MINUTES
BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING
JANUARY 20, 2022

Note: On November 29, 2021, Governor David Y. Ige issued a proclamation related to COVID-19 that temporarily suspended Chapter 92, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS), relating to public meetings and records, “only to the extent necessary to minimize the potential spread of COVID-19 and its variants”. A subsequent proclamation related to Sunshine Law in-person meetings was issued on December 29, 2021, that temporarily suspended Section 92-3.7, HRS, “only to the extent necessary to suspend the requirement to have at least one meeting location that is open to the public”.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Moore called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. on Thursday, January 20, 2022. The meeting was conducted virtually with regents participating from various locations.

Quorum (10): Chair Randy Moore; Vice-Chair Alapaki Nahale-a; Vice-Chair Benjamin Kudo; Regent Simeon Acoba; Regent Kelli Acopan; Regent William Haning; Regent Wayne Higaki; Regent Diane Paloma; Regent Robert Westerman; and Regent Ernest Wilson.

Excused (1): Regent Eugene Bal.

Others in attendance: President David Lassner; Vice President (VP) for Administration Jan Gouveia; VP for Community Colleges Erika Lacro; VP for Legal Affairs/University General Counsel Carrie Okinaga; VP for Research and Innovation Vassilis Syrmos; VP for Information Technology/Chief Information Officer Garret Yoshimi; VP for Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer Kalbert Young; VP for Advancement/University of Hawai‘i (UH) Foundation (UHF) Chief Executive Officer Tim Dolan; UH Mānoa (UHM) Provost Michael Bruno; UH Hilo (UHH) Chancellor Bonnie Irwin; UH West O‘ahu (UHWO) Chancellor Maenette Benham; Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board of Regents (Board Secretary) Kendra Oishi; and others as noted.

Prior to acting on the minutes, Chair Moore stated that formal motions to approve meeting minutes and adjourn meetings were not required pursuant to Robert’s Rules of Order. He noted the new procedures that would be followed moving forward to approve board meeting minutes and adjourn board meetings.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Chair Moore inquired if there were any comments or amendments to the minutes of the November 18, 2021, and December 16, 2021, meetings which had been circulated to board members for review. Hearing none, the minutes for each meeting were approved.
III. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Board Secretary Oishi announced that the Board Office received numerous written comments on several issues as noted below.

The Hawai‘i Island Chamber of Commerce, Kona-Kohala Chamber of Commerce, and numerous individuals submitted written testimony in support of the proposed Master Plan for the University of Hawai‘i Maunakea Lands (Master Plan), the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT), and/or astronomy on Maunakea.

The Mauna Kea Observatories submitted written testimony and provided oral testimony offering comments on the Master Plan and the impacts on indigenous populations, as well as community partnerships and collaboration.

Numerous individuals submitted written testimony in opposition to the Master Plan and/or TMT.

Late written testimony was received from the National Science Foundation expressing concerns about the Master Plan relative to its two facilities on Maunakea.

Late written testimony was received from Sustainable Energy Hawai‘i and several individuals in support of the Master Plan, TMT, and/or astronomy on Maunakea.

Late written testimony was received from Kahea: The Hawaiian-Environmental Alliance, the Graduate Student Organization (GSO) at UHM, Na Kupuna Moku O Keawe, and several individuals in opposition to the Master Plan and/or TMT.

Late written comments were received from several individual coaches in support of UHM Athletics and Athletic Director (AD) David Matlin.

A late written comment was received regarding the university’s COVID-19 vaccine policy.

A late written comment was received regarding university hiring practices, particularly with respect to UHH.

Written comments may be viewed at the Board of Regents website as follows:

-Written Testimony Comment Received
-Late Written Testimony Comment Received #1
-Late Written Testimony Comment Received #2

Oral testimony was received from Sara Maaria Saastamoinen, Laulani Teale, Tara Rojas, Liko Martin, Bianca Isaki, Candace Fujikane, Healani Sonoda-Pale, Alison Hufana, Sesame Shim, Kāhala Johnson, Ihilani Lasconia, La‘akea Low, Kaleiheana Stormcrow, S Kaleikoa Ka‘eo, E. Kalani Flores, Jordan Hocker, Puanani Brown, Kaylene Sheldon, and Doreen Bird in opposition to the Master Plan and/or TMT.
Wendy Laros on behalf of the Kona-Kohala Chamber of Commerce, John O’Meara, Alan Tokunaga, and Thayne Currie provided oral testimony in support of the Master Plan and TMT.

Laura Beeman provided oral comments in support of UHM Athletics Director (AD) David Matlin.

Regent Acopan left at 10:40 a.m.

Chair Moore stated that agenda item VI.H., relating to UHM athletics, would be taken out-of-order at approximately 1:00 p.m. to accommodate the schedule of AD Matlin.

The meeting recessed at 10:50 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:57 a.m.

IV. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

A. COVID-19 UPDATE

President Lassner provided an update on the university’s current state of affairs with regard to the COVID-19 pandemic stating that the rapid spread of the virus’ Omicron variant has resulted in increased COVID-19 test positivity rates and case counts throughout the State over the past several weeks, which is reflected by an uptick in case numbers within the university community, particularly within residence halls. The university continues to require all students, faculty, and staff to be fully vaccinated and is currently contemplating the inclusion of booster shots as a condition to be considered “up-to-date with vaccinations”. The start of in-person instruction for spring 2022, which was delayed two weeks because of the surge in positive cases, has been deferred for an additional week. It is expected that a return to in-person instruction will begin on January 31st.

President Lassner also reflected on the management of the COVID-19 pandemic across the university system, as well as lessons learned over the past two years, highlighting the collaborative, consensus-based approach used systemwide to contend with very dynamic situations while maintaining the flexibility to address individual campus issues, and the cooperative engagement of all facets of the university community in addressing the numerous challenges related to the pandemic. He noted the positive impacts of federal relief funding on the university and stated that the university is anticipating a more normalized 2022 calendar year with a return to more in-person commencement ceremonies this spring in addition to more in-person instruction in the fall. While expectations are for COVID-19 to become endemic throughout communities and something that will need to be dealt with for the foreseeable future, the adversities faced by the university during the course of the pandemic and the manner in which these challenges have been addressed has transformed it into an institution that will be better at adapting to and dealing with challenges it may face in the future.

The MKWG, which was formed pursuant to a resolution passed by the State House of Representatives and charged with recommending a new governance and management structure for Maunakea, has completed its work and released a report of its findings and recommendations. The impacts of the recommendations made by the MKWG on the university’s management of Maunakea remain unclear as legislation addressing this issue that is based upon the work of the MKWG has not yet been introduced. The university has noted its opposition to the report of the MKWG, will continue to monitor any legislation introduced, and will respond accordingly. President Lassner stated that the university continues to believe that management and stewardship of Maunakea is the university’s kuleana under the current lease and will remain so until such time as a firm decision is made otherwise. As such, the university will continue its work to improve management and stewardship, including seeking renewal of a master lease and preparation of a new master plan as well as updating the comprehensive management plan (CMP).

C. Legislative Inquiries

The university continues to receive inquiries from the Senate Committee on Higher Education (HRE) with the most recent questions involving employment of university personnel and telework. It was noted that the university has responded to these inquiries including the provision of information on the numbers of current university personnel who have worked out-of-state or have been teleworking over a set period of time.

President Lassner stated that, in response to pandemic-related guidance issued by the State and counties requesting employees remain at home to the extent possible, the university implemented an interim telework policy in mid-2020. Through this effort, it was discovered that many university employees were able to productively fulfill their employment obligations from home. Hence, the administration, working in collaboration with the labor unions, has developed a non-pandemic-related telework policy that will provide appropriate mechanisms to allow employees to work from home while ensuring that the work of the university is accomplished. The university believes that embracing telework options to meet the needs of its employees is part of being a responsive employer.

