TASK FORCE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

Friday, January 9, 2008 • 2:00 PM-3:30 PM • Chancellor’s Conference Room

Present: Phil Castille, Pila Wilson, Kathryn Besio, Luoluo Hong, Hank Hennessey, Kenny Simmons, Karen Pellegrin, Jene Michaud, Sevki Erdogan, Kevin Hopkins, April Scazzola

Next Meeting: January 23, 2-3:30, Chancellor’s Conference Room

Review of December 5, 2008 minutes.

These minutes had been extensively revised at the December 19 meeting. The group reviewed the revised minutes to make sure that the revisions were accurately recorded. We corrected a minor typographical error and agreed that additional discussion was needed on the five questions to be addressed in the “college-level process overall prior to the proposal being forwarded to the Dean.” The December 5, 2008 minutes were approved as distributed.

Review of December 19, 2008 minutes. We corrected section 1.b of the summary of the discussion of the Tri-Level Review Chart as follows (changes underscored):

1.b. New interdisciplinary programs should be assigned to a dean (s) and a college on a case-by-case basis. . . .

After discussion about other changes, we agreed that minutes should record what had transpired in the meeting, and that changes of substance should be addressed in subsequent meetings. The December 19, 2008 minutes were approved with only the above changes in 1.b.

Discussion of “Curriculum Modification Process—Supporting Notes” matrix and “Curriculum Modification Process” flowchart

These notes comment on the chart “Curriculum Modification Process—New Courses, Course Modifications, and Program Modifications” (formerly known as the “Tri-Level Review Chart”). The group suggested various means of representing the process both concisely and clearly. Hank will revise the chart accordingly.

We agreed that the key to the chart be revised to read “Graduate and professional.”

We reaffirmed the December 19 decision that this flowchart was for curriculum review for existing programs and that “a separate flow chart will be developed for the review and approval process for new programs.”
The question was raised whether or not the graduate council should serve as the campus-wide curriculum review body for review of new graduate/Pharmacy courses or course modifications. However, the task force acknowledged that a prime source of WASC’s criticism was the failure to involve in the review process individuals not personally invested in the proposal who could provide objective, impartial review. We recognized that given the size of our campus, we could best ensure impartial review if the campus-wide curriculum committee were the final faculty review body for graduate curriculum.

It was noted that the graduate council has a curriculum review committee but does not yet have bylaws or a charter.

We revised the row title “Proposing faculty member or group” to “Proposing faculty individual or group, eligibility to propose to be determined by each college,” and eliminated the cell “Instructional faculty.”

For next meeting

The locus of the campus-wide committee

Respectfully submitted,

April K. Scazzola