TASK FORCE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

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

Minutes

Present: Kathryn Besio, Sevki Erdogan, Jene Michaud, Pila Wilson, Karen Pellegrin, Phil Castille, Luoluo Hong, Kenith Simmons, April Scazzola

Absent: Hank Hennessey, Kevin Hopkins

I. Review of minutes of Feb. 27 meeting
   a. Regarding item III.b. Reporting to constituencies:
      i. The VCAA reported that the evolving flow chart and notes have been shared at two deans’ council meetings and that they have been received positively by the deans.
      ii. The CAS task force representative reported that the CAS dean had expressed concerns at a meeting with the Natural Sciences division chairs.
      iii. The task force members reaffirmed that the curriculum review process as represented in the flow chart and explanatory notes was ready to be presented for final approval.
      iv. The Congress representative affirmed that the Congress has been kept apprised of the task force’s deliberations.
      v. We agreed that senate charters will need to be revised to reflect the newly defined processes, including any claim for senates or Congress to be “policy-making.” (UH Executive Policy limits the power of faculty governance units to recommending policy to the administration.) We did not discuss how this will be communicated to the senates or the Congress.

   b. Regarding the flowchart on curriculum review: We agreed that:
      i. With regard to curriculum proposals, we agreed that the flow chart makes it clear that dean has veto power but may send proposals back to proposers or the college curriculum review body for revision and resubmission.
      ii. The revise/recycle process makes an appeal process unnecessary. The new process makes it explicit that it is the prerogative of the dean/VCAA/Chancellor to make such decisions.
      iii. Proposal not approved by deans or VCAA or Chancellor should be archived.
      iv. “Recommend approval” should be revised to read “Recommend approval/disapproval” in the actions associated with the squares “Review...Body” and “Review...College”
      v. A key should be added indicating the significance of diamonds vs. rectangles in the flowchart
      vi. The Graduate Council functions like a senate; its relations to the Congress are laid out in the flow chart and in the notes. Because the Graduate Council’s recommendations would go to Congress, it would no longer be necessary for a Congress representative to serve on the grad council.
      vii. See III.d. below: addition of two-year review statement: Process will be reviewed and revised prior to 12/31/2010 by a shared governance body appointed by the UH Hilo Chancellor
c. Clarification of notes: The notes make it sufficiently clear that non-degree-granting units can not create courses

II. Policy flow chart.
   a. We agreed that the Chancellor and VCs may initiate campus-wide policies and that these should be sent to Congress, not to the individual colleges. Congress may then refer these to colleges. The down, dotted-line arrows will therefore be revised to link the Chancellor and VCs to the Congress, not to the colleges.
   b. We reaffirmed that the Graduate Council’s recommendations must go thru the Congress, and Congress will refer these back to deans or send on to VCAA as appropriate.

III. Approval and implementation of the task force’s recommended processes for curriculum review and policy.
   a. We reaffirmed that, as outlined in the Chancellor’s letter to the campus community and the associated timeline, the task force’s recommended processes should be submitted directly to the Chancellor for approval, to be followed by immediate implementation. The task force was appointed by the Chancellor following preliminary consultation between the VCAA and VCSA, Congress, Graduate Council, and each college. Each of these bodies has a representative on the task force. At its initial meeting the group agreed on working principles of consensus and timely sharing with constituencies and members have adhered to these.
   b. We agreed that an open forum should be scheduled as soon as the policy flow chart and notes have been adequately refined, to solicit input.
   c. We agreed that a referendum is not appropriate.
   d. We agreed that the curriculum review process and the policy-making process should be reviewed in two years.
      Statements regarding two-year review should be added to each of the flowcharts.

IV. Next topics for discussion.
   a. 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.
   b. The open forum should be scheduled.

Next meeting: March 23, 2009, 2:00-3:30, Chancellor’s Conference Room

Respectfully submitted,

April Scazzola, ALO