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

Date: May 2nd, 2011
Time: 8-10am
Location: Private Dining Room, Campus Center, UH Hilo

Attendees: Thora Abarca  Siân Millard (notes)
Kelly Burke (chair)  Marcia Sakai
Jim Cromwell  Elizabeth Stacy
Mazen Hamad  Harry Yada
Barry Mark  Errol Yudko

Apologies: Kainoa Ariola
Dec Drozario
Maria Haws
Jackie Johnson
Gail Makuakane-Lundin
Tracey Niimi
Karen Pellegrin
Pila Wilson

1. Announcements/Questions from Stakeholders

Kelly highlighted that depending on the outcome of today’s meeting that the committee may need an additional meeting to finalize the strategic plan before it goes for endorsement next week. This would be agreed at the end of the meeting (see item 4 below).

Kelly reminded members that they still have the task of prioritizing the actions into two levels as requested by the Chancellor. Members noted that they would be asked to complete an electronic ranking form for each goal – this will be from Wednesday this week (May 4th). Kelly highlighted that instructions will be provided for the ranking and that members will be asked to rank each action taking into account three issues:

1. Its impact on the goal
2. Its cross-cutting impact across the university
3. How strongly it supports graduation success

Kelly asked members to start thinking about prioritization of the actions on this basis.

In terms of general feedback from stakeholders, it was noted that some students have started a petition to try to gain support for developing a pub on campus. It was noted that this related to the action on gathering places in Goal 3, and further noted that UH Hilo is currently a “dry” campus so should that effort be
successful changes to current policies would be required.

2 Minutes of the 24th SPC meeting (56/11)

The minutes were approved subject to removing the unfinished sentence under item 1.

3 Latest Draft Strategic Plan for Review (57/11)

There were four purposes to this paper: (1) address the remaining issues from the consultation (issues 5-8), (2) review the suggestion to refer to the concept of a Hawaiian university under the ‘who we are’ section, (3) review the redrafted version of Goal 4 (diversity, multiculturalism), and (4) review all other areas of the strategic plan – particularly the actions for each goal. The committee attended to the first three of these and the outcomes of the discussion are summarized below:

(1) Remaining Issues 5-8 from Consultation

Issue 5 – whether to replace the word scholarship

The issue with the term ‘scholarship’ was that some people had interpreted it as financial scholarships. The committee acknowledged that there is ambiguity in the term because it can be applied to different meanings. The committee discussed whether to replace the term ‘scholarship’ with the term ‘learning’. They noted that learning may have a broader application but that scholarship refers to one of the highest levels of learning which is consistent with the message in strategic plan to try to ‘raise the bar’. Scholarship also complements and reinforces use of the phrase ‘student scholars’ in the vision statement. The committee therefore agreed to retain the term ‘scholarship’ with a relevant definition of the term (see also below).

Issue 6 – do we mean to focus on ‘applied’ scholarship?

The committee agreed that the focus is on ‘applied’ scholarship but also acknowledged that there is some potential ambiguity over what ‘applied’ means. The committee therefore also agreed that the term ‘applied’ should be defined in the context of the entire ‘applied scholarship’ phrase. Elizabeth and Errol volunteered to develop a definition for the term and report back at the next SPC meeting on Wednesday May 4th.

Action 1: Elizabeth and Errol to work up definition for ‘applied scholarship’ by Wednesday May 4th SPC meeting.

Issue 7: should we retain the second sentence of the vision statement?

In light of the above discussion, the committee agreed to retain the second sentence of the vision statement.

Issue 8: should we retain reference to the connection to Hawaii in the second sentence?

The issue raised from the consultation was that the wording of this part of the vision statement implied that students’ applied experiences should only be relevant to Hawai‘i. This was not a universal view but nonetheless was an important issue to revisit. The committee acknowledged that the way in which the sentence is currently structured lends itself to some level of misinterpretation. The committee reminded themselves that the reason why connection to the community was important was because it references the unique multicultural and geographic environment within which student study and therefore enhances their learning. This was seen as giving UH Hilo students an advantage over their peers. The spirit of this second sentence therefore ties back to goal 4 on diversity and multiculturalism. It also relates to the idea of Hawaii as a living laboratory and microcosm of the world because of its many cultures.

