



**University of Hawaii**  
**Advisory Task Group on Operational and**  
**Financial Controls Improvement**

May 14, 2013

Mr. James H.Q. Lee, Chair  
Committee on University Audits  
2444 Dole Street, Bachman Hall 209  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dear Chair Lee:

The Advisory Task Group on Operational and Financial Controls Improvement (“ATG”) is pleased to submit its Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations. This report is the result of research conducted on leading practices at various universities with similar issues as the University of Hawaii.

The research included reviewing applicable statutes, university policies and organization charts, and interviews with selected university presidents. The purpose of the report is to provide information to the Board of Regents (“BOR”) for its review and use. The ATG undertook this research at the request of the BOR when it approved our scope of work for this portion of its work. The report does not make recommendations, but does include the ATG’s comments on the legislation.

This report is prepared as part of the ATG’s current Operational Assessment of University’s System Level operations. A draft of this report was released to the Committee on University Audits April 17, 2013 for its review and feedback. Issuance of this report was delayed by the ATG because of the need to shift its focus and emphasis to other aspects of the project. The ATG has made some changes after receiving the feedback and is now releasing the report in final form.

The Legislature has since adjourned and two bills (HB 114 and SB 1388) discussed in this report were approved by the Legislature and are awaiting the Governor’s signature. HB 114 as passed is essentially the same as the version discussed in the report and the comments in the report still apply. The same holds true for SB 1388.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lawrence D. Rodriguez".

Lawrence D. Rodriguez  
Chair, ATG



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

### BACKGROUND

---

On September 5, 2012, the University of Hawaii System (“University”) Board of Regents (“BOR”) approved the formation of an Advisory Task Group on Operational and Financial Controls Improvement (“ATG”) to assist the BOR with its oversight of the University’s actions and improvements to policies, internal controls, and practices. The purpose and primary function of the ATG is to oversee, provide input, monitor activities, and guide the scope of an evaluation and improvement initiative specific to operational and financial processes and related internal controls of the University. The ATG reports to the BOR’s Committee on University Audits.

The ATG is comprised of seven members, three members from the BOR, and four from private industry with expertise in financial processes and organizational structure and internal controls. The members of the ATG are:

- James H.Q. Lee, Vice Chair, Board of Regents
- Barry Mizuno, Regent
- Saedene Ota, Regent
- Terri Fujii, Office Managing Partner, Honolulu Office of Ernst & Young LLP
- Cory Kubota, Assurance Principal, Accuity LLP
- Patrick Oki, Managing Partner, PKF Pacific Hawaii LLP
- Lawrence D. Rodriguez, Business Consultant, ATG Chair

The ATG’s first effort was to evaluate the operational and financial processes associated with the planned Stevie Wonder Concert. It issued its report to the Committee on University Audits on November 15, 2012. With the completion of its first task, the ATG has moved on to its second task, and is now conducting an Operational Assessment at the System Level of the University. For purposes of the assessment, “System Level” is defined as the Board of Regents and its direct reports and the University President and her direct reports.

The scope of work for this Operational Assessment includes a review of the laws, rules, and regulations governing the University’s operations; Board and Executive policies, practices, roles and responsibilities; and System Level delegations of authority. It also includes research on leading practices that combines reviews of published papers from organizations knowledgeable about university governance issues with reviews of existing organizational structures and statutes applicable to a number of other states’ universities. Additionally, the ATG is interviewing the Regents, key legislators and other government officials, and University System Level management. Interviews are being conducted in confidence as the purpose is to gain a better understanding of underlying themes and issues. We have also conducted interviews with presidents and/or obtained information from over 30 U.S. universities and land grant institutions. The information and perspectives obtained have been factored into this report, and will be used, as appropriate, in future reports to be issued by the ATG.