The January 7, 2022, informational briefing on UHM Athletics was also mentioned with President Lassner noting that details would be forthcoming during agenda item VI.H.

D. SCR 201 (2021) Task Force Update

The task force created by SCR 201 to, among other things, examine, compare, and contrast the university’s policies and procedures regarding tenure in relation to its peer institutions, completed its work and has processed feedback received on a draft report. The report is currently being finalized for submittal to the Legislature and public posting. A copy of this report will also be transmitted to the board so that consideration can be given to its findings and recommendations in conjunction with the findings and
recommendations contained within the report of the board’s permitted interaction group on tenure.

E. University of Hawai‘i by the Numbers

UHM’s School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology (SOEST) has received a $50 million gift from Dr. Priscilla Chan and Mr. Mark Zuckerberg to support various research groups within the Hawai‘i Institute of Marine Biology (HIMB) including programs that document changing ocean conditions, explore solutions to support healthier ocean ecosystems, enhance coastal resilience, and tackle challenges to marine organisms. President Lassner stated that this was a demonstration of the fundraising success achieved through greater collaboration and partnership between the university and UHF which was an effort spearheaded by the board several years ago. The university is expecting to experience its best year ever in philanthropic donations receiving slightly more than $125 million to date.

Pre-census overall headcount enrollment for the spring 2022 semester has decreased systemwide by 2.2 percent as compared to spring 2021, although UHM and Windward Community College have witnessed enrollment increases of 4.2 and 2.2 percent respectively. The university remains concerned about the large declines in enrollment being experienced by the neighbor island community colleges and continues work to understand and ameliorate this trend.

The university continues to do well in securing extramural research funding with just over $321 million being received to date, which is an increase of approximately three percent as compared to the same period last year. UHM currently leads the way in research funding with over $228.6 million being received to date, which is an increase of just over 10 percent as compared to last year. It is anticipated that a new record in the receipt of extramural research funding will be experienced this academic year.

F. Other

President Lassner stated that there were no other pressing matters at UHM to report on at this time. He encouraged regents to review the news releases and weekly summaries from the university’s communications team to keep abreast of all the activities involving the university.

G. UHM Campus Presentation

Provost Bruno articulated four high-level strategic goals which were developed to achieve UHM’s mission and vision for the future while enhancing alignment with the strategic direction plans of the university stating that UHM must never lose sight of its primary goal to foster student success and address the needs of the communities it serves.

Provost Bruno provided an overview of enrollment statistics and student population demographics noting that UHM is an ethnically-diverse campus that has achieved notable success in recruiting and retaining Native Hawaiian students, and has increased overall headcount enrollment, as well as enrollment in a number of other student
classifications. He pointed out a number of achievements regarding enrollment metrics, including the sizeable number of first-generation college students, as well as increases in incoming transfer students and freshman, but noted that incoming transfer students from the university’s community colleges remains flat and that UHM must work to improve outreach efforts and transition pathways.

Provost Bruno also highlighted the success of UHM’s academic programs, noting several academic distinctions and stating that UHM was recently ranked among the top one percent of all public universities in the world and 66th among all public universities in the United States. As a Carnegie R1 designated doctoral university, UHM continues to perform well in achieving research excellence, ranking near the top with respect to extramural funding and expenditures in several scientific fields, and experiencing numerous successes in research and development projects. He also stated that UHM is striving to create a campus that is more efficient, effective, collaborative, and interdisciplinary regarding academic programs and called attention to recent mergers that reduced the number of colleges and schools at UHM from 18 to 15 that helps to achieve this goal.

Data on retention rates, four-year and six-year graduation rates, and average time-to-degree (TTD) was also reviewed with Provost Bruno noting that UHM’s overall retention rate remains high despite experiencing a slight dip, and that 4-year graduation rates and average TTD continue to improve. However, UHM experienced a small decline in its 6-year graduation rate which is perplexing given the 4-year graduation rate and is an issue that is currently undergoing further analysis.

An overview of some of the challenges faced by the UHM community during the COVID-19 pandemic was provided with Provost Bruno highlighting efforts undertaken to provide student and academic staff support such as the continued provision of access to computers, the internet, safe study spaces, mental health counseling, physical health services, and professional development.

The Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) was also touted as another successful endeavor undertaken by UHM. UROP, which coordinates and promotes opportunities for undergraduate students to engage in faculty-mentored research and creative work as a complement to the classroom learning experience, has been extremely popular among students. Provost Bruno stated that the enrichment of the overall academic experience and development of lifelong academic, professional, and personal skills provided by UROP not only benefits and prepares students to be engaged community members and leaders in their professions, but also helps UHM with recruiting and retaining a wide-range of undergraduate students.

A comparison of overall revenues and expenditures for UHM since fiscal year 2017 was provided with Provost Bruno stating that revenues have exceeded expenses in each of the last four fiscal years and that the trend is expected to continue for the current fiscal year. He also stated that UHM continues to build reserves which will be crucial for the campus over the next several years.
Provost Bruno provided an update on UHM’s progress towards obtaining reaffirmation of its accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) noting the completion of a virtual site-visit in November of 2021 which included meetings with students, faculty, and staff. He reviewed issues, commendations, and recommendations noted in the draft accreditation report and stated that the WASC Commission review of the draft report and final decision on reaccreditation is expected to occur by the end of February 2022. UHM expects that it will achieve reaffirmation and receive accreditation for the next 10 years.

Although challenges will undoubtedly be faced in the future, Provost Bruno stated that UHM remains committed to continuing on the path toward sustainability through a collaborative approach that uses data, information, and performance indicators to develop a more viable university that is well-equipped and repositioned to further contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of the people of Hawai‘i.

**Student Report**

Mr. Jungha Kim, President of the Associated Students of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (ASUH), gave a presentation on the work and achievements of ASUH over the past year highlighting some of the initiatives undertaken. He also reviewed some of ASUH’s 2022 proposals which include beginning the process to develop an American Sign Language degree program at UHM; holding workshops on sustainability and legislative matters to increase student engagement in campus and world affairs; working with the administration on LGBTQ+ initiatives including the development of procedures for the use of pronouns throughout the university system and the placement of preferred names on university diplomas; and supporting a sick leave policy for graduate student employees. Mr. Kim stated that ASUH looks forward to continuing its work on achieving the goals it established for 2022 and engaging with students to ensure that their voices are heard, as well as maintaining a collaborative relationship with the administration.

Mr. Mark Willingham, President of the UHM Graduate Student Organization (GSO), stated that GSO is the official representative body that advocates for and supports over 4,000 graduate students at UHM, and serves as a conduit between graduate students and the university administration which provides opportunities for graduate students to seek resolution to their expressed concerns.

Mr. Willingham stated that, similar to other governance organizations, GSO has been required to adapt to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and conduct the majority of its activities, including meetings, professional development activities, and social events, in an online format. He highlighted the work and accomplishments of GSO over the past year noting that it continues to advocate for graduate students through active engagement with the administration on issues such as the implementation of a sick-leave policy for graduate student employees; post-pandemic planning; and proposed administrative reorganization efforts. GSO also continues to forge ahead with its grants and awards program, as well as its merit-based awards program, both of which offer funding opportunities for graduate students to enhance their education through attendance at conferences in addition to research projects,
increasing the number of awards and grants allocated as well as their monetary amounts over the last two years.

