MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE UH HILO STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: April 27th, 2011
Time: 8-10am
Location: Private Dining Room, Campus Center, UH Hilo

Attendees:

Thora Abarca     Gail Makuakane-Lundin
Kainoa Ariola    Barry Mark
Kelly Burke (chair) Siân Millard (notes)
Jim Cromwell     Marcia Sakai
Dec Drozario     Elizabeth Stacy
Maria Haws       Pila Wilson
Mazen Hamad      Harry Yada
Jackie Johnson   Errol Yudko

Apologies:

Tracey Niimi
Karen Pellegrin

1 | Announcements/Questions from Stakeholders

Thora reported that one of her colleagues asked if the strategic plan would be implemented. The committee confirmed that the Chancellor's intention is to ensure implementation of the plan.

Kelly reported that he and Marcia had met with representatives of the diversity committee last week. The feedback is provided under item 4.

2 | Minutes of the 23rd SPC meeting (54/11)

There were no additions or amendments to the minutes of the twenty-first meeting. The minutes were therefore approved.

3 | Consultation Interim Report (55/11)

Siân introduced this item and explained that its purpose was to continue to go through the issues raised from the consultation. Issues 1-8 remained for the committee to discuss and they addressed issues 1-4 at the meeting. A summary of the decisions made against these issues is given below:

Issue 1: Whether or not to make specific reference to the Asia-Pacific region in the strategic plan

Several respondents to the consultation raised concern that ‘Asia-Pacific’ was not specifically referenced in the strategic plan. The committee noted that UH Hilo previous strategic plan for 2002-2010 did make special reference to this region. The committee also agreed that UH Hilo, and the Island and State of Hawaii has a unique link to the Asia-Pacific region and therefore agreed to make reference to the ‘Asia-Pacific’ region in an appropriate part of the strategic plan. The committee further agreed to not make specific reference to ‘Asia-Pacific’ in the mission statement as it is too narrow, but instead to identify an appropriate place to
reference Asia-Pacific within the strategic plan.

**Action 1: Drafting subcommittee** to determine appropriate place to refer to Asia-Pacific in the strategic plan.

**Issue 2: The draft strategic plan makes good reference to Hawaiian culture but it doesn’t explicitly refer to the special responsibility the university has, as set out in the UH System mission, to serve the Native Hawaiian population**

The committee **agreed** that reference to UH Hilo’s special obligation to serve the indigenous peoples of Hawaii should be made in the strategic plan under the ‘who we are’ section.

**Action 2: Drafting subcommittee** to draft wording that addresses UH Hilo’s service to Native Hawaiian people as per the UH System mission.

**Issue 3: Should greater emphasis be placed on distance learning/educational technologies in the strategic plan?**

The committee **noted** that reference to distance learning and/or educational technologies is currently made in the strategic plan and that its level of emphasis was appropriate. They did however **agree** that reference to ensuring technological support for distance learning is part of a relevant goal. They also agreed that distance learning should be referenced as the first example in action 1.5 on supporting non-traditional and underserved populations.

**Action 3: Drafting subcommittee** to ensure that reference is made to ensure technological support for distance learning in a relevant part of the strategic plan.

**Issue 4: In the vision statement, do we really mean ‘every student’? To students, this part of the vision came across as a type of mandatory assignment that they would have to do and felt that the onus was on them.**

The committee **agreed** to retain ‘every student’, confirming their response to the original draft mission and vision consultation that they wish to retain a strong stance on this term. The committee did however recognize that as currently phrased it could be seen as a mandatory assignment for students. The committee therefore **agreed** to reverse the wording of the second sentence of the vision statement to read ‘We will engage every student in…’ instead of ‘Every student will engage in…’ This makes it clear that it is the university’s responsibility to provide applied scholarship experiences for students.

The committee will attend to remaining issues 5-8 at their next meeting.

**4 Discussion of multiculturalism/diversity and Hawaiian identity concepts**

The purpose of this item was to discuss the various feedback the committee has received on goal 4 – diversity/multiculturalism and a Hawaiian identity. The committee held this dedicated discussion given strong feelings some respondents to the consultation reported.

Kelly provided feedback from his and Marcia’s meeting with the diversity committee representatives. He reported that the diversity committee felt that the goal and actions does not reflect diversity and implies exclusion. They were concerned about the term ‘Hawaiian university’ within this goal as it seemed to imply a focus on Native Hawaiian culture and implicitly reference a relationship to the recent ‘Hawaiian language university within a university’ idea. As a result, goal 4 in general seemed to be exclusionary rather than inclusive. The meaning of ‘Hawaiian university’ therefore requires clarification.

Dee provided feedback from some of her student peers and also referenced that they felt the term ‘Hawaiian university’ was exclusive and too specific. She suggested that some potential students from off-island could be ‘put-off’ from coming to UH Hilo because of a perceived exclusionary focus on one culture. Dee noted that the goal should be more nationally and internationally open, and suggested that one of the ways to bring in the Hawaiian component would be to have a Hawaiian language requirement in general education.

