Minutes

Present: Phil Castille, Kenny Simmons, Sevki Erdogan, Pila Wilson, Karen Pellegin, Kevin Hopkins, Hank Hennessey, Kathryn Besio, Jene Michaud

Absent: Luoluo Hong

I. **Review of draft minutes, chart and matrix from January 9 meeting.**
   In the section Discussion...flowchart, we agreed to the following changes, then approved the revised minutes for January 9.

   [par. 1] (otherwise formerly known as the “Tri-Level Review Chart”)

   [part.2] It was suggested **We agreed** that the key to the chart be revised to read “Graduate and professional.”

II. **Preparing to report to our constituencies.**
   We agreed to finalize the flow chart and supporting notes before sharing them with constituencies.
   a. The supporting notes:
      i. In the column “Composition of Committees”:
         1. Graduate Council: KB will email a description of the Council’s composition to all of us for inclusion into this cell
         2. Change column heading to include “Processes”
      ii. In the entry for College Curriculum Review Body:
         1. To first sentence add the underscored phrase: “The faculty of each college is responsible for...”
         2. Change final sentence to read: “then the Dean is authorized to make a final decision implement a provisional process and/or a provisional faculty review committee or committees”
      iii. In the column “scope of review,” for the campus-wide curriculum review body, we agreed to add the underscored phrase: “with the university’s mission and Strategic Plan.”
b. The flow chart:
   i. We agreed that the flow chart title should be revised to read as follows (additions underscored): Curriculum Review Process: New Courses, Course Modifications, Program Modifications, New Programs, Program Termination.
   ii. We agreed that a dotted line should be added from the campus-wide curriculum review committee back to the Graduate Council

II. Reporting to constituencies and preparing for implementation of new processes.

   According to the task force timeline (August 28, 2008), there is to be a progress report and public meetings regarding that report.
   a. The task force postponed consideration of these in light of the fact that Phil has updated Rose and her executive staff on the task force’s progress
   b. We were reminded that we are also charged with developing “a systematic method of codifying university policies.”
   c. We agreed that the processes we are developing would not require substantial internal changes in college governance because each college already had their own processes which lead to recommendations to college deans. The CAS Senate happens not to be functioning this year, and the CAS division chairs are acting as the college curriculum review committee, but the college’s senate charter and governance structure have not been changed and the senate could resume and function within the processes the task force has defined.

III. Composition and locus of the campus-wide curriculum review committee.

   a. The CCRC chair is elected by the Congress from among its members. This is consistent with the election of the chairs of the other standing Congress committees.
   b. There will be one representative and one alternate from each college and one from the graduate council, selected by a process to be determined by each college.
   c. The University Registrar is an ex officio member
   d. The committee reports and makes recommends directly to the VCAA
   e. The committee’s actions are disseminated to Congress and faculty and posted regularly on the Congress webpage.

IV. New Program Review and termination of programs

   a. Authorization to Plan: This is preliminary to the development of a full proposal, requiring proposers to consider such issues as curriculum, possible costs (a five-year business plan is required), possible duplication within the university and across the university system. It includes review by the CACAO. We agreed that our new process would require the following changes to the current UH Hilo Authorization to Plan form:
      i. Replace “Dept” with “College CRC”
      ii. Add “Campus CRC” before CoCAO
   b. Program Proposals: We agreed that these must go through the same internal process
   c. As pointed out in item II.b. above, we agreed to modify the flow chart title to include new programs and program terminations

V. Some remaining issues with respect to curriculum review.

   a. We noted that the Records Office has developed and posted standard curriculum change forms; it remains for faculty and administrators to use them consistently
b. We agreed that timelines and deadlines must be defined that allow enough time for curricular proposals to be properly developed and fully reviewed before catalog deadlines

c. We agreed that we lack mechanisms for systematically communicating, tracking, recording, and posting changes

VI. Next meeting: February 13, 2009; Time: 2:00-3:30; Chancellor’s Conference Room

Respectfully submitted,

April K. Scanzola, ALO