**Faculty Report**

Brent Sipes, UHM Faculty Senate Chair, reviewed the membership, committee structure, and operational processes of the Mānoa Faculty Senate explaining that it is a governance body contained within the UHM Faculty Congress, the larger faculty-governance body of UHM that represents over 2,300 faculty members, and often serves as the representative for the Faculty Congress.

Dr. Sipes spoke on the Faculty Senate’s understanding of its role on the issue of shared governance as contained within Regents Policy (RP) 1.210. He also reviewed some of the major issues being discussed for this academic year including consultation on planning for a post-pandemic Hawai‘i; instructional quality; university reorganization; tenure; general education curriculum and core requirement (Gen Ed) redesign efforts; and the use of appropriate forms of instructional modalities.

**Staff Report**

Jaret K.C. Leong, Chair of the Mānoa Staff Senate (MSS), began by providing background information on the establishment, membership, and work of the MSS. He noted that MSS is an officially-recognized shared governance body that serves as the voice for all staff at UHM and is responsible for collaborating with the UHM administration on university policies and operations that impact staff.

Mr. Leong reviewed the work of MSS over the past year, including the holding of several forums to discuss a number of issues of importance to staff, and reported on some of its top priorities for 2022 which include a safe return to campus for employees, including addressing the physical and mental health needs for both students and employees; telework issues; continued inclusion and consultation in UHM’s post-pandemic planning, as well as administrative and academic reorganization plans; and the development of an All Campus Council of Staff Senate Chairs. He also noted that staff senates exist on six of the university campuses and urged these campuses to provide the opportunity for their respective staff senates to deliver a report to the board during their campus presentations. MSS also requested that the board continue to hold virtual meetings as this increases transparency and allows for greater participation by the university community; continue to include staff concerns in its decision-making process; and consider creating a staff liaison to the board to assist the Regents in understanding the effects board decisions have on staff members which may be very different than the impacts realized by university faculty.

Noting a recommendation made by WASC that the board develop a conflicts-of-interest policy relative to the dual role of the president of the university as both the president of the university system and chief executive officer of UHM, Vice-Chair Kudo suggested that this issue be referred to a standing committee of the board so that it can be discussed and addressed through appropriate amendments to the RPs.
Regent Westerman expressed his concurrence with the development of a telework policy for the university but opined that such a policy should be periodically reviewed so that it can be amended to address changing situations, particularly with respect to the provision of online courses. President Lassner explained the distinctions between teleworking and the provision of instruction in an online format and stated that a copy of the university’s telework policy will be provided to the regents. He also stated that, while the recently developed telework policy is expected to go through periodic reviews, course modalities are continually reviewed to ensure that they meet student needs.

Given recent community discussions on the mental health needs of athletes at UHM as well as conversations during past board meetings with respect to the provision of mental health services on the various university campuses, Regent Wilson inquired about the university’s evaluation of its mental health needs. President Lassner replied that services specific to the mental health needs of student-athletes will be summarized and discussed during agenda item VI.H. but stated that all of the university’s student-athletes can avail themselves of private mental health services as well as those provided on their respective campus. Although the university has been fortunate to have received federal funds during the pandemic to assist it in providing mental health services to students, this funding will eventually end. As such, the university continues to evaluate the amount of resources necessary, as well as the types of investments that must be made, to improve mental health services on each of its campuses.

Regent Haning asked whether faculty and staff senates were symmetrically spread throughout the university. Mr. Leong responded that while each campus of the ten-campus university system has a faculty senate, only six campuses currently have staff senates. He stated that staff senates mainly consist of at-large members, although they are seeking to move towards a more representative model of governance similar to the faculty senates. He also noted that some colleges have their own faculty senates which is not the case for the staff senates.

Regent Paloma questioned where she could obtain further information about UHM’s strategies related to increasing the number of enrolled students, as well as faculty, who were of Native Hawaiian descent. She also encouraged the various governance groups throughout the university system to continue to engage with the board on issues of importance to their respective constituencies. Provost Bruno cited several university programs that conduct high school outreach to assist students of Native Hawaiian ancestry with onboarding and the transition to life as an undergraduate at UHM although he noted that the administration is evaluating the centralization of these initiatives as they are broadly distributed throughout programs across the campus. He also stated that questions specifically related to strategies being contemplated to increase Native Hawaiian enrollment would best be answered by Dr. Willy Kaua’i, the Director of Native Hawaiian Student Services at UHM.

Citing the numerous accomplishments achieved by UHM over the past couple of years, Vice-Chair Nahale-a requested Provost Bruno to provide one story that encapsulated this success. Provost Bruno replied that, while it is difficult to choose one story that adequately captures the achievements of UHM, he was most proud of the efforts undertaken by the entire UHM ‘ohana to assist the community, State, and
counties in addressing the numerous challenges resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Vice-Chair Nahale-a praised UHM for its remarkable successes amidst all the challenges and chaos over the past two years and expressed his opinion that UHM should increase efforts to tout its accomplishments.

Regent Westerman offered his thanks to Dr. Phyllis Chang and Mr. Mark Zuckeberg for their $50 million gift to SOEST.

Regent Acoba commended UHM on their feats, suggested that consideration be given to selecting three to five additional areas in which the university could attain a world-class designation and determine how this can be achieved, commented on the apparent stagnation in the percentage of Filipino students enrolling at UHM, and expressed his hope that the program established to increase ethnic diversity among faculty and staff at UHM would continue.

Noting the drop in the number of students transferring to UHM from the community colleges, Regent Acoba asked if there were any specific reasons for this decline. Provost Bruno stated that one of the impediments to the transfer of students from the community colleges is the restrained presence of UHM on community college campuses which limits engagement with the students on those campuses. UHM must improve upon its efforts to increase the amount of community college students transferring to its campus including the development of articulation pathways that are more visible and provide an easier transition to a four-year university.

Citing remarks made that UHM would be analyzing recent reductions in the six-year graduation rate, Regent Acoba questioned why UHM would investigate this decline as it appeared to be a positive educational outcome. Provost Bruno replied that an increase in the 4-year graduation rate would normally result in a concomitant increase in the 6-year graduation rate. However, this did not occur and UHM will analyze the data to determine the reasons for this disconnect.

Referencing actions taken by UHM to increase revenues and decrease expenses over the past two years as part of an effort to build financial reserves that will be crucial for the campus over the next several years, Regent Acoba asked about the amount of reserves accumulated to date. Sandy French, Chief Business Officer at UHM, replied that UHM is anticipating that it will have approximately $100 million in reserves by the end of this fiscal year which will be needed should the projected reduction in general fund revenues received from the State Legislature materialize. She also stated that federal relief funds that assisted UHM in supporting the needs of students as well as its own financial needs during the pandemic will not be available next year which adds to the importance of maintaining a large reserve.

Stating that the University of Hawai‘i Cancer Center accounts for approximately $26 million in extramural funding and that research conducted at the facility serves a significant public health purpose, Regent Acoba asked if progress has been made in hiring a new director for the Center. Provost Bruno replied that an international search which has identified three finalists has been completed. The three finalists are scheduled to participate in site visits throughout March 2022 with a final
recommendation on the new director expected to be made at the conclusion of these visits.

Regent Acoba requested clarification from ASUH on the total amount of funds it currently holds, as well as the amount of scholarships awarded from these funds. He also inquired about ASUH’s thoughts on the amount of athletic fees paid by UHM students which are some of the lowest among Mountain West Conference (MWC) and Big West Conference schools. Mr. Kim replied that ASUH uses a maximum of five percent of the market value of the ASUH Stadium Stock Fund’s (Stadium Stock Fund) portfolio each year to benefit UHM students. In fiscal year 2022, ASUH received approximately $570,000 in Stadium Stock Fund dividends. In addition, ASUH collected approximately $120,000 in student fees which is included in its overall budget. Of these amounts, roughly $350,000 has been allocated towards university programs, services, and support for students and $112,000 has been distributed towards scholarships and awards. With respect to student athletic fees, he stated that he did not have enough information on this issue to provide an educated answer but that ASUH would be interested in continuing this conversation in the future.

