MEETING OF THE TASK FORCE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE
Friday, December 5, 2008 • 2:00 – 3:30 PM • Chancellor’s Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

Present: Phil Castille (Chair); Luoluo Hong (Facilitator); April Scazzola (Accreditation Liaison Officer, ALO); Jene Michaud (CAS); Kevin Hopkins (CAFNRM); Kalena Silva (CHL); Hank Hennessey (CoBE); Karen Pellegrin (CoP); Kathryn Besio (Graduate Council) & Kenny Simmons (VCAA designee)

Absent: Sevki Erdogan (Congress)

Review of Minutes from November 21, 2008 Meeting

- Request was made to omit attribution of comments to specific members in future meeting minutes.
- Under “Flowchart/Framework” in item 1.e., end the sentence after “…campus CRC.”  Item 1.f. should be moved to item 2.e.: “How policy change can be initiated.” Item 1.g. should be corrected to read “prerequisites.”
- Motioned and seconded to approved minutes as amended. Passed unanimously. April Scazzola will amend and post on the WASC Accreditation website.

Review of Undergraduate Curriculum Review Process
(Both Luoluo Hong & Hank Hennessey provided draft flow charts for consideration, which are attached to the minutes. There was quite a bit of overlap in the two representations. Review began first with the draft provided by Hong, then draft provided by Hennessey. Comments below incorporate both charts.)

- 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.
- Since our intent is not to force every college into one rigid process, we could instead simplify the process a bit: Collapse the processes at the beginning of the flow chart so that each college defines the process that takes place before it gets to the college dean level prior to being forwarded to the campus curriculum committee.
  - Requirement would be that the relevant faculty take a vote at some time. So, the initial box in the flow chart after a proposal had been submitted would be program and/or
department and/or college curriculum committee, and the next box would be program coordinator and/or department chair and/or college dean.

- We would also require that the following five questions be instituted as expectations for the college-level process overall prior to the proposal being forwarded 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.

- It was suggested and consensus was reached that it should be clear that the ultimate authority for decision-making rests with University administrators, while reviewing or recommending bodies exercise due diligence to provide information.

- Most likely we would want to end to process with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, then stipulate those few things that require Chancellor’s additional approval or review.

- Outcomes expected prior to a proposal being forwarded to a college Dean could include:
  1. Detailed review by a committee of instructional faculty involved in the program, the composition of which is to be determined by the college;
  2. Vote and approval by affected tenure and tenure-track faculty, with the college to determine who is affected; and
  3. The Dean should ensure that such review and voting processes are codified, using a decision-making process that involves faculty consultation and approval. Reasonable deadlines for faculty approval will be designated; if that deadline is not met, then the Dean is authorized to make a final decision.

At the next meeting, we will continue the present discussion, as well as address the process for graduate curriculum and academic policy.

Housekeeping Items

- The Friday, December 19th meeting was moved to 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM so as not to conflict with rehearsal for Commencement.

- Meeting times for Spring 2009 moved to 2:00 – 3:30 PM to accommodate teaching schedules of committee members.

Respectfully submitted,
Luoluo Hong
December 6, 2008