

## **MINUTES**

### **BOARD OF REGENTS COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 6, 2020**

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Ernest Wilson called the meeting to order at 12:48 p.m. on Thursday, February 6, 2020, at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Information Technology Building, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room 105A/B, 2520 Correa Road, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822.

Committee members in attendance: Chair Ernest Wilson Jr.; Regent Jan Sullivan; and Regent Michelle Tagorda.

Committee members excused: Vice-Chair Robert Westerman; Regent Alapaki Nahale-a.

Others in attendance: Board Chair Ben Kudo; Regent Simeon Acoba; Regent Eugene Bal; Regent Wayne Higaki; Regent Michael McEnerney; Regent Randy Moore (ex officio committee members); President David Lassner; Vice President (VP) for Community Colleges Erika Lacro; VP for Legal Affairs/University General Counsel Carrie Okinaga; VP for Academic Planning and Policy Donald Straney; UH-Mānoa (UHM) Provost Michael Bruno; UH-Hilo Chancellor Bonnie Irwin; UH-West O'ahu Chancellor Maenette Benham; Kapi'olani Community College (KapCC) Chancellor Louise Pagotto; Leeward Community College (LeeCC) Chancellor Carlos Peñaloza; Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board of Regents (Board Secretary) Kendra Oishi; and others as noted.

#### **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2019 MEETING**

Regent Sullivan moved to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2019 meeting, seconded by Regent Tagorda, and noting the excused absence of Vice-Chair Westerman and Regent Nahale-a, the motion carried, with all members present voting in the affirmative.

#### **III. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Board Secretary Oishi announced that the Board Office received no written testimony and no individuals had signed up to provide oral testimony.

#### **IV. AGENDA ITEMS**

VP Lacro provided an overview of the accrediting agency follow-up report for KapCC and LeeCC. She noted that both KapCC and LeeCC submitted a comprehensive Institutional Self Evaluation Report in August 2018 and that both campuses were visited by a peer review team in October of that same year. She reported that in January 2019, KapCC received accreditation for 18 months while LeeCC received accreditation for seven years. However, both KapCC and LeeCC were required to submit follow-up

reports no later than March 2, 2020, to address recommendations made by the peer review team. After the follow-up report is filed, another peer review team will conduct additional site visits of both campuses which is anticipated to take place in October of this year.

**A. Kapi'olani Community College Accreditation Follow-up Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)**

VP Lacro introduced KapCC Chancellor Louise Pagotto who highlighted that KapCC received four commendations from the ACCJC for practices for which the Commission believed the institution exceeded standards. However, she also noted that the ACCJC determined that KapCC must demonstrate compliance with certain Commission standards as identified in two recommendations made by the peer review team. The ACCJC recommended that KapCC regularly evaluate its institutional plans and governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes to ensure their effectiveness and that these evaluations be widely communicated across the institution. The ACCJC also recommended that KapCC analyze and document the results of learning outcomes assessment across all disciplines and programs and integrate this analysis and documentation into program review and institutional planning processes on a regular and consistent cycle. Chancellor Pagotto noted that steps taken by KapCC to address these issues and recommendations are stated in the follow-up report which has been provided to the committee and will be submitted to the ACCJC as required.

**B. Leeward Community College Accreditation Follow-up Report to the ACCJC**

VP Lacro introduced LeeCC Chancellor Carlos Peñaloza who highlighted that LeeCC received six commendations from the ACCJC for exemplary performance. However, he noted that ACCJC determined that LeeCC must demonstrate compliance with certain Commission standards as identified in one recommendation made by the peer review team. The ACCJC recommended that LeeCC establish a clear cycle to regularly evaluate and update its policies and procedures. Chancellor Peñaloza noted that steps taken by LeeCC to address this issue and recommendation are stated in the follow-up report which has been provided to the committee and will be submitted to the ACCJC as required.

Chair Kudo noted that the student conduct code was replaced by a system-wide conduct code and asked what the major changes were to the conduct code. VP Lacro responded that she did not recall the specific changes but could provide them to the committee. She remarked that the conduct code required updating as the previous conduct code was quite old and was last updated in the 1980s.