The meeting recessed at 12:58 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 1:04 p.m.

Chair Moore stated that, as previously noted, agenda item VI.H. would be taken out of order and addressed at this time.

H. Discussion and Possible Action on Issues Raised Regarding UHM Athletics

AD Matlin began by providing an overview of the mission of, and vision for, UHM athletics stating that while UHM athletics strives to bring pride to Hawai‘i through championship-caliber competition, its primary role is to serve the student-athlete through an academic degree program and through intercollegiate sports to develop their capabilities to the fullest. He highlighted several issues and concerns that were raised with respect to UHM athletics through various forums and noted that each would be addressed during this presentation.

Jonathan Sladky, M.D., the university’s team physician, stressed the importance of ensuring the mental well-being of student-athletes in addition to their physical well-being and underscored UHM athletics’ commitment to making the mental health of student athletes its top medical priority over the past three years. He spoke about several initiatives undertaken over the past two years to address this issue including the hiring of a mental health specialist specifically dedicated to assisting student-athletes with their mental healthcare needs; the use of a web-based mental health platform that provided rapid access to licensed psychologists; and the establishment of a partnership with the Counseling and Student Development Center (CSDC) at UHM to offer group therapy sessions to proactively address mental health issues and concerns of student-athletes. He also reviewed the multilayered approach used by UHM athletics to address the mental health needs of its student-athletes highlighting several proactive and preventative mental health measures being taken, such as the initiation of a CSDC
therapists-in-residence program and the planned implementation of standardized mental health screening for all athletes beginning in the 2022-2023 academic year. Reactive measures to treat acute mental health issues are also provided through a number of counseling and crisis hotline services provided by CSDC as well as third parties.

Referencing allegations by several former athletes regarding mental and emotional abuse by the former head football coach, Vice-Chair Kudo inquired whether any of these athletes availed themselves of the mental health services provided by UHM athletics. Dr. Sladky replied that he could not comment on the rendering of mental health services due to medical privacy issues. He explained that student-athletes seeking help are referred to the appropriate resource and that he was unaware of any situations whereby a student-athlete failed to receive, or was denied, proper assistance.

Regent Haning asked about Dr. Sladky’s official role with UHM athletics and questioned whether UHM students had the same access to mental health care that was available to UHM student-athletes. Dr. Sladky replied that he serves as the head team physician for UHM Athletics but also works part-time at the UHM Student Health Center. While mental health services are available to all UHM students, he stated that, due to the nature of their situations, student-athletes are, at times, afforded expedited services that might not be readily available to non-student-athletes. President Lassner clarified that student-athletes are able to take advantage of the substantial scope of mental health services afforded to all UHM students and are also able to receive certain customized services through the UHM athletics.

Lois Manin, Associate Athletics Director (AAD), reported on student-athlete nutrition which includes the provision of meals to student-athletes. It was noted that the term “student-athlete meals” refers to supplemental meals, pre- and post-game meals, occasional meals which are paid for through funds from UHF, and food and drinks provided through what is commonly known as “trade” with the weight room. She presented figures on the amount of funds spent on student-athlete meals by Hawai‘i’s peer institutions in the MWC, as well as average amounts spent by other conferences and institutions, noting that they compare favorably to monies spent by UHM athletics. Although UHM athletics strives to do more to support the nutritional needs of its student-athletes, budget constraints and the impact of COVID-19 on nutrition programs, which were compounded by a $900,000 decrease in legislative appropriations earmarked for student-athlete nutrition, has made this difficult.

AAD Manin clarified what appears to be a misconception about student-athletes being denied access to meals explaining that student-athlete meals for individuals on an athletic scholarship are in addition to meals already provided through their respective scholarships. Non-scholarship athletes are only provided their allotted student-athlete meals.

Regent Acoba questioned whether it is anticipated that the $900,000 in appropriations for student-athlete nutrition will be restored in the coming legislative session. AD Matlin replied that the university requested that these funds be restored but that it was uncertain if this would occur. President Lassner concurred with AD
Matlin noting that funding restoration was included in the recent budget request approved by the board and then the governor and that discussions are ongoing at the Legislature.

Vice-Chair Nahale-a requested further explanation of the impact of COVID-19 on the nutrition programs provided by UHM athletics. AD Matlin responded that the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a number of athletic events either being severely limited or canceled which resulted in the inability of UHM athletics to provide certain student-athlete meals such as pre- and post-game meals due to National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) restrictions. Additionally, the limited presence of student-athletes on campus hampered the provision of some student-athlete meals, although to-go meal options were made available.

Regent Acoba questioned whether the cost of meals in Hawai‘i were higher due to higher food costs which may impact the amount of funds spent on student-athlete meals and asked about if the meals were distributed proportionally. AAD Manin replied that student-athlete meals are made available through a contracted food service provider. The pricing for meals, as well as the amount and types of meals afforded, are contained within the contract with the selected provider and are comparable to the cost-of-living in Hawai‘i.

Regent Wilson asked whether student-athlete meals met recommended nutritional requirements. AAD Manin responded that she believed there were nutritional requirements contained within the student-athlete food service contract specifications but would need to verify the exact requirements.

Vice-Chair Kudo inquired as to whether there were limitations placed on the receipt of student-athlete meals based upon the athlete’s position or status on a team or if all student-athletes within a given sport were provided equal access to meals. AAD Manin replied that access to student-athlete meals was not limited by an athlete’s playing status or position on a team although the timing of meals provided may be dependent on the specific needs of an athlete based upon their particular position on a team. She reiterated that the only differential in the receipt of meals was between scholarship and non-scholarship athletes.

AAD Manin provided an overview of communication channels that are available to all student-athletes to voice any concerns, making clear that concerns can be brought forward by individual athletes or groups of athletes. She reviewed several of the communication options offered including end-of-season program evaluations and exit interviews and noted the existence of a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) which includes representation from each of the 21 UHM athletics’ teams. She stated that part of the mission of the SAAC was to support the welfare of student-athletes and promote increased communication between student-athletes, administration, and coaches. AAD Manin also summarized the processes by which student-athletes can raise concerns or file complaints explaining that the Student-Athlete Handbook, which is provided to every student-athlete, contains detailed information on this issue.
Regent Higaki questioned whether student-athletes were well versed in the existence of other avenues they may have outside of UHM athletics to report their issues or concerns such as the university’s whistleblower hotline noting that his review of past whistleblower reports provided to the board did not contain information related to this subject matter. AAD Manin stated that she was unaware as to whether student-athletes were fully cognizant of the existence of the whistleblower hotline but that this information could be added to the Student-Athlete Handbook. President Lassner added that an email regarding the whistleblower hotline is sent out to the entire university community systemwide each semester, independent of the UHM athletics. AAD Manin remarked that UHM athletics also employs a Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) who serves as an additional confidential resource available to student-athletes for reporting any issues or concerns.

