19 April 2013

Academic Policy April 2013 Committee Report

The APC met Friday, April 5

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

Excused: Roberta Barra (CoBE) – sabbatical, Jeanie Flood (Nursing)

Absent: Mike Sado (UHHSA)

Old Business:

1. In order for the motion on PRAC to fit into the format used by other standing committees the motion to create the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) was changed to the following: Most of the wording is the same as what was presented in Congress last meeting, but now fits the format for the by-laws.

Motion: Move to create a UHH Faculty Congress Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) to assist programs with the program review process. The intent is that this will be a standing committee of the UHH Congress.

Proposed By-Laws of the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee

The Congress will approve the membership of the Academic Program Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) composed of an executive committee of no fewer than three or more than five faculty members from UHH and broad general membership from across the various units. Congress will also appoint a faculty member to serve as chair.

The Executive Committee will

- identify and invite faculty members with recent experience in Program Review to serve as PRAC members to assist in the training of other faculty whose programs are scheduled for PR in the next 1 – 2 years
- identify and invite faculty from programs scheduled for PR within the next 2 years to serve as PRAC members in order to help facilitate their PR training
- supervise committee meetings with programs at the beginning of the PR process to inform the program faculty members of what to expect during the PR process, the deadlines that need to be met, best practices with respect to obtaining required
information and distributing the work among the faculty members, how to identify and invite an external reviewer, and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) development process (note: programs may choose to decline this offer of assistance)

- supervise a PRAC internal review of Program Review documents prior to external reviewer visits and provide feedback to programs
- review [optional] program annual reviews that highlight progress or lack thereof within the MOUs, and assist programs with their ongoing negotiations with the administration when progress is deemed insufficient.

PRAC Executive Committee members shall serve two-year staggered terms. Committee members serving in the trainee-capacity shall serve through the completion of their program’s PR and will be encouraged to continue for at least one year in a trainer-capacity to provide continuity from year to year. The Congress Chair may negotiate a course reduction with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for the Chair of this Committee depending on the agenda of the Committee for the upcoming year.

2. Notifying candidates during the Contract Renewal and Tenure and Promotion process. The chair contacted Jim Kardash at UHPA to discuss this issue. He was informed that Congress does not have jurisdiction with respect to requesting the Dean or Division Chair to notify candidates. Further, according to the contract departments have the right to develop their own DPC policies. Therefore, any motion from the APC must take this into account. Finally, the current contract already includes the following statement regarding notifying candidates subsequent to TPRC review:

   The Faculty member shall be notified of the recommendation of the TPRC when it is reported.

   The chair asked for clarification on the meaning of “when it is reported” and was told that this referred to when the TPRC submitted their recommendation. Therefore, it appears that the contract already stipulates that candidates should be informed immediately. The chair has requested further clarification on the issue of jurisdiction from another UHPA source and is awaiting a response.

3. E-filing Contract Renewal and Tenure and Promotion applications. The committee is continuing to work on this issue and is also awaiting an UHPA response. The committee notes:

   a. We would like to suggest that within the current guidelines for applying for contract renewal and T & P that all materials be submitted electronically, and that the same timelines and confidentiality requirements still be met.
b. Much of the dossier is already prepared electronically. Problems arise with the supporting materials that are currently supplied in appendices, particularly bulky items or other items that do not lend themselves well to electronic submission.

c. Of particular concern is the appendix containing the hard copies of the students’ comments. The committee notes that the authenticity of these comments are in question, which diminishes their importance. This possibly goes against the views of many of the faculty.

d. It is the charge of the committee to suggest policy only and to leave the responsibility of accepting the policy and implementing it to the administration. However, there are a number of logistical considerations that greatly impact the future success of such policy. These include but may not be limited to:
   i. Creating a secure filing site
   ii. Confidentiality of electronic files by the reviewers – setting policy for restricting copying of electronic files and in printed form
   iii. Uniformity of filing requirements across units – formatting, page limits (or not), submission deadline enforcement, latitude in the case of electronic difficulties, large PDF files, etc.
   iv. Accessibility – from the perspectives of the candidate and more often the reviewers (many reviewers are not comfortable viewing files electronically)

e. Given these hurdles the committee is leaning towards taking advantage of the fact that a large part of the dossiers are already in electronic form and suggesting running a pilot program that allows candidates to submit all or part of their dossiers electronically. The committee is in discussion about how to handle the student evaluations in particular. Suggestions are welcome.