14 March 2013

Academic Policy March 2013 Committee Report

The APC met Wednesday, March 13

Present: Mitchell Anderson, chair, Armando Garcia-Ortega (CAFNRM), Kirsten Mollegaard (English), Jodilyn Kunimoto (Student Affairs), Mazen Hamad (Chem)

Excused: Roberta Barra (CoBE) – sabbatical, Mike Sado (UHHSA), Katherine Anderson (Pharmacy), Jeanie Flood (Nursing)

Note: included herein are two motions scheduled for a vote, having gone through a first reading at the last Congress meeting, and three motions being presented for their first reading.

Old Business:

A. UHH Credit Hour and Review Policy – A motion was made at the last Congress meeting to recommend to the VCAA that UHH adopt the following Credit Hour Policy. This motion was read at the last meeting and is scheduled to be voted on at the March 15, 2013 Congress meeting. The version presented at the last Congress meeting included as its final sentence in the Review Process the following: “Monitoring and reviewing courses in which the amount of face-to-face time is less than one-third the total work for the course will be referred to the Distance Learning Advisory Committee.” After discussions with the DL Advisory Committee the APC voted to remove this sentence since that committee indicated it does not have the authority nor manpower to conduct such reviews.

UHH Credit Hour Policy

Regardless of the type of academic activity, schedule, or method of delivery, one credit hour at UHH represents the expected amount of work a student must expend to achieve intended learning outcomes consistent with that of a traditional course (i.e. one that meets one hour per week, with a minimum of two hours additional work such as preparation, research, homework, investigation, etc. over the course of an approximate 15 week semester).

This definition of credit hour implies:

1. One credit hour for courses with a non-traditional schedule (e.g. labs, directed studies, internships, etc.) or with alternative methods of delivery (e.g. online, hybrid, reverse lecture, etc.) represents an equivalent amount of work, as defined by intended student learning outcomes. Since there is no substitute for time spent in study or research, at
least as much time must be spent “learning” regardless of the academic activity or method of delivery.

2. Courses with equivalent department course numbers should be consistent in terms of learning outcomes, regardless of the method of delivery.

3. Each credit hour represents approximately 45 hours of work. Departments should particularly keep this in mind when assigning non-traditional credit for activities such as independent study, service learning, laboratory, practica, seminar, internships, and courses with variable units, etc.

4. Only students who are able to demonstrate they have achieved the minimum intended learning outcomes will be awarded the credit hour.

Review Process

The application of the credit hour policy will be reviewed within the Academic Program Review process, New Course Approval (Curriculum Review Committee(s) and Curriculum Central), and General Education Certification and re-Certification.

Justification for the credit-hour policy is included for the record as an attachment.

The following need to be completed, assuming the motion passes:

- All units should be informed of the change and the resulting necessity to include evidence within their program reviews demonstrating they are following the credit hour policy, in particular as it applies to non-traditional modes of delivery.
- All Curriculum Review Committees, Curriculum Central administrators, and the chair of Gen Ed should be notified to include the credit hour policy in their determinations for new curriculum and general education certification and re-certification.
- The Accreditation Committee should develop a list of courses that do not satisfy the traditional one-hour lecture, two-hour homework model. Such a list should include courses such as:
  - Laboratory (e.g. one-credit Science labs that meet for three hours each week with little or no homework)
  - Practica (e.g. Nursing and Education courses where students are required to enter the classroom or hospital for hands-on experience).
  - Service Learning Academic Activities
  - Directed Reading/Independent Study
  - Study Abroad
  - Seminar
  - Internship
The Accreditation Committee needs to compile three sample Syllabi from each of the types of non-traditional courses listed above.

B. **Time Limits to complete the Ph.D. program**

A motion was made at the last Congress meeting to recommend that UHH adopt the following Policy regarding Time Limits to Complete a Ph.D. This motion was read at the last meeting and is scheduled to be voted on at the March 15, 2013 Congress meeting. The version presented at the last Congress meeting included the three final words “and/or VCAA.” After discussions with Matt Platz, Dan Brown informed the APC chair that he and Dr. Platz agreed that such applications should be forwarded only to the VCRED. Those words have been removed in the version below.

**Time limits for Ph.D. programs**

It is proposed that the following general time limits for Ph.D. programs be adopted as UHH Graduate Division policy. An individual program may shorten the time limits, if desired and internally approved. Special exceptions to the limits, with the support of the program and Dean, would require graduate council approval.

- Graduate level courses may only be applied towards the degree requirements if taken within 10 years of the completion of the degree. [Credits used towards fulfillment of another degree may not be used.]

- The maximum time a student may take to complete all requirements for a Ph.D. is 7 years from matriculation into the Ph.D. program, with a possible extension for extenuating circumstances not to exceed 10 years in total. A petition for extension will be submitted by the program to the Graduate Council, and if approved, the Graduate Council will forward approval of the extension to the VCRED.