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

Legislation has been introduced in the 2013 Legislative Session that would impact System Level operational and financial processes of the University and, therefore, could affect the Operational Assessment being conducted by the ATG. The ATG has been asked to include in its scope of work a review of that legislation, specifically to identify, based on the research conducted, whether the legislation is reflective of, or consistent with leading practices in university governance and management. The ATG agreed to review the legislation introduced and provide feedback on those matters that could impact System Level operational and financial processes. The purpose of this report is to provide information that may assist the BOR with its review.

The ATG acknowledges the importance of the Legislature's role in establishing the legal framework for the University. This report is intended to provide the BOR with information on leading practices, defined as practices that are followed by the majority of the universities included in the research, relative to the legislation being considered. The report does not address each section of each piece of legislation, but rather focuses on those issues considered by the ATG to be of more relevance to this Operational Assessment.

It is understood that action taken on this legislation will occur at different times and, in some cases, action on the legislation may be deferred. This draft was approved for release to the Committee on University Audits on April 17, 2013.



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

### SUMMARY OF WORK PERFORMED

---

The ATG obtained a list of 26 bills introduced during the current legislative session that were identified by the University as potentially affecting or impacting its operations. The list also included 26 Resolutions introduced that were identified by the University as resolutions of interest. The list was received on March 19, 2013. Using the Hawaii State Legislature Website, the ATG obtained the most recent version of each bill and resolution at that date. Attached as Appendix A to this report is the ATG's discussion of the resolutions and a brief summary of the resolutions introduced. This section summarizes the work performed on the 26 bills introduced.

Each bill was read to determine if the specific provisions could affect the Operational Assessment of the University at the System Level. Bills that could change the authorities or responsibilities of the BOR or University President were considered to impact the University at the System Level. Examples of changes of responsibilities or authorities include imposition of limits on authorities granted or transfers of authority or responsibilities to another governmental agency. Additionally, bills that could impact the BOR's composition, appointment, or termination were also considered impacting the University at the System Level.

Not considered impacting governance or management at the System Level would be legislation introduced such as adding a new educational program within a school or changes to the funding of programs (e.g., removing General Fund support from a program and requiring that it be fully self-sustaining).

The ATG determined that 19 of the bills introduced did not have a System Level impact. The remaining seven bills contain a number of separate actions or requirements that could impact System Level operations. The seven bills and their requirements are discussed in detail in the following section. A brief description of the impact of each bill is provided here.

- House Bill 115, House Draft 3 which establishes a Campus Planning Facility Board and requires that five percent of gross revenues received by the University be placed into a new special fund for major repairs and replacements;
- Senate Bill 229, Senate Draft 1 which establishes causes for and procedures for impeachment of the Governor and appointed officers which would include the University's Board of Regents;
- Senate Bill 1385, Senate Draft 1 which requires the University's Board of Regents to receive annual training and changes the election date for the Board Chair and Vice-Chairs;
- House Bill 114, House Draft 3 which repeals the University President's authority as chief procurement officer for construction and construction related professional services contracts and establishes an Independent Audit Committee within the Board of Regents, including the requirement that it oversee a Whistleblower-like Program at the University;
- Senate Bill 1388, Senate Draft 2 which removes the University President as the concurrent President of the Research Corporation of the University of Hawaii ("RCUH"), reduces the University's Board of Regents' membership in the Board of Directors of the



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

RCUH, and caps the salary of the RCUH Executive Director at twice the salary of the Governor;

- Senate Bill 1384, Senate Draft 2 which places the office of the University's General Counsel directly under the Board of Regents; and
- Senate Bill 967, Senate Draft 2 which requires the Board of Regents to obtain Legislative approval for proposed salary ranges for all positions for which the proposed salary is at least twice that of the Governor prior to recruiting to fill those positions.

Our research has prompted us to provide certain comments with respect to the legislation introduced. Our comments reflect leading practices as determined from our research. The nature and extent of our research and our comments on each bill are contained in the next section of this Interim Report.