Regent Higaki left at 12:58 p.m.

Regent Acoba questioned whether Chancellor Peñaloza thought the evaluation and recommendation by the ACCJC was a fair assessment. Chancellor Peñaloza replied that the evaluations are very subjective and noted that LeeCC was already in the process of reviewing the issue which the peer review team felt needed to be addressed. VP Lacro added that depending on the individuals on any given ACCJC peer review

team, the evaluation of, and recommendation on, the same issue can vary tremendously.

Chair Wilson inquired as to whether the administration reviews all the findings and recommendations received from the various accrediting commissions for the each campus of the UH System to determine if actions may need to be taken on a system-wide level. President Lassner responded that the six community colleges are evaluated simultaneously by one accrediting agency which allows the VP for Community Colleges to collectively review all the evaluation reports and recommendations and would provide community colleges with the opportunity to determine if issues need to be addressed on a broader scale. However, the other campuses of the system are all evaluated at different times which would make a broad scale application of recommendations more difficult. He also noted that every peer review team is different and, depending on who is on the review team, the outcomes of evaluations can run the gamut. As such, the recommendations for any particular campus might not be particularly valuable to another campus. However, the evaluations and recommendations are seen by all campus administrations, which permits campuses to share their issues, and allows the system to work together to continuously improve.

### **C. Draft Academic Program Master Plan (Draft Master Plan)**

Prior to the presentation on the Draft Master Plan, Chair Wilson noted that Regent Tagorda disclosed that she is a faculty specialist with the Office of Public Health within the School of Social Work at UHM. Given the fact that the presentation to the committee is based on a Draft Master Plan, that any discussions by the committee on the Draft Master Plan will be very broad and taking place at a high level, that no decision will be made by the committee on the Draft Master Plan for the UH System as a whole, and that the Draft Master Plan is a high-level planning document, Board Chair Kudo and Chair Wilson have concurred that Regent Tagorda's participation in these discussions is appropriate. Chair Wilson asked if there were any concerns among committee members with allowing Regent Tagorda to participate in these discussions. There being no concerns expressed, Chair Wilson called upon VP Straney to begin his presentation.

VP Straney provided background information on the Draft Master Plan and presented a brief overview of the current status of the Draft Master Plan's development stating that it identifies academic programs already provided by the ten campuses of the UH System, as well as academic programs that will need to be provided to address both the current and long-term educational needs and challenges of the state. The Draft Master Plan is a key component of the Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan - a plan which identifies goals and guiding principles for managing academic programs across the UH System to avoid unnecessary duplication and offer programming that is best suited for each campus. He noted that the Draft Master Plan adopted a multi-year perspective in order to better align academics with planning for enrollment, facilities planning, and fiscal planning. The Draft Master Plan is also designed to use medium- and long-range approaches to the provision of education so that academic offerings can be proactively aligned to meet both existing and emerging educational needs while

remaining fluid and retaining the ability to adapt programs to meet ever-changing educational and workforce situations.

VP Straney discussed the process used in developing the Draft Master Plan, including guidelines and criteria used and program priorities that were considered. He remarked that, while academic program development occurs mainly at the campus and unit level, having a master academic plan will ensure that campus and unit plans are shared system-wide which will allow for better allocation and use of oftentimes limited resources. He noted that the Draft Master Plan is a dynamic document that is intended to be updated regularly and stated that the administration is currently working on revising various Executive and Regent Policies to allow for proper implementation of the Draft Master Plan.

Regent Tagorda asked whether the Draft Master Plan could show academic programs under consideration for review in addition to new academic programs being initiated. VP Straney replied that it was important to see the programs that were being discontinued as well as what was being initiated or being proposed and that some of the items from academic action reports were incorporated into the Draft Master Plan to allow for this to occur.

Board Chair Kudo asked whether information regarding the various programmatic and academic needs was gathered by collecting it on an individual basis prior to the development of the matrix contained in the Draft Master Plan. VP Straney responded in the affirmative.