Vice-Chair Kudo asked if the FAR served as a de-facto ombudsman for student-athletes and whether UHM athletics had a regimented system to follow-up on complaints or concerns raised to ensure that the issues were addressed by the department. AD Matlin replied that UHM athletics takes every complaint or concern that is brought forward seriously and responds to each one. However, at times the response provided is not agreeable to the position of the complainant and therefore may be misconstrued as UHM athletics not being responsive to their concerns. Additionally, some responses provided on the outcome of a complaint are generic in nature because of the subject matter or privacy and personnel issues. However, he expressed his belief that UHM athletics could improve on the way it communicates its responsive actions to a complainant. President Lassner added that the functions of the FAR are defined by the NCAA and RP 7.208, is a position that reports directly to the chief executive officer of the campus, serves as the eyes and ears of the university administration in UHM athletics, and engages directly with student-athletes. He noted that the UHM FAR was the individual who brought the extent of the morale issues facing the university’s football team to his attention at which time AD Matlin was notified and action to address the issues commenced. It was explained that all of this occurred prior to the briefings held on this matter by the State Senate.

Chair Moore inquired about the nature of the exit interviews conducted with student-athletes as well as the percentage of student-athletes interviewed. AAD Manin replied that whenever a student-athlete leaves UHM athletics due to graduation, transfer, completion of eligibility, or any other reason, the student-athlete is requested to take part in an exit interview which includes candid and confidential conversations about their experiences, concerns or issues they may have had with UHM athletics, and areas in which improvements can be made. Although exit interviews are afforded to all student-athletes, approximately 20 percent do not take part in these interviews.

AD Matlin spoke about the athletic facilities at UHM noting their multiple uses, the importance of maintaining them, and the benefits of these facilities to academia, athletics, and the general community. He stated that approximately $40 million has been invested in facility upgrades over the last five years and summarized several remodeling and improvement projects that are currently being vetted or are in the initial design stages. AD Matlin also talked about an opportunity to develop a high-
performance center within the university’s athletic complex that would serve as a multi-purpose facility and would allow for the consolidation of football activities into a single facility thereby freeing up space for reallocation to other sports. Development of a high-performance center would also allow UHM athletics to be on equal footing with the rest of the MWC schools. UHM athletics has worked with the School of Architecture to produce three conceptual designs for this project that can meet the needs of the athletics department while encouraging student integration with UHM athletics.

Regent Wilson asked if UHM has discussed collaboration with other schools or programs, such as the John A. Burns School of Medicine (JABSOM), that would be beneficial to both parties. AD Matlin replied that UHM athletics has worked collaboratively with JABSOM, as well as other schools and programs within the university, and provided examples of some of these efforts. He stated that UHM athletics welcomes any opportunity in which it can team up with a school or program at the university on a project. Dr. Sladky added that the rotation of medical residents at JABSOM that are interested in sports medicine through the athletic department is a program has been mutually beneficial to both parties.

Mentioning recent public statements asserting that there were instances in which concerns raised by student-athletes were not addressed by UHM athletics, AD Matlin reiterated that all complaints or concerns that are brought forward are taken seriously and dealt with accordingly. He stated that all of the claims made in submitted testimony alleging a lack-of-action on the part of UHM athletics are currently being reviewed and assessed to determine whether the department responded appropriately. UHM athletics will be prepared to provide a more detailed report on this matter to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA).

Vice-Chair Kudo opined that, while the system in place to solicit feedback and input from the student-athletes is good, UHM athletics needs to remain cognizant of the human element involved in the process. If an individual does not feel a certain level of trust and comfort with the person or entity serving as the portal for complaints, they will not speak openly about their concerns and the reporting system becomes ineffective. He also expressed his belief that UHM athletics needs to do a better job of communicating actions that they are taking with respect to the concerns of a complainant as long as it does not violate any law, agreement, rule, or policy. AD Matlin replied that UHM athletics provides multiple avenues for complaints to be filed to address this type of situation. However, he also agreed that improvements could be made to the system, particularly with respect to communicating department actions.

Regent Acoba remarked that what transpired over the last two weeks cannot be ignored and he was pleased to hear that an assessment of the issues brought forth in public testimony was occurring. He stated that he was looking forward to receiving a report on the outcome of this assessment, as well as the provision of concrete recommendations by UHM athletics to improve the processing and handling of complaints. He also implored UHM athletics to follow-up on claims related to the mental health of student-athletes. Although RP 7.208 requires that the board be kept aware of the overall state of intercollegiate athletic programs with respect to certain issues, including student-athlete health and welfare, this did not prevent what was apparently
occurring within the football program. Regent Acoba stated that it may be prudent to consider something beyond regular reports to the board or ICA as additional safeguards to prevent this type of situation from occurring again and commented that he was intrigued by the idea of creating an ombudsman or similar position within the department. Athletics often serves as the public’s primary gateway and connection to the university and it is imperative to restore public trust and confidence in the program. AD Matlin responded that UHM athletics can focus on these issues and report its findings to ICA at future meetings.

Vice-Chair Kudo echoed the comments of Regent Acoba stating that the establishment of improved procedures and mechanisms for addressing complaints, as well as putting the right individuals in place to deal with these situations, is paramount to restoring the public’s trust in UHM athletics and the university. He suggested that ICA continue to monitor the situation, perform a review of the analysis being conducted by UHM athletics with respect to recently raised issues, and examine the response of the department to these issues, including any recommended changes. The committee can then report its findings and recommendations to the board. He stated that, in his opinion, taking these actions will help to allay some of the public concerns raised about the lack of oversight of UHM athletics. Chair Moore stated that this suggestion can be discussed once UHM athletics concluded its presentation.

AD Matlin provided an update on changes to NCAA transfer rules stating that a uniform, one-time transfer rule was adopted on April 28, 2021, to afford all student-athletes with the opportunity to exercise a one-time option to transfer to an athletics program at another institution and become immediately eligible to participate in athletic competition. He stated that the new transfer rules, coupled with rule changes adopted by the NCAA on July 1, 2021, that makes it possible for a student-athlete to receive compensation for use of their name, image, and likeness, has significantly impacted intercollegiate athletics at all program levels. He also reviewed UHM athletics’ experience with the transfer portal as compared to its peer institutions in the MWC over the past two years and highlighted several of the issues driving UHM’s football players into the transfer portal including the closing of Aloha Stadium, lack of fans due to COVID-19 restrictions, opportunities for increased exposure, and transition to a new coaching staff. AD Matlin noted that he attempts to meet with every departing athlete to understand their reasons for leaving the program so that improvements can be made and that the goal of UHM athletics, moving forward, is to eliminate transfers driven by the kinds of feelings expressed during the legislative briefing.

Some of the financial considerations pondered when developing the budget for UHM athletics were reviewed and given context. While UHM athletics is primarily supported by multiple self-generated revenue streams, it also relies on campus services and internal allocations to meet its fiscal needs. AD Matlin remarked that, despite UHM athletics’ efforts to reduce costs and increase revenues, fiscal challenges continue to be an issue, and that a number of factors impacting the budget are beyond the department’s control. He further stated the UHM athletics will continue to work with the administration in developing a financial plan that is congruent with the overall campus financial plan and is aimed at eliminating its paper deficit and arriving at an internal
allocation amount that will allow for the consistent balancing of revenues and expenditures.

A comparison of athletic revenues generated by UHM athletics relative to its peer institutions and summary of fundraising efforts, including the receipt of significant long-term commitments for the naming rights of facilities was provided. While fundraising has more than doubled since 2019, AD Matlin cautioned that efforts to generate revenue for the near future will be hindered by the anticipated loss of “seat premium” proceeds due to the lack of a full-sized stadium for football, which is a significant source of income for UHM athletics.

Chair Moore reiterated Vice-Chair Kudo’s suggestion that these matters be referred to ICA for further discussion and asked for input from regents.

Regent Haning stated that he did not have any objections to this suggestion but requested that guidance be provided to ICA on the extent of these discussions. Chair Moore replied that several issues were raised during the presentation into which ICA could delve further.