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

### RESULTS OF RESEARCH

---

We obtained the March 19, 2013 version of all 26 bills and read them to obtain an understanding of their impact on the University. We determined that seven of the bills could impact the University at the System Level. We then conducted research to determine if there were position papers, analyses, or other literature addressing each of the bills' sections that could impact System Level operations. We conducted our research from publically available sources and literature obtained directly or on the Internet from:

- The Association of Governing Boards (“AGB”);
- The American Council of Trustees and Alumni (“ACTA”);
- The National Association of College and University Business Officers (“NACUBO”);
- The State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (“SHEEO”); and
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges (“WASC”).

Three of the bills introduced included provisions that affected governance practices for which we could find published literature. Our research provided us with information on leading practices with respect to Board training and having a well-functioning Audit Committee. However, we could find no such literature, with respect to leading practices, for other provisions of bills introduced that could affect the other System Level operations. For example, we could find no specific literature that addressed the General Counsel and whom it should report to (i.e. should it report to the BOR, the President, or both) and the requirement that the University cannot recruit for any position that would have a salary equal to or greater than twice the Governor's salary until the salary for the position had been approved by the Legislature. Our research on these and other operational matters was conducted through a combination of the following:

- Obtaining and reviewing published organization charts of over 30 different universities;
- Obtaining and reviewing statutes governing the procurement responsibilities of 22 of the universities;
- Conducting telephone interviews with the Presidents of seven of the universities; and
- Contacting staff of the AGB for information.

We selected the various universities to review using a number of different criteria. Because of its relative size, we selected universities classified as Manoa Campus peers by the National Center for Education Statistics. We also used geographic dispersion of campuses in state university systems as well as governance similarities (e.g., inclusion of community colleges within a state system).

**SB 1385, SD1** - Requires the UH Board of Regents to undergo annual training on board policies and procedures, Hawaii's sunshine law, Hawaii's open records law, and Hawaii's ethics standards. It also requires each regent to receive certification that the regent successfully completed the training and provides that the certification may include passing a test on the training's subject matter. Additionally, it requires the removal of a regent from the Board if the



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

regent does not meet the annual training requirements more than once during the regent's term. It also requires that the election of the Board Chair and Vice-Chairs take place at the first meeting after June 30 of each year.

The need for training for members of governing boards for institutions of higher education is accepted and advocated by the AGB<sup>1</sup>, ACTA<sup>2</sup>, NACUBO<sup>3</sup>, and SHEEO<sup>4</sup>. Board orientation and training is also required by the University of Hawaii Board of Regents bylaws<sup>5</sup>. Further, the University Presidents we interviewed all agreed as to the necessity of orientation and periodic updates for their governing boards.

We could not find any support for defined statutory educational or training requirements for members of the governing boards. Nor could we find any support for annual certification or testing of board members.

The requirement that the Board of Regents' Chair and Vice-Chairs be elected after June 30 of each year is a change from the current requirement to have the election before June 30 of each year. Since the terms of the Regents end on June 30, those new members whose term begins July 1 are currently precluded from voting for the Chair and Vice-Chair whom they will work with that first year. The effect of this change is to have the Chair and Vice-Chairs elected by Regents with whom they will be working with the entire year of the election.

**ATG Comments** – Training for Board of Regents annually and for new members during initial board orientation is a leading practice in university governance. However, placing detailed educational and certification requirements in statute is not a leading practice and could limit the Board's ability to define, develop, and modify its orientation and training program. The University currently provides orientation training to new Board members and has provided additional education sessions in the past. Further, there is general agreement among BOR members that having additional annual educational updates is warranted. Rather than setting the requirement in law, the same objective can be achieved through further refinements and enhancements to its orientation and training program.

Enabling all BOR members to vote on their Chair and Vice-Chairs is consistent with existing legislative processes for the election of its leadership (i.e., at the beginning of legislative sessions by a vote of all current members). On the other hand, allowing the current requirement to stand helps ensure that leadership be elected by more experienced members and, during their first year as Regents, new members have the opportunity to learn from the experienced leadership.

