Present: Hank Hennessey, Kathryn Besio, Cam Muir (for Sevki Erdogan), Jene Michaud, Kevin Hopkins, Karen Pellegrin, Phil Castille, Luolu Hong, Kenith Simmons,

Absent: Pila

I. Review of draft minutes for Feb.13 meeting, curriculum review chart, and notes
   a. Curriculum Review Flowchart: replace text of bottom box with the following: The request for Authorization to Plan (ATP) must be submitted through the above review process prior to being forwarded to the UH system. Once UH system has granted the ATP, then the new program proposal must undergo this campus review process.
   b. Curriculum Review Notes: The Graduate Council representative will provide more information for the “scope of review” cell for Graduate Council
   c. 2/23/09 Minutes: Strike item III.b.ii regarding the Notes and report this addition in today’s minutes.
   d. Curriculum Review Notes: add to the list of dean’s scope of review item 6. Consistency with university mission and strategic planning

II. Policy Proposal and Modification Process Flowchart
   a. We agreed that it is essential to determine into whose purview a proposed policy will fall. We acknowledged that some policies will bridge the jurisdictions of two or three vice chancellors. Accordingly, we agreed to change “VCAA” (second diamond from the top) to “Appropriate VC(s).”
   b. We agreed that consultation must be built into the process: that is, proposers must consult with those most affected by the proposed policy and those most expert in the relevant areas.
      i. A policy proposal form should be developed with a list of appropriate experts, each of whom would sign the form after consultation was completed satisfactorily.
      ii. After the proposal is submitted, reviewers can follow up with experts and those affected by the proposed policy, including those who should be or could have been consulted on the proposal.
   c. So that the Graduate Council can function in the process as do the colleges and to allow for cases when more than one college and dean are involved, we agreed to these modifications to the flowchart:
i. bottom square: Delete “College”
ii. bottom diamond: Dean(s)

d. We agreed that a set of explanatory notes should be appended to the policy flowchart, similar to those attached to the curriculum review flowchart. The notes should provide such explanations and definitions as “Faculty governance entity includes Graduate Council,” and “Deans includes deans, director of grad council, and director of CHL.”

III. Reporting to constituencies.

a. The VCAA should report to Congress, colleges (deans and senate chairs) on our achievements to date and to inform them what college-specific documentation is needed: specifically, revisions to the college senate charters/bylaws that reflect the new procedures. Grad Council should be working on a charter and bylaws. The VCSA volunteered to assist the VCAA in preparing this report.

b. We discussed the question of how the faculty of CAS, in the absence of a functioning CAS senate, will be able to approve the processes we are developing.

IV. Next topics for discussion.

We will consider the possibility of converting the large body of long-standing practices into policies in a streamlined but systematic process. Many of the practices described in the faculty handbook are of this kind. This expedient would enable us to continue to operate as we have while avoiding overwhelming the new policy process. Revisions to these transforms would go through the new process.

Next meeting: March 13, 2009, 2:00-3:30, Chancellor’s Conference Room

Respectfully submitted,

April Scazzola, ALO