MEMORANDUM

November 25, 2015

TO: Veronica Ogata  
  Faculty Senate Chair

FROM: Leon Richards  
  Chancellor

SUBJECT: Response to Resolution 10052015-2

This is to address the proposed recommendation by S. Kitamura which is as follows, "Request a detailed written policy from the Chancellor be required to be met for future exemptions to following the curriculum approval process, including who is eligible for such exemptions, and what criteria need to be met to qualify for such an exemption."

In addition, the Faculty Senate resolution requests that, "The Chancellor provide a written response to address all areas in reaction to Action Request #1415034, including the memo submitted by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, dated September 28, 2015.

First, I am assuming that the proposed recommendation was submitted in response to the decision made at the April 16, 2015 meeting regarding the admission criteria for the MLT program. It should be noted that although the admission criteria for the MLT program has been used since December 2010 on a Best Qualified First Accepted basis, those criteria were never officially submitted for review or approved. The counselors informed the Program Director of the situation in March of 2012, but to date the admission criteria has not been officially approved. I made the decision to continue to follow current practice of Best Qualified First Accepted admission criteria based upon:

- Anticipation of the changes being submitted for formal review via an Action Request memo and Program Action Request;
- Recommendations from a Health Sciences counselor; and
- Not wanting to negatively impact those students who had already applied to the MLT program under the Best Qualified First Accepted basis.

In order to be fair, and at the request of the Health Sciences Department Chair, I also approved the Medical Assisting and Occupational Therapy Assistant Programs to adopt the Best Qualified, First Accepted process. Of course, the Program Directors for the Health Sciences Department would need to submit the necessary curriculum paperwork. Dental
Assisting, Physical Therapy Assistant, Radiologic Technology and Respiratory Care Practitioner have already implemented this procedure. For the changes to be reflected in the 2016-2017 catalog, the paperwork must be submitted by January 20, 2016.

In summary, this was an isolated and atypical situation. The purpose for the decision was to officially recognize that the current practice of the Best Qualified First Accepted process was already being applied since December 2010. In addition, the decision was made to ensure consistent admission processes for all the programs in the Health Sciences Department. Most importantly, the decision was made to mitigate the negative effects on students. As stated, the Program Directors are still required to submit the required curriculum paperwork.

In response to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee memo, dated September 28, 2015, I assert that it is of vital importance that curriculum development and implementation fall directly to the faculty through the procedures developed by Faculty Senate. However, as stated earlier, when students are negatively affected, the Chancellor should be able to exercise his judgment to intervene and, in this case, the procedures that were affected were related to the admission process and not directly related to course or program curriculum.

Mahalo.
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