---

<sup>1</sup> Policies Practices, and Composition of Governing Boards of Public Colleges, Universities and Systems, Page 24

<sup>2</sup> Governing Public Colleges and Universities: A Trustee Perspective, Pages 7-9 and Here We have Idaho, Page 17

<sup>3</sup> Taking the Right Path: Sarbanes Summit, Pages 8-10

<sup>4</sup> Excellence at Scale, Pages 20-21, and SHEEO Higher Education Policy Leadership Seminar: Board Development Checklist

<sup>5</sup> Article II.E, UH BOR Bylaws



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

**HB 114, HD3** – Establishes an Independent Audit Committee within the Board of Regents to include one or more members with financial expertise. It also repeals the University President’s authority as the Procurement Officer for construction and related professional services contracts and places that authority with the Department of Accounting and General Services.

There is substantial support for Audit Committees as part of the Board Governance Structure. This concept is supported by AGB<sup>6</sup>, ACTA<sup>7</sup>, and NACUBO<sup>8</sup>. The Bylaws of the University of Hawaii Board of Regent establishes the Committee on University Audits as a standing committee<sup>9</sup> with many of the same responsibilities that are provided for in the bill. The bill’s provisions concerning the Audit Committee are consistent with leading practices and the BOR Committee on University Audits responsibilities. The University’s Director of Internal Audit has prepared a detailed analysis of the bill’s provisions comparing them to the Committee on University Audits and University Internal Audit Charters and practices<sup>10</sup>. The bill, however, goes further than the current Charters and Bylaws by requiring the Audit Committee to review all complaints filed by individuals internally or externally (i.e., similar to “whistleblower” provisions in private industry) and that at least one member have “financial expertise” which is not defined in the bill. The bill provides that a non-Regent member with financial expertise be appointed if no such expertise resides within the current Board membership.

Establishing and maintaining a whistleblower-like program will require clearly defined policies, procedures and the respective operational infrastructure to ensure the effectiveness of the program and that proper protections are in place. Whistleblower programs have a cost, and the funding has not been addressed in the bill.

We could find nothing promulgated by AGB, ACTA, NACUBO, or SHEEO that addresses the procurement authority of the University President with respect to construction projects. To address this, we researched statutes governing 22 universities’ procurement authority. Of the 22 that we researched<sup>11</sup>, only one vested the authority for procurement of construction to another state agency outside of the university. That one was in the State University of New York System (“SUNY”) and then only for university construction projects that are funded with state moneys. SUNY had authority to procure construction and construction related contracts for those projects funded with its own revenues or borrowings.

Additionally, the University Presidents we interviewed all expressed their concerns about placing this procurement authority outside of the institutions due to the unique nature of the required facilities (e.g., laboratories and specialized teaching facilities). Moving the responsibility from the University to another agency was likened by those interviewed to removing road and highway construction contracting from the respective transportation departments.

<sup>6</sup> The 2011 AGB Survey of Higher Education Governance, Pages 22-23

<sup>7</sup> Governance in the Public Interest, Page 56 and Here We have Idaho, Page 18

<sup>8</sup> The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002: Recommendations for Higher Education

<sup>9</sup> Article II.D.2.g UH BOR Bylaws

<sup>10</sup> UH Internal auditor analysis

<sup>11</sup> Attachment 1 - Summary of Research on Legislation





## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

**ATG Comments** – Placing the procurement authority for construction projects with another state agency has little support in other states’ statutes and will, in all likelihood, further extend the time it takes to get any needed construction project completed.

There already exists an Audit Committee within the Board of Regents. It has in policy and practice many of the responsibilities outlined in the bill and would likely need additional resources to monitor the complaints made against the University under a whistleblower-like hotline. Nevertheless, we do believe that having a program in place like a formal whistleblower hotline is something that should be considered and is supported by leading practices. However, the costs associated with such a program would need to be thoroughly evaluated. We believe that current members of the Committee on University Audits meet the definition of “financial experts” that is used by the Securities and Exchange Commission for members of boards of regulated organizations. Additionally, the Committee on University Audits can avail itself of outside financial expertise much as the Board has done by seeking experienced volunteers from the private community as members of this Advisory Task Group. Adopting such prescriptive legislation prevents the Board from addressing the issues using alternative methods and thus limits its ability to adapt its operations to changing needs of the University.