Pila noted that all colleagues he had spoken to were supportive of goal 4.
Gail provided the perspective from Hanakahi Council and stated that the Council was supportive of the original goal 4 and strongly supported reference to a ‘Hawaiian university’ to celebrate the host culture and uniqueness of Hawaii island.

The committee then had a discussion about what a ‘Hawaiian university’ would look like. They agreed that it is broader than just ethnicity and would encompass and reflect all aspects of place in terms of the culture, people, history and natural environment of Hawaii. It would be a reflection of our location and cultures, with the indigenous culture as the historical base. Specific examples that would reflect a ‘Hawaiian university’, some of which already exist on campus, are:

- That many people wear ‘aloha’ shirts/dress
- Lei’s are presented at official ceremonies and as greetings
- Encouraging faculty to reflect Hawaiian perspectives and concepts. This could be achieved by holding seminars that teach faculty how they could infuse Hawaiian perspectives into their curricula so that they can choose what changes, if any, to make. Such an action may need to be rewarded/supported eg. through release time to work on curriculum review.
- Running basic foundational courses to help people learn about the history and cultures of Hawaii. Curricula to reflect Hawaii. – Hawaiian perspectives, concepts, and natural environment. Basic foundational courses. Faculty and staff more knowledgeable about the host culture.
- The landscaping of the campus could reflect plants native to Hawaii.
- Our buildings could better reflect Hawaii.
- Managing with aloha (reference to a book that teaches management in Hawaii)

The committee noted the university’s fundamental responsibility to serve the Native Hawaiian people, as set out in the UH System mission. They therefore agreed that reference to this special responsibility should be made up front in the ‘who we are’ section of the plan.

**Action 3: Drafting subcommittee** to draft reference to unique responsibility to serve the Native Hawaiian population.

There are some dedicated services for Native Hawaiian students and they are perceived to be by some as exclusionary. The reality may be different but nonetheless the perception remains which needs to be addressed.

The committee agreed that the goal should be redrafted to paint a picture of inclusion, with ‘Hawaiianess’, in its broadest possible sense, as the historical base. The committee also noted that it would be useful to include the entire university in a conversation about what a ‘Hawaiian university’ means and how it can be achieved.

Other points made regarding the term ‘Hawaiian university’ and its implication included:

- The focus should be more on what we will do rather than the label.
- We may be trying to be too ambitious in seeking address a ‘Hawaiian university’ in just one goal. There is potential for embedding Hawaiian perspectives/reflecting Hawaii in every goal (e.g as is currently in goal by giving buildings Hawaiian names).

The committee acknowledged that while participants in the strategic planning consultations did not necessarily refer to a Hawaiian university, comments about the strengths of UH Hilo in regards to our location, ‘Hawaiianess’ and culture were prevalent.

The committee noted that diversity is a big part of our university. There is a microcosm of cultures that helps to prepare students to go out into the world – the idea of multicultural fluency. Members agreed that concept may have been lost in the wording of the draft strategic plan. Members noted that the challenge is to
describe a model of inclusiveness and openness that is based on Hawaiian culture.

Following this detailed discussion, the committee voted on two fundamental questions that would inform the direction of redrafting for the goal:

Vote 1: Committee members were asked to raise their hand if they agreed that the concept of reflecting Hawaii (in terms of the people, culture, history and natural environment of Hawaii) should be made in the strategic plan.

Result: Unanimous YES – Hawaii should be reflected in the strategic plan

Vote 2: Committee members were asked to raise their hand if they agreed that the term ‘Hawaiian university’ should remain in the strategic plan so long as it was accompanied by a clear definition.

Result: 11 YES, 3 NO – Hawaiian university term with appropriate definition to be drafted.

In relation to vote 2, members agreed that they may vote again on the definition of the term ‘Hawaiian university’ to determine if it would clear enough to reference in the strategic plan. Without a clear definition the committee would likely remove the term from the plan entirely.

In terms of structure, the committee reaffirmed that they would like to keep diversity/multiculturalism and Hawaiian identity as one integrated goal.

Members then agreed to task a subgroup to work on goal 4 and bring a revised version back to the full committee for discussion at the next meeting. Siân, María, Pila and Jim will meet to redraft the goal. [Post-meeting note: Kainoa and Kelly also joined the subgroup to help in the redrafting].

Action 4: Subgroup for goal 4 to redraft goal based on committee’s discussions and send to full SPC for review and discussion at the next meeting.

5 Summary of actions and close

Siân confirmed that key actions and decisions that had been made at the meeting and reminded members that the next meeting is on Monday May 2nd, 8-10am in the Private Dining Room. Siân thanked members for their time and considered input and closed the meeting.