Board Chair Kudo questioned whether there was a process the administration, or perhaps other universities, used to look at farther reaching educational and programmatic needs that will be faced in the future, longer than the six-year timeframe envisioned by the Draft Master Plan, perhaps even decades in the future. VP Straney replied that the Third Decade Project does this with a ten-year perspective. He noted that there is value in having a much longer timeframe perspective to better prepare for the educational needs of the future. VP Straney remarked that there are individuals across the country looking at what post-secondary education will look like in the future, including how universities will work and the role they'll play in meeting future workforce and educational needs, and mentioned several books that have recently been published on the subject. He also noted that UH was fortunate in that the Futures Institute in the Department of Political Science is currently performing this type of work.

Regent Sullivan expressed her concerns that, while the Draft Master Plan was a good endeavor, it may create increased bureaucracy that does not make for good adaptation to change. She commented that perhaps the administration could look at an alternative process that could be built in to the Draft Master Plan to allow for experimentation with new curricula and programs by faculty which could serve as an incubator that would provide for fast success or failure and encourage new thinking and quicker adaptation. President Lassner mentioned that UH currently has different ways of establishing innovative curricula on each campus and that innovative and experimental courses are fairly easy to offer. He provided several examples of

incubator-type programs currently in existence that have become, or have the potential of becoming, full-fledged degree programs.

Regent Sullivan noted that the Draft Master Plan did not appear to address costs that invariably occur whenever new programs are created. VP Straney noted that at the end of each unit section of the Draft Master Plan there is a short portion that discusses fiscal implications, enrollment implications, facility implications, and so on which is a starting point to address this issue.

Regent Sullivan discussed the concept of incorporating a systemwide overview within the Draft Master Plan that looks at areas of study by program and campus to gain a better understanding of what is available at each campus and to avoid duplication and allow for more efficient use of resources. VP Straney mentioned that this is being done to some extent by smaller groups but that this is something that will need to be addressed on a larger scale to be more effective and the administration can work on addressing this issue.

Noting that, of all the rolling plans being developed by the administration, the Draft Master Plan has the most interface and interaction with the community, Regent Moore asked how the administration was obtaining input from the various sectors of the community that may be interested in or affected by various aspects of the Draft Master Plan. VP Straney replied that academic planning cannot occur in isolation and that the vision of the Draft Master Plan is to take into account the numerous issues and groups that may have an impact, or be impacted by, the development of an academic program. President Lassner added that there have been workshops held that worked with various sectors of the business community to understand their workforce development needs which is one way of creating increased involvement in the academic planning process.

Regent Wilson stated that when looking at the labor market and statistics there are areas of the labor market that have critical needs such as in the healthcare industry and asked whether UH was focusing on these needs and the ability to meet future workforce demands. VP Straney responded in the affirmative stating that this is why it is imperative to have proper academic planning that involves all stakeholders.

Regent Moore inquired as to where, in the process of academic planning, does the teaching of soft skills come in. VP Straney replied that this generally occurs through the use of articulated learning outcomes but the question of whether these outcomes are being achieved or not has not yet been asked and is something that the administration will be working on.

Brief discussions occurred on how the administration was planning on addressing the need to develop basic, cognitive skills that are used across academic curricula in an academic planning process that appears to be focused on the concept of planning creative career or educational pathways with an emphasis on specific skills.

Chair Wilson recommended, and the committee agreed, that the Draft Master Plan should be presented to the full board to allow for further comment and discussion. VP Straney suggested that it be presented to the full board once development of the Draft

Master Plan is further along in the process. President Lassner added that this is a first attempt in developing a draft, multi-year academic plan and that the administration hopes to continue to present it to the board to receive suggestions and feedback on how it can be continually improved.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Regent Sullivan moved to adjourn, Regent Tagorda seconded the motion, and noting the excused absences of Vice-Chair Westerman, Regent Acopan, and Regent Nahale-a, and with all members present voting in the affirmative, the meeting was adjourned at 1:47 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

/S/

Kendra Oishi  
Executive Administrator and Secretary  
of the Board of Regents