**SB 1384, SD2** – Places the responsibility of oversight of the University’s General Counsel with the Board of Regents. It also requires the State Auditor conduct a review of all contracts entered into by the University within the past five years with attorneys to provide legal services and submit a report to the Legislature in 2014.

Research on leading practices found that the overwhelming majority of universities have the General Counsel reporting to the President. We could find no literature on this matter so we reviewed the placement of the General Counsel within the governance structure of 31 different universities<sup>12</sup>. We also sought input on this while interviewing university Presidents. Of the 31 universities reviewed, 26 had General Counsel reporting directly to the President, three had General Counsel reporting directly to the President and the Board, and two had General Counsel reporting directly to the Board.

Until February 21, 2013, the University of Hawaii had its General Counsel reporting directly to the President and the Board of Regents. On February 21, 2013, the Board of Regents placed the General Counsel under it directly, with a dotted line to the President to provide assistance and for other administrative matters. As explained above, only two of 31 universities researched have the General Counsel reporting directly to the Board, and only three of 31 have the General Counsel reporting to both the Board and the President.

**ATG Comments** – Having the University’s General Counsel reporting directly to the Board of Regents is not consistent with leading practice of universities as evidenced by the research. The University President needs to be able to access and utilize General Counsel in the daily conduct of business as its role is strictly advisory in nature. General Counsel needs to be

---

<sup>12</sup> Attachment 1 - Summary of Research on Legislation



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

available to draft and review legal documents and provide legal input and advice on operational matters on a daily basis.

The Board of Regents may want to reconsider its action to place the General Counsel under its direct supervision.

The requirement of a one-time audit of past contracts is a legislative prerogative and does not affect the governance structure of the University. However, if the bill becomes law, the BOR should require the University Administration to work with the legislative personnel and State Auditor to provide the necessary information and data so that the scope and objectives of the audit are clearly defined to ensure that the audit work performed achieves the desired objective.

**SB 1388, SD2** – Reduces the membership of the Board of Directors (BOD) of the RCUH from 10 to 8 members and reduces the number of members of the Board of Regents from 5 to 2 members of the BOD. It also removes the President of the University from serving as the President of RCUH.

We found that the universities we contacted did have research components, some with a separately constituted body such as RCUH. In each case, the research component or body were a part of, and subsidiary to, the respective universities. In no case was the component or body governed by a majority appointed from outside of the university system.

**ATG Comments** – The purpose of RCUH is to promote educational, scientific, and literary pursuits<sup>13</sup>. Removing the University of Hawaii President's authority to oversee the activities of RCUH, and reducing the Board of Regents representation on the RCUH BOD to that of a minority position could weaken the linkage between the two and may lead to issues with respect to responsibility and accountability for research activities and funding.

Additionally, reducing the role of the Board of Regents and removing the authority of the University President may affect the ability to obtain grants if the administration of the grants is no longer under the auspices of the University. Additionally, this change could impact the University's consolidated financial statements. Removing one of the major criteria (half of RCUH BOD is comprised of BOR members) for having RCUH included as a component unit of the University could cause RCUH to no longer be included as a component unit for financial statement purposes.

**SB 967, SD2** – Requires the Board of Regents to submit to the legislature for approval proposals to pay positions at the University salaries equal or greater than twice the salary of the Governor before the University can recruit for the positions.

Of the universities we researched, we found none with a similar statutory compensation provision. We therefore sought input on this during our interviews with the university Presidents.

