Facilitated by Will Jonen, Curriculum Committee Co-Chair and Susan Pope, Educational Specialist.

Attendees: Maria Bautista (A/S), Amy Cook (MKC), Hal Corcoran (BLT), Mae Dorado (Health Sci), Ron Dunn (M/S), Susan Inouye (LLL), Grant Itomitsu (Culinary), Susan Jaworowski (BLT), Will Jonen (M/S), Yoneko Kanaoka (LLL), Lisa Kobuki (LLL), Kapulani Landgraf (A/S), Bob Moeng (M/S), Nawa'a Napoleon (LLL), Frank Noji (LLL), Vern Ogata (Soc. Sci.), Sunny Pai (LLR), Trude Pang (BLT), Louise Pagotto (Admin), Susan Pope (Admin), Leon Richards (Admin), Lori Sakaguchi (BLT), Kawehi Sellers (HOST), Satoru Shinagawa (LLL), Tony Silva (LLL), Michelle Sturges (LLR), Sheldon Tawata (S.S.), Joyce Tokuda (LLR), Jill Wakabayashi (Health Sci), Gemma Williams (MKC), Drake Zintgraff (SA)

Proposal for a new curriculum review and approval flow
Facilitated by Will Jonen

As part of the transition from the existing Curriculum Central system to the new Kuali Student Curriculum Management (KSCM) System, there have been ongoing conversations on the curriculum review and approval process – what is concerning about the process we have; what we might do differently. There have been suggestions from the Disappearing Task Force on Curriculum and recommendations to Faculty Senate from the Curriculum Committee.

There have been a number of sources of frustration for curriculum proposers in recent years:
- Contradicting feedback to proposers and discrepancies in requests for revisions due to multiple reviewers reviewing the same things;
- Too many small checkboxes to link content with assessment;
- Some proposers resent having their choices questioned or having to justify elements of their proposals since they are the content experts;
- Having to get multiple hard-copy signatures multiple times when there are multiple revisions;
- Having to correct typos regardless of where they appear in a proposal;
- Delays in getting course proposals back so that they can be worked on because someone in the review pipeline won't sign off;
- Having to repeatedly provide new electronic copies and hard copies of program action requests when there are repeated revisions;
- Delays in getting a proposal improved due to all of the aforementioned problems.

The sources of frustration have impacted faculty perception of the Curriculum Committee which is often viewed as an impediment to the curriculum process and an obstacle to faculty innovation. The Disappearing Task Force on Curriculum held discussions on how the process might be improved and developed a document *Recommended Curriculum Review Flow of Course and Program Proposals*. The proposed workflow has been submitted to Faculty Senate for consideration.

Among the proposed changes:
- Checking for spelling and grammar errors in text that will appear in the catalog will no longer be performed as part of the Curriculum Committee review process. The proposer is responsible for making sure such text is error free before submitting their proposal.
- Checking SLOs will no longer be performed as part of the Curriculum Committee review process. The proposer is responsible for working with an SLO coach or other expert to develop suitable SLOs before submitting their proposal.
- There is no longer a review layer that happens before the department vote. Instead, potentially-impacted entities such as CELTT, academic advising, and the program Dean will receive an FYI email about the proposal at the time it is sent to the Department Chair for the department vote. The Library will receive an FYI email at the time the proposal is sent to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA).
- The Curriculum Committee will not review proposals for correctness of grammar, spelling, or word choice. Instead, the Committee will review the proposal based on merit: Does it make sense? Is it supportive of program outcomes? Is it in keeping with the mission, vision and values of the College?

Question: The Curriculum Committee responsibilities seem vague. Where is the feedback mechanism if the Committee recommendation is not to move the proposal forward to Faculty Senate?
W. Jonen: The Curriculum Committee has to work this out with Faculty Senate. The Committee does not want to be checking grammar and wording. It would be looking at the proposal for completeness in KSCM. Also, how the proposal fits in with the goals/vision/mission of the College. Does it seem like a good idea? What the Committee does beyond that would be developed by future Curriculum Committees. The Committee doesn't want to be viewed as an obstacle or impediment to faculty ideas. If the Curriculum Committee feels there is a problem with SLOs, grammar, etc., the proposal should be referred to an entity with the appropriate expertise. There isn't always that expertise on the Curriculum Committee – expertise changes with each year's membership.

Question: In the proposed review flow, what is the difference between the Curriculum Committee and the Dean in terms of what they are reviewing in a proposal?
W. Jonen: The Dean is looking at available resources: faculty, needed equipment, funds. Does it make financial sense? Does it fit program goals?

