollment has been declining this year, although we do not know if that is due to tuition or other things. The concept that tuition can keep increasing every year is not necessarily well thought through. When an enrollment assumption is made in the tuition proposal, it cannot assume a straight line enrollment that continues with no impact. She noted lack of assumptions on general funds and expenses, and reduction of expenses to justify what is going to be done to increase revenue, and what would be done with any additional revenue. Regarding the current IPEDS data, it is unclear why the cost per FTE student increased significantly for UHM from 2011 to 2014, and whether the situation is stabilized or will decrease. Lastly, the model of getting more revenue to increase more financial aid may be sensible now, but at what point does that stop being cost effective and sensible. She hoped there would be good discussion on tuition because it will be one of the most important decisions the board makes during its tenure, and requires good information.

Regent Tagorda recounted her experience as an undergraduate student, the hardships of paying increased tuition, and how financial aid and scholarships helped her succeed. She related how undergraduate students have expressed concern to her that they do not want to get priced out of being able to enroll at UH. In order to have confidence in any tuition proposal, including a financial allocation in the areas of academic support for advising, and increasing access and completion would be helpful. The board requested an analysis of the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) tuition paid in other states.

Additional questions, concerns and comments were raised regarding how to establish tuition without knowing the level of legislative support; the need for any multiple year tuition schedule to also include multiple year costs assumptions; the reason why annual expenditures per completion and FTE at UHM was 40% higher than peers and substantially higher than the IPEDS group.

President Lassner concurred with concerns about the uncertainty regarding legislative funding and indicated that administration will include explicit assumptions about general fund appropriations in the proposal. He noted that if they based the decision based on the general fund appropriation, then tuition would change every year, which would create gross unpredictability for students. General fund appropriations are
not highly predictable, particularly if the state’s economy is impacted by outside events such as a recession or sequestration and how the Legislature appropriates additional funds for a specific purpose. The timeline begins with the public conversations in February, with the final tuition schedule proposal being brought to the board in June, after the end of the legislative session. Administration will only proceed with meetings when the board is comfortable with the proposal. If administration goes with a multi-year schedule, there will always be an element of uncertainty but gives students an idea of what to expect. He added that UH no longer has the luxury of returning to being one of the lowest tuitions in the country. He clarified that the university’s philosophy was not to increase tuition so financial aid could be increased, but rather if state appropriations fall and tuition has to be increased, financial aid also needs to be increased so the university is not unduly hurting those individuals who are most financially challenged to obtain access, which is a priority.

Regarding the reasons why UHM was higher than peers and IPEDs group, UHM administration will provide data that explains peers and benchmarks calculations.

3. Status of Design and Implementation Plan for System and UH Mānoa Organizational Changes and Consolidations to Improve the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Support Services

President Lassner provided an update on the progress of the organizational changes of the System and UHM units. He recounted the history of board actions regarding the separation of the UH President and UHM Chancellor positions, 2015 WICHE report recommendations, and range of organizational approaches, and the areas of focus, key relevant principles & commitments, the hybrid approach, plan of action for reorganization of research compliance, government relations, communications, facilities & construction, and human resources units priorities, and next steps. The plan will be used to develop formal reorganization proposals that under the board of regents’ guidelines must be fully consulted through shared governance processes.

Comments, questions, concerns and comments were raised regarding the need to look at all areas more broadly and take into account the priorities of the entire system and Hawai‘i; whether separating the community colleges from the baccalaureate universities had been looked at; developing a mechanism to break deadlines in collaborative management models; providing a financial impact pro forma of the reorganization to show impact on the operating budget; and status of the UHM chancellor search.

Regarding separating the community college and baccalaureate universities, President Lassner explained that as a system UH has been able to do things to academically serve students across the state unmatched by other states. UH is able to work together collaboratively to help provide opportunities for students to move within the UH system (e.g., student information systems and policies). He noted that in testimony on the HMFSEC resolution regarding adopting foundation of quantitative reasoning general education core requirements hallmarks recognized the value of
working together because it would help drive mobility of students from community colleges. Dual-enrollment programs and pathways with direct articulation do not exist at other universities with separate systems. UH is much more agile in performing as a system, and leveraging the capabilities of the system is one of the four strategic directions. UH has reduced operational, administrative costs that other systems are still exploring or not able to be done in states with multiple systems (e.g., Texas, California). UH has one set of systems (e.g., HR, IT, Financial, Student, and Research Administration), which provides significant cost savings. There would absolutely be increased costs associated with separating the two systems. There was real fear among UHM faculty when talking about collapsing the president and UHM chancellor positions. UHM faculty was behind the drive to separate those positions and did not feel the president in a dual position could sufficiently advocate for UHM. The same concern could have arisen from other parts of the system, and would likely arise over time if the two positions were to be collapsed and be viewed as unfavorable to the other campuses. Having separate boards means that instead one board looking out for public higher education in the state it would be left to the Legislature because each board would provide competing proposals. Another common structure for some universities is to have a coordinating board above the other boards, which adds a layer between the board and the Governor/Legislature that creates another set of agendas.

Regarding final impact of reorganization, President Lassner explained that any financial savings would be identified, but noted key areas may be understaffed, requiring reassignment to implement efficiencies to better deliver in those areas. He noted how this is a sensitive matter that requires union consultation and a more gradual process than in the private sector. As vacancies or attrition occur, positions can be reallocated to higher priority areas, which helps expand the span of control. He gave an example of when VP Gouveia reassigned positions in communications to other higher priority areas (e.g., sustainability, CIP program).