---

<sup>13</sup> Section 304A-3001, HRS



## University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment Report on Legislation Introduced Affecting the University of Hawaii System Level Operations

The result of that inquiry is that none are aware of any such requirement at any public institution of higher education. That is not to say that salary and compensation issues are not discussed, but that there are no statutory caps on compensation, nor are there requirements to get prior approvals before recruiting for positions. Additionally, it was believed that the issue of compensation is an operating issue and the responsibility of the President, not the Board. The Board should set the President's salary and should be generally aware of the compensation schedules and issues within the University.

Additionally, the consensus of the university Presidents interviewed was that the practice could seriously impair the University's ability to attract qualified staff and faculty.

**ATG Comments** – Placing such a requirement on the University is inconsistent with leading practice and severely limits the ability of the University to recruit qualified staff and faculty when needed. This bill would not allow that recruitment to begin until the salaries are approved by the legislature.

**HB 115, HD3** – Establishes a Campus Planning Facility Board and requires that five percent of gross revenues received by the University be placed into a new special fund for major repairs and replacements. It also requires that five percent of gross revenues received be deposited into a new Major Repairs and Replacement Special Fund.

Our research found no literature or other information supporting these proposals. However the concept of conducting reviews and prioritizing campus repairs and maintenance is not new. Public institutions of higher education must have their operating budgets reviewed and approved by their respective legislatures. The University currently has an Office of Capital Improvements reporting to the Chief Financial Officer. That office is responsible for working with campuses and programs on needed facilities. This bill would require that an internal Campus Planning Facility Board determine the repairs and maintenance projects to be funded by the newly created Major Repairs and Replacement Special Fund. The newly created Board would have to submit reports to the legislature on projects undertaken using these funds – similar to existing reporting requirements for University projects of this nature.

**ATG Comments** – This would add another administrative layer for repairs and maintenance projects within the University System. Additional layering often results in reduced efficiencies and increased processing requirements. Existing budget development, review and approval processes are in place for the prioritization and funding of repairs and maintenance projects in the University.

**SB 229, SD 1** – Establishes causes for and procedures for impeachment of the Governor and appointed officers which would include the University's Board of Regents. The bill is not targeted to any specific office or official.

**ATG Comments** – Based on our research and analysis we did find support for having a formal removal process for Trustees; however, this is typically handled in Bylaws and policy.



**Attachment 1**  
**University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment**  
**Summary of Research on Legislation**

**Scope:** Research was conducted with other universities concerning who general counsel reports to and the president’s authority with respect to construction procurement. This research was done in response to pending legislation in the Hawaii Legislature that would affect the operations of the University.

**Methodology:** Policies, statutes, organization charts and other information was obtained from each university’s website. Additionally, we interviewed the Presidents of seven of the universities to confirm the results of our research. The results of this research are presented in the following tables.

**Summary for Bill 114-HD3 – The University President’s Construction Procurement**

**Authority:**

Construction procurement authority resides with the President of the University (16)	Construction procurement authority resides within the University, but with an official other than the President (5)	Construction procurement authority resides outside the University (1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colorado State University System</li> <li>• Idaho State University</li> <li>• Florida State University</li> <li>• Mississippi State University</li> <li>• Oregon State University</li> <li>• State University of New York System (for campus funded projects)</li> <li>• University of Alaska System</li> <li>• University of Arizona</li> <li>• University of California System</li> <li>• University of Connecticut</li> <li>• University of Georgia</li> <li>• University of Missouri System</li> <li>• University of South Florida</li> <li>• University of Wyoming</li> <li>• Utah State University</li> <li>• Washington State University</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Montana State University</li> <li>• University of Illinois</li> <li>• University of Michigan</li> <li>• University of Nevada, Reno</li> <li>• University of Pittsburgh</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State University of New York System (for state funded projects)</li> </ul>



**Attachment 1**  
**University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment**  
**Summary of Research on Legislation**

