



**SCR51**

University of Hawai'i  
**Regents Candidate Advisory Council**

Roy Takeyama, Chair  
Karl Fujii, Vice Chair  
Dr. L. Thomas Ramsey, Secretary  
Nelson Befitel, Member  
Neil Bellinger, Member  
Frank Boas, Member  
Ginger Takeshita, Member

**TESTIMONY TO THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION  
IN OPPOSITION OF PROPOSED S.C.R. No. 51, S.D. 1**

April 9, 2009  
1:15 p.m., State Capitol, Conference Room 225

Chairman Tokuda, Vice Chair Sakamoto and Members of the Senate Committee on Higher Education:

We strongly disagree with S.C.R. No. 51, S.D. 1, "urging the Candidate Advisory Council for the Board of Regents to convene a working group of students to develop and implement a modified process for the selection of the candidates for the student member of the Board of Regents."

Under the existing law, any student can file for the student seat and the Regents Candidate Advisory Council (RCAC) must consider that completed application. The RCAC cannot select only from the list that the student council recommends. However, the various campus student organizations can encourage and recruit students to file their nominations with the RCAC and submit their letters of support with the applications which the RCAC will consider.

We, therefore, request that the resolution be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



Roy Y. Takeyama, Chairman  
Regents Candidate Advisory Council

# **ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE *LATE*** **UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII**

---

**HONOLULU COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**Contact (808) 845-9268 / Email: [asuh@hcc.hawaii.edu](mailto:asuh@hcc.hawaii.edu)**

## **Testimony in Strong Support of S.C.R. No. 51, S.D. 1**

**TO:** Honorable Senator Jill Tokuda, Chair,  
Committee on Higher Education

**TESTIFIER:** Joseph Lewis, President  
ASUH Student Senate  
Honolulu Community College

**DATE:** Thursday, April 9, 2009

**HEARING:** Senate Bill 884

---

,  
Aloha Chair Tokuda and Honorable Committee Members:

The purpose of placing a Student Regent on the Board of Regents is to ensure that concerns of the Students of the University of Hawaii are addressed at the highest level of university governance.

Providing Students this opportunity will:

- 1) Mitigate concerns raised after the selection process
- 2) Promote a fair and balanced selection process
- 3) Give applicants an understanding of what students are looking for in their regent

Our student communities face serious economic times; we need to ensure our regent represents our interest.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Lewis  
President ASUH-HCC

**TESTIMONY PRESENTED BEFORE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

By  
Dr. Jan Minoru Javinar

**S.C.R. 51, SD1 URGING THE BOARD OF REGENTS CANDIDATE ADVISORY COUNCIL TO CONVENE A WORKING GROUP OF STUDENTS TO DEVELOP & IMPLEMENT A MODIFIED PROCESS FOR SELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR THE STUDENT MEMBER OF THE BOARD**

Chair Tokuda and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify on SCR 51, SD1. Although I am currently an employee of the University, I am not offering official testimony on behalf of the University. Rather, this serves as my personal testimony as a private citizen. From 1995 to 2003, I served as the University staff advisor to the University of Hawaii Student Caucus and was involved with the efforts to add the voting student member to the University Board of Regents back in spring 1997. I wish to express my wholehearted support of the resolution's intent and offer three overall comments followed by some substantive amendments to the resolution's content.

First, in the sixth Whereas clause, it is asserted that "the student member is the only member of the Board of Regents who represents a specific constituency." When your predecessors in the 1971 session of the State Legislature adopted Act 143 which added two seats to the then nine-member Board of Regents, the standing committee report expressed that these two additional seats with shortened two-year terms, would be appropriate for individuals from "both ends of the age scale" and would provide an opportunity for a young person, such as a recent alumnus to be appointed. While Act 143 did not include language providing for specific membership of a student on the Board of Regents, the standing committee report declared that "...no member of the Board, regardless of age or occupation, should be representative of a faction or a constituency."

I don't believe it is your Committee's intent to render the student member on the Board of Regents organizationally impotent by imposing upon this Regent roles, responsibilities, and expectations that your Committee would not hold of the other fourteen Regents, yet, the sixth and seventh Whereas clauses do just that. The message is conveyed that it is solely the responsibility of

the student member of the Board to represent and advocate for the needs and interests of the students. This would require the student member of the Board to “check in” with her or his constituents each time an issue or concern arose, and each time a decision needed to be made. Given the student member’s manifold obligations as a matriculating student, possible company employee, and a responsible family member, it would be difficult, if not impossible and perhaps, impractical, for any potential appointee to the student member seat on the Board to fulfill this requirement of answering to her or his constituency on a consistent and responsive basis. *For this reason, I would suggest that the sixth and seventh Whereas clauses be eliminated from the resolution and that the eighth Whereas clause be amended to read (following Ramseyer format):*

***“WHEREAS, [as a result,] the role of the student member of the Board of Regents is [doubly] challenging and may require additional considerations in selecting candidates for the student member; now, therefore,”***

Second, the first BE IT RESOLVED clause calls for the establishment of a “working group of students” to come up with a modified selection process for candidates for the student member of the Board. In order that this working group and the Regents Candidate Advisory Council may benefit from the experiences of individuals who are familiar with the history, intent, and goals of the movement to include a voting student member on the Board of Regents, I would *recommend that the working group not be limited to students and propose that the first BE IT RESOLVED clause be amended to read (following Ramseyer format):*

***“BE IT RESOLVED by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2009, the House of Representatives concurring, that the Candidate Advisory Council for the Board of Regents is urged to convene a working group of students and other appropriate parties to develop and implement a modified process for the selection of the candidates for the student member of the University of Hawaii Board of Regents; and”***

Finally, the third BE IT RESOLVED clause establishes a composition for the working group. There may be redundancy in the identification of the various working group members. For example, the working group is proposed to include “representatives from each campus” as well as the University

of Hawaii Student Caucus. The Student Caucus includes an equal number of voting delegates from all of the officially recognized campus student governments. Additionally, it is unclear as to which organization the “Associated Students of the University of Hawaii” refers. For the Manoa campus, ASUH is the undergraduate student government, yet Manoa also has a graduate student government. The term, ASUH, is also used by a number of other campuses to refer to its campus student government (e.g. ASUH-Honolulu CC, ASUH-Windward CC, etc.). Regardless, all campus student governments are represented on the UH Student Caucus. *To clarify the working group’s composition, I suggest that the third BE IT RESOLVED clause be amended to read (following Ramseyer format):*

***“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the working group include [representatives from each campus,] the University of Hawaii Student Caucus, [the Associated Students of the University of Hawaii], the Associate Vice President of Student Affairs for the University of Hawaii System, student life staff advisors from the various campuses, and other [student organizations] appropriate parties as may be appropriate; and”***

Thank you again for this opportunity to provide testimony on S.C.R. 51, SD1.