C. **Policy Flow Chart.**

**Motion:** Move to replace the current UHH Policy Flow Chart, found on the Chancellor’s web site [http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/PolicyProposalflowchartNotesFINAL10-6-09.pdf](http://hilo.hawaii.edu/policies/documents/PolicyProposalflowchartNotesFINAL10-6-09.pdf) with the attached Policy Flow Chart, along with the revised notes below. The new flowchart has been developed to better reflect the role of the Research Council, and the notes included on the current web site have been revised to reflect these changes. A document comparing the current notes with the proposed notes is also attached.
Notes to accompany the Academic Policy Proposal Flow Chart

This process is intended to govern the proposal and approval of new or modified academic policies.

Academic policy proposals may originate at any level of the campus community.

When the need is apparent, or when directed to do so by decision-making authorities, persons proposing new or amended policies are responsible for seeking consultation with appropriate university staff members, to ensure compliance with law, government and system policies, and other regulations. Proposals may be returned for further consultation at any point in the process.

Certification of consultation must be provided by the consulted staff member or members and forwarded with the proposal.

Footnote references from the flow chart:

1. For the purposes of this document, Dean(s) includes Deans, the University Librarian, and the Director of Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani, the College of Hawaiian Language.

2. For the purposes of this document, the word "Unit" in the phrase "Unit Governance Entities" includes, but is not limited to, the Colleges and the Library.

3. Representatives of Faculty Congress and Graduate Council are responsible for seeking consultation with appropriate Faculty and Staff members within their respective units on the potential implications of new or amended policies. Faculty Congress will appoint a member as “liaison to Graduate Council” to communicate between the two representative bodies.

4. Referrals for proposal revision from Faculty Congress and Graduate Council are sent to proposal originator.

5. Referrals for proposal revision from the VCAA may be sent to either Faculty Congress or Graduate Council, depending on the scope and potential implications of the proposed policy.

6. There is a time-limit between receiving and voting/deciding on a proposal. For Faculty Congress, the time-limit is two months. For Graduate Council, the VCR, and VCAA this is one month. If time-limit is not met, the proposal shall automatically be advanced to the next recipient without recommendation.

Note that the University administration is responsible for:

- Developing forms and documentation consistent with these procedures;
- Arranging for a system to track policy proposals as they move through the process, and arranging for training of users;
- Specifying procedures to notify submitters, reviewers, and other appropriate participants of the progress and final status of proposals, using a combination of web-posting, email, hardcopy distribution, etc., as appropriate;
• Codifying long-standing policies and procedures and posting them on the academic policies webpage; and
• Ensuring that other campus shared governance constitutions and by-laws are consistent with these established processes.

D. Curriculum Review Flow Chart. The Committee was asked by the Congress Chair to postpone work on this flow chart.

E. Program Review – All units have been given ample opportunity to review the proposed changes to the PR document and procedures and have provided feedback to the committee. The primary concerns of some faculty include anticipated resources necessary to perform meaningful assessments and for a new faculty committee, the proposed Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC). While resources for assessment are a very legitimate concern, assessment is already a required part of Program Review. The proposed PR document simply attempts to make the role of assessment more clear, and reflects the role of assessment that WASC and the Federal DOE place on assessment. Faculty also voiced concerns over the process of developing an MOU between programs and the administration, and the manner in which MOU’s have been used or more importantly ignored in the past. The committee’s response was to point out that one of the purposes of PRAC was to address this problem by ensuring that the MOU’s remained current through annual reports. (More on this under the second motion below.)


Motion: Move to create a UHH Faculty Congress Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) to assist programs with the program review process.

Membership: Congress will identify and appoint a 2-year Chair and 2 – 3 additional core members who will serve alternating 2-year terms and who are responsible for the following:

1. Identify faculty with recent experience in Program Review to serve in a training capacity to assist other faculty who will be coming up for PR in the next 1 – 2 years.
2. Identify faculty from programs scheduled for PR within the next 2 years. Membership by such faculty will facilitate their training.
3. Meet with programs at the beginning of the PR process to inform the program faculty members of what to expect, the deadlines that need to be met, the amount of work that needs to be distributed among the faculty members, the information that needs to
be included and how to obtain said information, how to choose an external reviewer, and the MOU development process.

4. Internally review Program Review documents prior to external reviewer visits and provide feedback to programs.

5. Assist programs in the process of identifying an external reviewer.

6. Assist programs in developing and negotiating their MOU.

7. Review program [optional] annual reviews that highlight progress or lack thereof within the MOU’s, and assist programs with their ongoing negotiations with the administration when progress is deemed insufficient.

F. Tenure and Promotion e-filing.
   The committee has identified a number of challenges in moving to e-filing, and is currently developing a strategy and policy for moving towards e-filing contract renewal and T&P applications in the near future. The committee hopes to circulate a proposal within the units after spring break.

G. Tenure and Promotion and Contract Renewal Feedback during the process, and the inclusion of an MOU between the Dean and the candidate.
   The committee has contacted UHPA for an initial consultation and is still researching those parts of the contract pertinent to this proposal. The committee is splitting the two issues, notification and agreement. The committee hopes to circulate an initial proposal within the units shortly after spring break.