Regarding the UHM chancellor search, President Lassner explained that there was some confusion among attendees about what was decided at the November board meeting. Even though he believes he had the authority to start the search, he did not think all the regents were comfortable with that so he did not feel it was in his best interest or the search’s best interest to start. Based on the actions taken, he has the authority to start the search, but would like the regents to be more comfortable. The search cannot succeed if the regents do not believe it should have started. After this meeting he hopes to form the search committee and proceed expeditiously with the search. There were no objections from the board to President Lassner commencing with the search.

Chair Moore called for a recess to break for lunch and a motion for executive session, and announced that the board planned to reconvene at approximately 2:00 p.m.

VII. EXECUTIVE SESSION
Upon motion by Regent Matayoshi, seconded by Regent Wilson, the Board unanimously approved convening in executive session, pursuant to HRS §92-5(a)(2) to discuss personnel matters. The Board convened in executive session at 12:36 p.m. Following a motion to come out of executive session by Regent Wilson, seconded by Regent Matayoshi, which was unanimously approved, executive session was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 1:50 p.m. Chair Moore stated that the board went into executive session to discuss personnel matters as indicated on the agenda.

X. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL (continued)

A. Personnel Actions (A-1 for approval)

Regent Putnam moved to approve the personnel actions on Attachment A-1. Regent Yuen seconded the motion.

Regent Acoba indicated he would be voting against the appointment of the Interim Associate Dean of the College of Natural Sciences at UHM. This is not a reflection of the selectee or individuals involved in the selection process, but his belief that there should be extraordinary justification for salaries exceeding the maximum approved range.

The motion having been moved and seconded, it was put to a vote and passed unanimously with the exception of Regent Acoba who voted no.

XI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Moore announced that the next board meeting is February 25, 2016 at the University of Hawai’i at Hilo.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Regent Sullivan moved and Regent Matayoshi seconded the motion, and with unanimous approval, the meeting was adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

/S/

Cynthia Quinn
Executive Administrator and
Secretary of the Board of Regents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Follow Up/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. STAR Update** | A demonstration of guided pathway registration through the STAR system was presented. This spring Honolulu Community College will register all fall semester 2016 incoming first year students, approximately 5000. By spring of 2017, all students systemwide are expected to be registering through STAR. More work to be done:  
• Building optimal course sequencing for degree completion  
• scheduling classes to maximize student velocity,  
• training faculty, staff, students.  
Expected outcomes: 1. promoting the strategic graduation initiative, 2. increased efficiency in use of resources (faculty and facilities), registration process, and academic advising shifting from course selection to career counseling. | By spring of 2017, all students systemwide are expected to be registering through STAR. |
| **2. Committee Discussion on Scope of Report on the Impact of Campuses Upon the Workforce in the State of Hawai‘i and how Campuses are Addressing the Dynamic Employment Needs and Demands of the State** | Committee members identified topics for a March briefing on how the University is addressing needs of the workforce in Hawaii, among them:  
• How do campuses assess and assist student needs, interest, career goals, planning  
• Where is the system falling short in numbers of graduates, programs for specific jobs or careers, student interest, Where are UH graduates employed (in/out migration; are graduates employed in their fields of study)  
• data on graduates eg. employment, in/out migration, in fields of study  
• data on employers eg. needs, satisfaction of UH graduate quality and preparedness  
• consideration of liberal arts graduates as well as those in professional and technical fields.  
• mechanisms or processes for a coordinated systemwide approach to planning for program actions and enrollment management | |
| **1. Request to Approve Revisions to RP 5.201 Instructional Programs** | The Committee reviewed revisions to RP 5.201 Instructional Programs, extending the length of time in provisional status for certificate and associate degrees from 150% time to 200% in order to have sufficient time to collect data for an appropriate program review. | recommend approval |
## Committee on personnel affairs

**Summary of meeting**

January 14, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Follow Up/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** Update on UHM faculty workload and post-tenure review processes – for information | a) All colleges have workload policies and half of the 14 have current written course equivalencies. The other half will begin working on them this fall. Workloads are reviewed annually or by semester. The committee suggested considering using empirical data such as a point system to measure equivalencies.  
  
b) The publicly-available information on individual faculty members varies by department that includes at least a brief bio. Some colleges include areas of research, selected publications, links to CVs, courses teaching, the course syllabus, and individual faculty websites. UHM admin will work with deans to encourage minimal info on CV and courses taught are updated regularly and made public for transparency.  
  
c) Faculty review is a collegial peer review process negotiated with UHPA and conducted by the department chair who is a member of the faculty, not the administration. Only a negative evaluation is reported to the dean. Periodic reviews of faculty by faculty do not measure the quality of the work done by the faculty; deans assess the quality of research in determining the course equivalency for research, as well as teaching quality when determining course assignments on a semester or annual basis. Remediation is conducted with the dean, peers and the teaching center. Dismissals are not common, and involve either retrenchment or become personnel matters. The committee suggested considering a sliding scale incentive for performance reviews by awarding excellent performance with longer review periods than others who may not perform as well and need closer attention on a more frequent basis. | Admin will provide information on what other public universities do in these areas and continue working on standardizing the format of publicly-available information on individual faculty members. Admin will also provide a current chart by college and articulation of equivalencies. 7 colleges will start articulation of equivalencies in Fall 2016 |

| **2** Exec session | Appointment of interim associate dean of the college of natural sciences. | Recommended to the board this appointment |