The committee recognized that it is late in the process to make further changes to the mission and vision statements. They did however note the issues raised with the second sentence of the vision statement and agreed to redraft it based on the discussion above. If the redrafting was unsuccessful, the committee agreed to retain the wording as it.

Action 2: Siân to revise second sentence of vision statement for review at May 4th SPC meeting. If no agreed reached on redraft, committee is to retain current wording.
In further relation to the vision, the committee briefly discussed whether the term ‘acclaimed’ is appropriate in the vision statement. Members agreed that ‘acclaimed’ was used in place of ‘what we will be known for’ and it sets a bar for where the university is aiming for. Members therefore agreed to retain the term ‘acclaimed’ in the vision statement.

(2) Concept of a Hawaiian University under ‘Who we are’

The committee reviewed and discussed the suggestion to define and refer to the concept of a Hawaiian university under the ‘who we are’ section to make it clearer that we are not just referring to ethnicity. Members agreed with this proposal, noting that it more clearly defines the concept of a ‘Hawaiian university’, and suggested revised wording for the second sentence of the paragraph from:

‘As a member of the University of Hawaii System, we embrace our unique responsibility to serve the indigenous people of Hawai’i and to Hawai’i’s indigenous language and culture.’

to:

‘As the world leader in Hawaiian language and indigenous culture revitalization, we embrace our responsibility to serve the indigenous people of Hawai’i and to Hawai’i’s indigenous language and culture.’

The revision was suggested to try to highlight UH Hilo’s strong position in Hawaiian language revitalization. Members noted that in making this reference that it is the only area in the strategic plan where reference to a unit or particular program strength is made. Members further agreed that this revised wording should be run passed Gail and Pila for their views.

Action 3: Siân ask Pila and Gail for their views on proposed new wording for second sentence of last paragraph under ‘who we are’.

(3) Review the redrafted version of Goal 4 (diversity, multiculturalism)

The committee was invited to make comments on the revised version of Goal 4. Below is a summary of the discussion and outcomes:

- Ordering: The goal blurb refers to diversity first, then rooting our identity in Hawai’i, whereas the actions state with Hawaiian identity first (action 5.1-5.2) and then move onto the broader concept of diversity and multiculturalism (actions 5.3-5.5). The ordering will need to be resolved once the prioritization has taken place.

- Goal blurb:
  - The second sentence starting ‘we appreciate diversity in our students...’ is redundant following the first sentence. Second sentence removed.
  - The third sentence starting ‘we seek to cultivate an inclusive...’ may also be redundant. If this sentence is removed it would be useful to keep the last part ‘challenge all of us to learn and grow’.
  - Last sentence in goal blurb seems a little out of place and reads like an add-on. The committee agreed to the take the last sentence in the paragraph (starting ‘we embrace our responsibilities to the indigenous...’) and integrate it further up in the blurb.

  **Action 4: Siân** to revise goal blurb as stated in sub-bullets above.

- Action 4.2:
  - Is there a more appropriate word that ‘structure’? Perhaps model?

  **Action 5: Siân** to ask Pila if there is a more appropriate word to ‘structure’ for use in this action.

Members also agreed to remove the last part of this action that reads ‘to benefit the university and broader community’ as that statement could be said of every action. Last part of action
Action 4.5:
  - The committee agreed to revise this action so that it is more output driven in terms of how diversity can support student success.

**Action 6: Siân** to revise action 4.5 to reflect committee’s above discussion.

4 Summary of actions and close

Siân explained that the committee would need a further meeting in this week to continue to make final adjustments to the strategic plan before it goes for endorsement in the week commencing May 9th. Siân emphasized that this would be the last meeting that the committee has to make substantive changes to the content of the strategic plan so it is important that members carefully review the plan, note any areas that require further clarification, and make suggestions for how areas could be improved.

The additional meeting will be held **Wednesday May 4th, 8-10am** in the **Private Dining Room**.