Present: Phil Castille, Kevin Hopkins, Dan Brown (Kathryn Besio), Luoluo Hong, Hank Hennessey, Kenny Simmons, Karen Pellegrin, April Scazzola.

Absent: Jene Michaud, Pila Wilson, Sevki Erdogan

Next Meeting: January 9, 2-3:30, Chancellor’s Conference Room

Review of December 5, 2008 Minutes. The minutes of the Dec. 5 minutes were approved following amendments made by group:

1. Two typographical errors were corrected.

2. The first five bulleted items under “Review of undergraduate curriculum review process” were deleted and replaced with the underscored text, which opens what is now the first bulleted item in this section:

   • Discussion began with outlining a review process that started with an individual faculty proposal. As discussion ensued, it became clear that the review processes at the college level were varied and potentially complex and confusing. In fact, there are currently three different processes in place at the present time across the five colleges.

3. Review questions were moved from the deleted third bulleted item to a subsequent item as follows:

   o We would also require that the following five questions be instituted as expectations for the college-level process overall prior to the proposal being forward to the Dean.
   1. availability of resources, including teaching personnel, space requirements, and operating budget;
   2. identify, vet and resolve any cross-program or departmental implications;
   3. academic integrity, i.e., the proposed course or program reflects intellectual rigor and teaching excellence;
   4. program coherence, e.g., articulation with other existing courses, determining placement within the major; and
   5. analyze impact on course and seat capacity.

Review of the Tri-Level Flow Chart: Curriculum Modification Process. The current tri-level flow chart is understood to cover the review and approval process for new courses, course modifications, and
modifications to existing programs. A separate flow chart will be developed for the review and approval process for new programs.

1. Multidisciplinary programs: The consensus was that:
   a. All involved colleges, including their deans, should participate in the review and approval process.
   b. New interdisciplinary programs should be assigned to a dean and a college on a case-by-case basis. The assignment will be made by the VCAA in consultation with affected faculty and dean(s).
   c. Wording to be inserted in the chart notes: “Each interdisciplinary program will follow the process used in the college designated as its home; the home college will be determined in consultation with the affected faculty and deans, with the final decision made by the VCAA.”

2. Graduate council: The chart was affirmed to reflect the consensus of the group with respect to the place of graduate council in the process: that a proposal regarding a graduate course or existing program should pass thru the college dean and then to the graduate council. The graduate council will determine whether the proposed course or program change demonstrates graduate-level rigor.

3. Rejections or recommendations against proposals through the program/department and college levels. The group was reminded that recommending bodies do not reject proposals; rather, they might recommend against approval. The group considered the fate of proposals not found acceptable or found to require revision: should there be limits to how often a proposal can be resubmitted? Should an appeals process be instituted?

   The consensus was that the review process should be characterized by feedback and collaboration throughout, so that limits and other constraints should not be specified.

3. The next step in reviewing the review/approval process for courses and existing programs: to examine third level processes in more detail: the roles of the VCAA, the campus curriculum review, and graduate council.

4. In preparation for the January 9 meeting:
   a. The ALO will provide the graduate council chair with WASC guidelines for graduate study and professional programs; the chair will present these to the council for review.
   b. The facilitator and the CoBE representative will jointly revise the tri-level flow chart and flesh out the three-column table (reviewing entity, committee composition, scope of review)

Respectfully submitted,

April K. Scazzola
December 22, 2008