Question: If the Dean doesn't approve and recommends changes, does the proposal go back through the entire review cycle?

W. Jonen: No, it moves forward.

Comment: We need to clarify what the review responsibility is at each level – what gets checked where? If one of those things changed, it should go back to the entity responsible for reviewing that area.
W. Jonen: Agreed. This proposal is the big picture. We still have to work out the nuts and bolts.

Question: When might the new process be in place?
W. Jonen: We don't know. The current Curriculum Committee co-chairs are on their way out. It is up to the new co-chairs to implement any changes. One concern that pushed in this direction was that no one wants to chair a committee that entails so much work and invites so much criticism and confrontation. The concern was that no one would want to serve on Curriculum Committee. The Committee needs to be a support to faculty.

Question: So is the assumption that the proposer will do the SLOs and grammar check with somebody and no one else checks?
W. Jonen: No, others will check. VCAA Pagotto will check.
Question: And then we are back to square one?
W. Jonen: One difference is that in KSCM the proposer works directly with each reviewer.

Comment: Proposers sometimes couldn't understand why reviewers didn't just make minor corrections themselves.
W. Jonen: The Disappearing Task Force discussed this option. The problem is that it is not the reviewer's proposal. Ultimately it is the proposer's responsibility to see things through. If others are making changes without the proposer's knowledge, it could be problematic.

Question: Can there be more drop-down boxes and less of the free-text entry that leads to errors?
W. Jonen: That would be a question for Susan Pope.

Question: Are there timelines?
S. Pope: I believe timelines can be set. What the timelines are would be a Faculty Senate and campus decision.

With respect to the SLOs check, Susan Jaworowski noted that she and fellow SLO coach Tony Silva would be absolutely willing to help with SLOs, but they are both 9-month faculty and they also have their own work. She didn't want the SLO coaches to be a bottleneck and suggested that Assessment Coordinator Dawne Bost be included as another source for assistance with SLOs. S. Jaworowski was asked if they might train some surrogates. She said they would be happy to do that and added that perhaps the Faculty Senate SLO Assessment Committee could be trained. S. Jaworowski noted that the SLO coaches don't have control over the timing of training, but they are here to help. It was suggested that the SLO Assessment Committee members receive duty-week training in SLO assessment so that they can be the go-to person for SLOs in their unit.

<u>Question</u>: Does the SLO check mean proposers see that the SLOs meet the criteria of how a SLO is supposed to be written?
<u>W. Jonen</u>: The SLO check is a voluntary thing (like the grammar check). It is not a required stop along the way. It is about the proposer being responsible for their proposal.

Faculty Senate Chair Vern Ogata observed that she and VCAA Pagotto decided to bring forward the proposed curriculum review/approval changes before the plan got set into details. They wanted feedback early in the development process before things got set in stone.

Email Curriculum Committee Co-Chairs Will Jonen (jonen@hawaii.edu) and Kapulani Landgraf (alandgra@hawaii.edu) with thoughts on the proposed changes.

<u>Transition to Kuali Student Curriculum Management (KSCM) System</u>
Facilitated by Susan Pope

S. Pope explained that her role is to translate the curriculum review and approval flow that faculty want into computer programming in the new curriculum system.

Five or six years ago, the UH System decided it needed commonality in curriculum and a better system than Curriculum Central. UH is a member of the Kuali Consortium, which had a curriculum product. UH explored using that product, but there were issues with the currency of its programming language. Then Kuali split off a for-profit entity, KualiCo, and that entity decided to develop a new curriculum system. UH signed on as a development partner.

S. Pope distributed a handout listing the 60 items that have to be filled out in a Curriculum Central course proposal and the 37 items that have to be filled out in a KSCM completed course outline. S. Pope worked with Nawaʻa Napoleon to develop Hawaiian language labels for all of the items. Kapiʻolani is the only campus to have labels in both Hawaiian and English.

Opportunities to perform KSCM testing will still be available. The testing resumes after the workflow is sorted out. Those interested need to sign a nondisclosure form to participate in testing.

Curriculum Central at Kapʻiolani was only used for courses, never for programs. Faculty Senate had asked that both program and course proposals be available digitally – that will be possible in KSCM.

Other differences between the two systems include:
- In Curriculum Central, when filling out a proposal, you can only view one field at a time. In KSCM, the proposer sees everything at once.