Regent Wilson concurred with Vice-Chair Kudo’s suggestion stating his belief that it was necessary for ICA to take a deeper dive into this matter, particularly from a public relations perspective, and this action will help to mitigate the situation facing UHM.

Regent Acoba emphasized that the approach taken by the board to address this issue should be from a policy perspective and determining the appropriate policy for the university. He stressed that the board must also respect the privacy and personal rights, as well as personnel rights and considerations, when obtaining information on this matter.

Chair Moore noted that he received a letter from the Chair of the Senate Committee on Ways and Means (WAM) and the Chair of HRE which posed several questions to the board about the situation at UHM athletics. Most of the questions posed were administrative related, which have been answered in the media or at this meeting. However, the WAM and HRE chairs did request information on any correspondence received by regents related to the situation involving the former football coach. He suggested that the administration be directed to respond to the administration-related questions and that inquiries be placed with each regent about correspondence received. Hearing no discussion on this matter, Chair Moore stated that he will draft a response to the Chairs of WAM and HRE, and provide regents with a copy of the response.

V. COMMITTEE AND AFFILIATE REPORTS

A. Report from the Committee on Independent Audit

Committee Chair Kudo summarized the committee report.

B. Report from the Committee on Personnel Affairs and Board Governance

Committee Chair Moore summarized the committee report.
C. Affiliate Reports

Hawai‘i P-20 Council: Regent Haning stated that the Hawai‘i P-20 Council has, to date, not held a meeting and there was no information to report at this time.

VI. AGENDA ITEMS

A. Consent Agenda

1. Approval of Indemnification Provision in a Grant Agreement between the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the University of Hawai‘i

Regent Wilson moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Vice-Chair Kudo, and noting the excused absences of Regents Acopan and Bal, the motion carried with all members present voting in the affirmative.

B. Approval to exceptions to RP 5.219 to award the following titles:

1. Title of Dean Emeritus for Dr. Brian Taylor, SOEST, UHM
2. Title of Professor Emeritus for Dr. Ronald Cambra, College of Arts, Languages, and Literature, UHM
3. Title of Professor Emeritus for Dr. Edward A. Laws, SOEST, UHM
4. Title of Associate Professor Emeritus for Dr. Andrew Taylor, College of Natural Sciences, UHM

Provost Bruno spoke about four former faculty members of the university – Dr. Brian Taylor, Dr. Ronald Cambra, Dr. Edward Laws, and Dr. Andrew Taylor, and provided a brief background of the long, illustrious career of each individual, highlighting a number of their accomplishments and giving a brief synopsis of their contributions to the university. He noted that their positive and valuable contributions to the university, as well as dedicated service, merits approval of exceptions to RP 5.219 which establishes the criteria for the awarding of such titles.

Regent Paloma questioned whether additional benefits beyond the emeritus distinction were bestowed upon individuals awarded this title. Provost Bruno responded in the affirmative citing examples of parking privileges and access to campus facilities.

Vice-Chair Kudo moved to approve the exceptions to RP 5.219 to award the aforementioned individuals with emeritus titles as recommended, seconded by Regent Wilson, and noting the excused absences of Regents Acopan and Bal, the motion carried with all members present voting in the affirmative.

C. Approval of the Establishment and Naming of the UHERO – HMSA Distinguished Endowed Professorship in Health Economics at the University of Hawai‘i Economic Research Organization within the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa College of Social Sciences
Provost Bruno provided information on a financial commitment received from the Hawai‘i Medical Service Association (HMSA) in the amount of $1,000,000 to establish and name the UHERO-HMSA Distinguished Endowed Professorship in Health Economics at the UHM College of Social Sciences. The purpose of the professorship and funds will be to recruit and retain faculty of the highest caliber, as well as support UHERO research and activities, in the area of health economics.

Regent Westerman moved to approve the establishment and naming of the UHERO-HMSA Distinguished Endowed Professorship in Health Economics at the UHM College of Social Sciences, seconded by Vice-Chair Kudo, and noting the excused absences of Regents Acopan and Bal, the motion carried with all members present voting in the affirmative.

D. Update and Preview for the 2022 Legislative Session

VP Young furnished a preview of the 2022 legislative session and updated the board on the university’s budget requests, highlighting several key elements of each. It was noted that the university’s entire operating budget request and the majority of its capital improvement project budget request were included in the budget submitted by the governor. He stated that the governor also requested funding for a number of additional initiatives involving the university including efforts to increase nursing education capacity, expand the medical residency program, address teacher workforce education, and create a university village at UHWO and enlarge its campus. VP Young also discussed non-fiscal items included in the governor’s requests, stated that several informational briefings were held regarding the university’s budget and UHM football, and reviewed the legislative calendar for January.

Vice-Chair Kudo left at 3:00 p.m.

E. Partial Report of the Maunakea Plan Review Permitted Interaction Group Recommending Consideration of Approval of the Proposed Master Plan for the University of Hawai‘i Maunakea Lands (Master Plan) – E Ō I Nā Leo (Listen to the Voices)

Vice-Chair Nahale-a began by acknowledging the hurt and frustration concerning agenda items VI.E. and VI.F. that have been expressed and offered his personal thoughts on the various issues involving Maunakea in relation to social justice matters being experienced by Native Hawaiians. He also thanked the members of the Maunakea Plan Review Permitted Interaction Group (Task Group), staff, and community members for their diligence and engagement, noting the tremendous amount of work that has been undertaken over the last few months.

Vice-Chair Nahale-a summarized the Task Group’s findings and specific recommendations, which are contained in its written report to the board, stating that the Master Plan (Master Plan) is one of several policy and guiding documents regarding Maunakea that must align and work together, that the Master Plan alone cannot address all of the interests and concerns expressed by the community, and that the board needs to address how this can best be accomplished given the current situation.
While the Task Group acknowledged past missteps concerning the stewardship of Maunakea and strongly encourages action by the university to correct and address the aforementioned missteps, substantial changes and improvements to management activities involving Maunakea lands is an evolutionary process. He stated that management and stewardship of Maunakea is the university’s kuleana and will remain so until such time that a better agency is identified and established to fulfill this obligation. He also expressed the sentiment of the Task Group that the university is currently in the best position to properly manage Maunakea and that a pathway needs to be found to continue to allow astronomy to be a part of Maunakea in an appropriate and responsible manner.

Although the Task Group believes that the Master Plan is ready for approval, Vice Chair Nahale-a remarked that it did not recommend adoption as is normally done. Rather, the Task Group recommended consideration of approving the Master Plan to afford regents the opportunity to digest the document and make suggestions and recommendations as appropriate. He also noted that, while the Task Group has concluded the portion of its task relating to the Master Plan, it has not yet concluded its task relating to the Comprehensive Management Plan (CMP). As such, the Task Group also recommends closing out the Master Plan portion of its charge while keeping open the CMP portion which is anticipated to be completed in the first half of 2022.

Chair Moore clarified that discussions and recommendations under this agenda item are on accepting the Task Group’s partial report and recommendation to consider approval of the Master Plan and not on the Master Plan itself.

Regent Westerman concurred with Vice-Chair Nahale-a’s assessment, stated that he shared many of his views, and supported acceptance of the Task Group’s report.

Regent Paloma asked if the Task Group had any interactions with the MKWG. Vice-Chair Nahale-a replied that the Task Group did not interact with the MKWG due to a variety of factors. However, Chancellor Irwin was a member of the MKWG and kept the Task Group apprised of the MKWG’s work.

Referencing a statement made by a testifier that an environmental impact statement (EIS) was needed in order for the Master Plan to move forward, Regent Acoba questioned whether the Task Group took this under consideration. Vice-Chair Nahale-a replied that the need for an EIS was considered and discussed but that the Task Group believed it was unnecessary given that the Master Plan did not authorize any actual projects to proceed on Maunakea.

