TASK FORCE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

Friday, February 13, 2009 • 2:00-3:30 pm • Chancellor’s Conference Room

Minutes

Present: Phil Castille, Kenny Simmons, Karen Pellegrin, Hank Hennessey, Jene Michaud, Kathryn Besio, Pila Wilson, Kevin Hopkins, Chuck Malenfant (for Sevki Erdogan), April Scazzola

Absent: Luoluo Hong

I. **Review of draft minutes, chart and notes from January 23 meeting.** These were approved without change.

II. **Follow-up on Feb. 9 open meeting.** We drew on our joint recollections of the open meeting and Phil’s notes. Both Luoluo and April also took notes at that meeting, and those notes were not available at the 2/13 meeting. Points made during the Feb. 9 discussion:
   a. **The need for a tracking system** as proposals wend their way through the process. We learned at the 2/13 meeting that tracking is one of the functions of the Curriculum Central system, available at no cost from Kapiolani Community College, which developed it, has been using it successfully for some years, and is offering it free of charge to other campuses in the system.
   b. **The need for a timeline and time limits** for each stage of the process. We agreed that the defining of timelines and time limits for each office/committee was crucial but might be outside the scope of the task force. The Registrar would be a key person in determining timelines and time limits.
   c. **Administration program initiatives.** We agreed that the process laid out in the flow chart and explanatory notes allows for administration as well as faculty to initiate new programs, and ensures that faculty will be “present at the birthing” of programs initiated by administration.
   d. **“Minor” changes.** We agreed that no change was so small that it should be limited to review within the individual college only. The rule that all changes should travel the full route is intended to cover the possibility that an apparently minor, internal curricular change will out to impact another college or program. We agreed that, once the full review process is in place, faculty will be much less likely to propose trivial changes.
III. Changes to the flow chart and supporting notes
   a. We agreed to modify the flow chart to reflect the concerns of the College of Pharmacy (additions underscored, deletion struck out):
      i. In rightmost box, the bottom row, this change will be made:
         Graduate/Advanced Professional proposals (includes Pharmacy)
      ii. To the solid line linking Dean and Review by Graduate Council, this change will be made:
         Approve Graduate/Advanced Professional Proposal

   b. We agreed to the following modification to the supporting notes: bottom row, leftmost cell (additions underscored):
      Faculty eligibility to new and modified curriculum items is to be determined by each College. Entities other than faculty in degree-granting colleges who wish to propose new courses or programs should work through an appropriate instructional faculty unit.

IV. Next steps in developing a coherent academic policy process
   a. We must be consistent with UH Executive Policy E1.201 Faculty Involvement in Academic Policy; and with the faculty union contract. Copies of E1.201 were distributed and guided our discussion.
   b. It was pointed out that the faculty Congress charter 1.2. is inconsistent with E1.201.II.2, 4 because it refers to the Congress as “the policy-making body” of the university. The Congress, UH Hilo’s campus faculty organization (CFO) can recommend policy to the Chancellor, who may in turn delegate authority on different aspects of University operations to her vice chancellors.
   c. We agreed that UH Hilo has many long-established practices that can be formulated, reviewed, approved, and published as policies.
   d. We agreed that in many respects the policy initiation, review, approval, and implementation process was parallel to the curriculum review process we have just formulated.
      Our flow chart designer will draft a flow chart for the policy process for review at our next meeting. This flow chart will capture both top-down and bottom-up flow of policy development.

V. Next meeting: February 27, 2009; Time: 2:00-3:30 pm

Respectfully submitted,

April Scazzola, ALO