**Summary for Bill SB1384-SD2 - The University General Counsel Reports to:**

Reports to President or Equivalent (26)	Reports to Board and President (3)	Reports to Board (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dartmouth College</li> <li>• Kent State University</li> <li>• Florida State University</li> <li>• Howard University</li> <li>• Indiana University</li> <li>• Mississippi State University</li> <li>• Montana State University</li> <li>• New Mexico State University (1)</li> <li>• New York University</li> <li>• Northwestern University</li> <li>• Oregon State University</li> <li>• Stanford University</li> <li>• State University NY (1)</li> <li>• University of Alabama (1)</li> <li>• University of Alaska System</li> <li>• University of Arizona</li> <li>• University of Idaho</li> <li>• University of Iowa</li> <li>• University of Nevada, Reno</li> <li>• University of North Carolina</li> <li>• University of South Dakota</li> <li>• University of South Florida</li> <li>• University of Wyoming</li> <li>• Utah State University</li> <li>• Washington State University</li> <li>• Yale University</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cornell University</li> <li>• University of California System</li> <li>• University of Illinois</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colorado State University System (2)</li> <li>• University of Missouri System</li> </ul>

(1) Dotted line reporting to Board

(2) Dotted line reporting to Chancellor (equivalent to President)



**Appendix A**  
**University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment**  
**Resolutions Introduced of Interest to the University of Hawaii**

The ATG read each of the following resolutions. Many of the resolutions are virtually identical and for that reason, we have combined them for the purpose of providing a brief summary of what they include. The resolutions cover a wide area of legislative interest or concern. Some request the State Auditor to conduct audits or studies of various aspects of University operations. Others request the Board of Regents to consider specific proposals. Summarized below are the 26 resolutions introduced and their purpose.

Before any work is undertaken by the University regarding the resolutions that are approved by the Legislature, the BOR should mandate that the University Administration work with the appropriate legislative personnel so that the specific efforts to be undertaken will address the intent of each resolution. This should help ensure that the intent of each resolution is clear to all parties so that the work performed achieves the desired objective.

<b>Resolution(s)</b>	<b>Summary</b>
House Concurrent Resolution 31, Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, and House Resolution 15	These resolutions request the State Auditor to conduct an audit of the University of Hawaii’s management of the faculty workload.
House Concurrent Resolution 52, Senate Concurrent Resolution 78, House Resolution 34, and Senate Resolution 45	These resolutions request the State Auditor to address the issues and concerns raised by the Senate Special Committee on Accountability relating to the University of Hawaii.
House Concurrent Resolution 235 and House Resolution 190	These resolutions request the State Auditor to conduct a financial and management audit of the University of Hawaii and its Board of Regents.
House Concurrent Resolution 133 and House Resolution 103	These resolutions request the Board of Regents (among others) to televise its general meetings.
Senate Concurrent Resolution 199 and Senate Resolution 151	These resolutions urge the Board of Regents to establish a three-year moratorium on and increases of resident tuition beginning July 1, 2014.
House Concurrent Resolution 39 and House Resolution 21	These resolutions request the Board of Regents to study whether the reintegration of the Office of the Chancellor of the University of Hawaii at Manoa into the Office of the President of the University of Hawaii System is prudent.



**Appendix A**  
**University of Hawaii – Advisory Task Group - Operational Assessment**  
**Resolutions Introduced of Interest to the University of Hawaii**

<b>Resolution(s)</b>	<b>Summary</b>
House Concurrent Resolution 66, Senate Concurrent Resolution 110, House Resolution 50, and Senate Resolution 76	These resolutions request the Board of Regents and the President of the University to give preference to local candidates when hiring for executive personnel positions.
House Concurrent Resolution 114 and House Resolution 85	These resolutions request the State Auditor to conduct a study of the potential effects of allowing graduate students of the University of Hawaii to unionize.
House Concurrent Resolution 103, Senate Concurrent Resolution 161, and House Resolution 79	These resolutions encourage the University of Hawaii Administration to establish and implement a tobacco-free university policy for all university campuses and facilities.
Senate Concurrent Resolution 33 and Senate Resolution 14	These resolutions urge the Board of Regents to name the library building at the University of Hawaii West Oahu Campus after Gene I. Awakuni.