Regent Westerman moved to accept the partial report of the Task Group and the recommendations contained therein, seconded by Regent Wilson, and noting the excused absences of Vice-Chair Kudo and Regents Acopan and Bal, the motion carried with all members present voting in the affirmative.

F. Adoption of the Master Plan for the University of Hawai‘i Maunakea Lands (Master Plan) – E Ō I Nā Leo (Listen to the Voices)
Prior to commencing with discussions, Dr. Greg Chun, Executive Director of Maunakea Stewardship, introduced the recently hired Director of Stewardship Programs at the Center for Maunakea Stewardship (CMS), Nahua Guilloz, who will oversee all stewardship operations relating to university managed lands on Maunakea. Ms. Guilloz spoke about her personal background and professional experience stating that she was humbled by the opportunity to assist in stewardship efforts related to Maunakea and that, as a Native Hawaiian, she did not take this kuleana lightly. She also reviewed some of the projects CMS is currently working on which include updating the CMP, improving educational and public outreach efforts, and expanding community engagement through the establishment of various programs.

Chancellor Irwin, who served as the board representative on the MKWG, stated that a draft report of the findings and recommendations of the MKWG was released in December 2021, and that the final report is expected to be released shortly. She remarked that, while every decision made by the MKWG may not have been favorable to the university, the experience was extremely valuable, provided an extraordinary amount of insight into the community’s concerns, and served as a venue for communication among individuals with differing perspectives. She also expressed her praise for the work being conducted by the team of individuals working on the stewardship of Maunakea, which included the drafting of the Master Plan. While a multitude of values and perspectives from numerous stakeholders were given due consideration during the creation of this document, the Master Plan will not be satisfactory to everyone. Nevertheless, Chancellor Irwin opined that the Master Plan was a sound document and believed that it should be adopted by the board.

Dr. Chun provided a brief history of the Master Plan presently before the board for action, from inception to its current iteration; reviewed the purpose for developing the Master Plan; and explained the administration's rationale for requesting approval. He noted that the Master Plan attempts to codify the university's commitment to sustainably stewarding Maunakea for the benefit of multiple communities while recognizing its learning, research, and teaching mission, and reviewed the process used to develop the Master Plan, which included two-years' worth of extensive information-gathering and outreach efforts. A draft of the Master Plan, which took into account public comment received since its release on September 10, 2021, was submitted to the board for review and consideration at a special meeting held on December 16, 2021, at which time additional public comment was received. Based upon this additional public comment, as well as comments made by regents, CMS further modified the Master Plan which has culminated in the document presently before the board.

Dr. Chun summarized the Master Plan and reviewed several key elements including its lack of advocacy for a grand vision of Maunakea development; consideration of scenarios whereby the TMT project does not move forward or the university is replaced in its role of implementing state policy with respect to Maunakea; commitment to a maximum of nine summit astronomy sites after December 31, 2033; and proposal to repurpose facilities located at Hale Pōhaku to support the university’s broader educational and research mission. He stressed that there was no indication that any provision within the Master Plan would trigger an environmental review and noted the
vigorou project review process set forth in the Master Plan stating that it created a best practice model on pre-consultation that regulatory bodies desire. Dr. Chun also outlined the next steps that will be taken should the board approve the Master Plan.

Regent Acoba stated that he would not debate whether or not an EIS was necessary for the Master Plan to proceed forward but expressed his concern with the breadth of factors given consideration with respect to statutory interpretation of this issue. He proceeded to question how the consultant used to develop the Master Plan was chosen and inquired about the consultant’s engagement in the process. Dr. Chun replied that the university’s consultant, Planning Solutions, Inc. (PSI), was chosen partly because of its familiarity with the Master Plan and Maunakea Management Plan. He noted that PSI has previously worked with the administration and is currently engaged in the process through the university’s Office of General Counsel as well as external legal counsel.

Regent Acoba asked for clarification about the compendium of comments received on the Master Plan that was provided to the board noting that the materials appeared to be out of order with emails and other correspondence interspersed with notes and remarks. Jim Hayes, President and Principal Environmental Planner at PSI, explained the methodology used to organize and present the comments received noting that each page of the Master Plan was immediately followed by the comments received for that particular page which may cause the materials to appear to be out of order.

Regent Paloma requested a breakdown of comments received that were specific to the Master Plan as opposed to other issues such as the TMT, Native Hawaiian sovereignty, and colonialism which, while not necessarily germane, may influence future decision-making on this issue. Dr. Chun replied that it is common to receive statements and comments on the fundamental issue of injustice whenever outreach is conducted on issues involving Maunakea and stated that more detailed information on the breakdown of comments received could be provided by PSI since they were responsible for reviewing and compiling this input. Mr. Hayes reviewed the process for receiving input on the Master Plan stating that comments received were fairly evenly divided between those applicable to the Plan itself and those related to issues beyond the scope of the Plan, including larger policy matters that are outside of the university’s purview.

Vice-Chair Nahale-a espoused the importance of community engagement but stated that this issue is complex. While he lauded the efforts of the administration in this matter, he also noted the inherent difficulty of this activity stating that there is no best practice or road map to follow when trying to determine the sufficiency of community engagement. He also expressed his concerns with respect to the absence of a Master Plan as opposed to having a Plan that was imperfect but could be built upon and amended to increase accountability and improve stewardship efforts. Vice-Chair Nahale-a asked if there would be consequences for delaying action on the Master Plan and whether the university would feel confident in conducting more community engagement if requested to do so. Chancellor Irwin replied that failure to approve a Master Plan in a timely manner will impact the future of astronomy on Maunakea because funding for facilities and research activities is provided on a long horizon. She also stated that the university will continue to struggle with the modality of community
engagement on this issue noting the limitations on this engagement due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Chancellor Irwin agreed with Vice-Chair Nahale-a that having a Master Plan in place that could be improved upon was better than not having a Plan in place; reiterated that the university has attempted and continues to try to balance the interests of all parties with respect to the Master Plan; and opined that there is greater interest in the outcome of the work being conducted to update the CMP which, in essence, is a representation of the State’s management plan for Maunakea and touches upon previously mentioned policy matters that are of concern to the public.

Discussions occurred on the possibility of eventually incorporating some of the findings of the MKWG into the Master Plan in the future; expanding the membership of the Mauna Kea Management Board to capture a broader range of the community’s thoughts and concerns as they relate to Maunakea; and ideas on improving community engagement in the future.

Regent Paloma remarked that the complexity of this issue and the discussions taking place reinforced the notion that the board be allowed to conduct a retreat so that members are afforded the opportunity to further delve into a topic and thus allow for more informed decision-making.

Chair Moore asked about the position of the 2000 Master Plan regarding the addition of another telescope on Maunakea that has since become TMT. Dr. Chun replied that the 2000 Master Plan contemplated the addition of what was then referred to as the next-generation large telescope and identified the location for this telescope which is the present site for the possible location of TMT.

Referencing the current draft of the Master Plan, Chair Moore inquired as to whether his understanding was correct that there will be four fewer telescopes on Maunakea by 2033. Dr. Chun replied that there are currently 13 observatories in existence on Maunakea. The proposed Master Plan calls for the decommissioning of four telescopes, two of which are presently in the process of being decommissioned. If TMT is constructed, decommissioning of an additional telescope will need to occur. He reiterated that the Master Plan commits the university to a maximum of nine observatories on Maunakea by 2033.

Vice-Chair Nahale-a conveyed his belief that the Master Plan will not remedy historical issues or completely address best management practices with respect to Maunakea, expressed his hope that fruitful conversations on these matters will continue to take place, and moved to approve the Master Plan. The motion was seconded by Regent Wilson.

Chair Moore remarked that Maunakea has been the most difficult and challenging topic undertaken by the board throughout his tenure as a regent stating that, in some ways, Maunakea has become a symbol for the injustices that have occurred among the Native Hawaiian community in the past. Neither the Master Plan, nor actions on the telescopes, will truly resolve these issues. They will only be resolved through wholehearted community efforts. He also stated that the issue of the university’s role as an indigenous serving institution and its relationship to the Native Hawaiian community
is an issue of importance to regents as it was one of the foremost concerns expressed in the survey conducted about retreat topics.

Regent Haning commented that, during his short tenure on the board, he has come to realize that the board is a contemplative body, takes its charge seriously, and will support the motion.

Regent Westerman expressed his support for the motion underscoring sentiments already expressed that approving an imperfect Master Plan that is subject to change is a better alternative than not having a Plan in place.

There having been a motion that was made and seconded, and noting the no vote of Regent Paloma, and the excused absences of Vice-Chair Kudo, Regent Acopan, and Regent Bal, the motion carried with all other members present voting in the affirmative.

Regent Higaki left at 5:17 p.m.

G. **Comprehensive Plan to Achieve a Reimagined University of Hawai‘i (Reimagining Plan)**

President Lassner provided context to the development of the Reimagining Plan stating that the impetus for this initiative was the COVID-19 pandemic which brought to light many of the fiscal and resource challenges faced by the university while underscoring its role in promoting a vibrant, sustainable, and globally competitive Hawai‘i. The Reimagining Plan is intended to work in concert with the university’s Strategic Plan to reposition the university and improve its resiliency through an integrated approach that focuses on reshaping the university through structural rebalancing and programmatic changes. The administration believes that this arrangement will allow the university to continue to carry out its core educational mission while confronting long-term fiscal challenges to improve resiliency in the face of economic fluctuations.

President Lassner reviewed several lessons learned during the pandemic; highlighted priorities that are critical to achieving the economic recovery goals of both the State and the university; noted actions that can be taken to achieve these priorities and improve the university’s viability; and provided an overview of the concept of UHunited which conveys the importance of the university working together as a more tightly knit and unified system while maintaining the unique characteristics of each of its units. He also spoke about the overall vision of the university and presented specifics on the administration’s preliminary path forward towards meeting its post-pandemic planning goals stating that many of the strategies, ideas, and decisions being contemplated are driven by data analysis. Several key elements of the post-pandemic vision for the university were reviewed including initiatives to improve academic programming so as to engage more Hawai‘i residents in post-secondary education; enhance workforce development; advance the economic diversification of the State through strategic investments in high-need academic programming; and strengthen the university’s research enterprise as a major economic driver and driver of intellectual innovation. An overview of the fiscal realities and programmatic challenges currently
facing the university was also provided, along with a summary of actions being taken, as well as additional opportunities available, to address these challenges.

While online learning will not replace in-person education in the next decade, it will substantially increase in importance and the university must be prepared to adapt to this change. President Lassner reviewed the benefits of a hybridized environment in which work and learning occur both online and in-person, some of which were experienced during the pandemic, and discussed the administration’s strategy and priorities for post-pandemic online learning.

Citing a request made by Regent Nahale-a during the board’s initial discussions on the Reimagining Plan, President Lassner shared some of the administration’s preliminary ideas for the university to achieve model indigenous serving institution status and embrace its role in improving Hawai‘i’s relationship with the Native Hawaiian community.

Provost Bruno, Chancellor Irwin, Chancellor Benham, and VP Lacro presented reports on post-pandemic work currently underway at UHM, UHH, UHWO, and the community colleges. Each provided details on the strategic changes, investments, and other actions being undertaken in their respective units that will support a thriving and sustainable future for the university. Some of the activities that have been embarked on include efforts to better align resources to post-pandemic priorities; reorganize and merge programs to reduce silos and foster collaboration; update programs to engage more students who are considering a post-secondary education; revise curricula to meet student needs; develop new programs that increase workforce development in high-demand areas; implement initiatives to better prepare students for careers in Hawai‘i through internships and partnerships; centralize some administrative services to enhance efficiency; create indicators to determine achievement of strategic imperatives; and improve resource sharing to better serve the university’s students as well as the community. It was noted that the processes used by each unit to develop its strategic goals and priorities included intensive campus conversations, planning meetings, open forums, and numerous discussions involving all university stakeholders.

President Lassner spoke about the future direction of the university, reviewed a timeline for the development of a new strategic plan, and provided examples of what the administration would consider successful attainment of its post-pandemic goals.

Regent Wilson emphasized the need to include educational programming in data analytics as part of the future vision of the university stressing that important decisions on both a global and local level are data driven and having the ability to collect, analyze, and correctly utilize data is an important life skill.

Regent Westerman commended the work of the administration on this issue but expressed his desire to hear a succinct vision for a post-pandemic university. President Lassner stated that, while elements of the post-pandemic vision for the university were laid out throughout the presentation, he has experienced difficulty in boiling this down to a single brief concept but will continue to work on this issue.
Regent Nahale-a stated his appreciation for the tremendous amount of work done on the Reimagining Plan but opined that it still lacked a clearly communicable focus for the university. He cited the Charter of Arizona State University (ASU) as an example of a concise vision that spotlights what ASU wants to accomplish and how this will be achieved.

Regent Wilson echoed the sentiments expressed by Regent Nahale-a stating his belief that having a concise, aspirational vision and expanding upon that vision will allow the university to thrive.

I. **Review of Regent Survey of Possible Retreat and Board Education and Development Topics**

Chair Moore summarized discussions that took place during a meeting of the Committee on Personnel Affairs and Board Governance on December 2, 2021, with respect to holding a board retreat noting that the consensus of regents was to conduct a retreat as soon as practical. He stated that a list of 30 topics of interest that were identified by regents as possible items for discussion at a retreat was distributed and that each regent was requested to rank the priority of these topics based upon personal preference. A compilation of the results of this survey is contained within the materials packet.

The Board Office is currently seeking the services of a facilitator to conduct the retreat and will be contacting regents to inquire about availability. Chair Moore expressed his hope that an in-person retreat could take place and stated his belief that it should be held at a location outside of the UHM campus.

Regent Acoba stated that it was his understanding that the board had already made a commitment to discuss issues regarding committee structure at a retreat and, as such, opined that this matter should be placed on a retreat agenda regardless of its ranking in the priority list.

Discussions ensued on Regent Acoba’s comments in relation to the contents of a retreat agenda.

Chair Moore expressed his belief that a retreat agenda should contain several issues. He suggested that the Board Office be directed to contact regents regarding the inclusion of the matter dealing with committee structure on an agenda, irrespective of ranking, and that board leadership be tasked with drafting a proposed agenda for consideration by regents. Regent Acoba reiterated his belief that the matter of amending the committee structure should be placed on the agenda regardless of ranking because a commitment had already been made.

Regent Higaki returned at 5:48 p.m.

Vice-Chair Nahale-a concurred with Regent Acoba’s recollection, supported the suggestion made by Chair Moore to prepare a draft retreat agenda for review by board leadership, and noted his inclination for inclusion of committee restructuring as an
agenda item. Regent Acoba stated that he would entrust this decision to board leadership.

VII. **EXECUTIVE SESSION (closed to the public)**

Chair Moore announced that it would not be necessary to meet in executive session.

VIII. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Moore announced that the next board meeting was scheduled for February 17, 2022, at a location to be determined.

IX. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair Moore adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

/S/

Kendra Oishi
Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board of Regents