- In Curriculum Central, proposers had to use checkboxes to link content to assessment. In KSCM, there is no linking. The record of how content links to assessment is now maintained in the Taskstream Assessment Management system.
- Response time in Curriculum Central tended to be slow. KSCM, which has more modern programming, is much faster.
- KSCM allows multiple people to work on the same document. This was not possible in Curriculum Central unless multiple people were set up to work under a shared login.
- If Faculty Senate approves, in KSCM certain approvers can have the ability to make edits to a proposal. Approvers could not make edits in Curriculum Central.
- In Curriculum Central, courses that did not need to go through the full review process, (like experimental courses), could only bypass portions of the review through manual intervention. In KSCM, pathways that skip parts of the process for certain types of proposals can be programmed into the system.
- In Curriculum Central, those entering information had to remember to click the "Save" button to avoid losing their work. KSCM saves automatically.
- KSCM connects proposals to programs which in some instances allows the system to autofill certain fields in a proposal.
- Linking proposals to programs in KSCM makes it possible to bundle items so that courses linked to programs cannot be deleted, thus preventing unwitting deletions of courses needed by programs.
- In KSCM, FYI emails to stakeholders are system-generated, so there is no time lag.

S. Pope said she is waiting for Faculty Senate to gather feedback and vote on the proposed workflow. The plan at this time is to have a soft opening in May 2016. The official launch will be in Fall 2016. The system still needs to undergo rigorous testing because this is new software.

Question: Can faculty enter course proposals in May?
S. Pope: Just small pilot groups. There has been no discussion yet on who will be in the groups.

Question: Will data be migrated from Curriculum Central?
S. Pope: There is not a one-to-one match between Curriculum Central and KSCM in terms of questions. Also, Curriculum Central is a dirty database – there are a lot of test records and pretend courses. The data migration will therefore be from Banner (for all 10 campuses).

Question: Will KSCM have the same problems with cutting and pasting text that Curriculum Central did?
S. Pope: No, KSCM uses more up-to-date software. It also supports Hawaiian diacritics. We were asked if we wanted support for the major East Asian languages, but it was decided that this would only be needed for syllabi, which are added to the system as attachments. There will only be support for English, Hawaiian and French (for culinary).

Question: What is the output for the proposer? Can they view a proposal at any time?
S. Pope: Like Curriculum Central, the ability to view proposals is open to everyone. One difference is that in KSCM you can see who has it and any comments they have made. Also, you can print.
Comment: It would be very useful if proposals could be exported as .pdf files.

Question: In case there is no one from Academic Advising on the Curriculum Committee, is there a report that can be sent to Maida Kamber Center, Honda International Center, etc. to keep them up-to-date on proposals?
S.Pope: That report has been requested. Please send any suggestions/requests for reports to Susan Pope (spope@hawaii.edu).

Question: Department Chairs get students complaining about the relevance of an assignment to SLOs or about a syllabus conforming to SLOs. Will there be something in KSCM that DCs can refer to when these issues come up?
S.Pope: That information will be in Taskstream.

Question: If a Dean makes a comment, can the proposer make a response? This was not possible in Curriculum Central.
S.Pope: In the comment box, everyone can see comments and responses.

Comment: Right now you can't do anything to respond to a comment until a proposal is sent back to you. It requires outside communication with the reviewer, leaving no record in Curriculum Central of the outside conversation. Also, you can only make changes in unlocked fields.
S.Pope: It's a Faculty Senate decision.

At Faculty Senate request, certain questions in KSCM were removed from the review workflow because they are only needed for Banner. S. Pope fills those questions in using a separate interface.

Question: Can changes be made live if they require feedback? Can everything be unlocked?
S.Pope: There is a column showing all changes – any change to any field and who did it.
Question: Does the proposer decide who sees the changes?
S.Pope: No, that is a Faculty Senate decision.

S. Pope: In KSCM you can have multiple proposers working on the same proposal.
Question: So you can set things so that all department faculty are able to work on proposals?
S.Pope: There might be an upper limit to how many proposers can work on the same proposal.

S. Pope: In KSCM you can say only one entity can approve, but you can also say that out of a group of X members, approval is when a certain number of those members have approved.

Question: What if we discover a flaw in the workflow design after going live? Can things be changed?
S.Pope: Certain things.

Comment: I like the flow chart, but I don't like the idea of going back through the cycle if someone says no.
Comment: But if the entity responsibilities are clearly defined and reviewers stick to their responsibilities the proposal won't need to repeat the cycle if someone says no.

S.Pope: One discussion in the Disappearing Task Force was grammar. VCAA Pagotto says she is expecting anything that appears in the catalog to be perfect – in correct English.
Question: Who has the final call?
S.Pope: VCAA Pagotto.
Question: So the items in the panel called Catalog Information = 'Ike Waihona Kula (items 5-13) have to be in perfect English?
S.Pope: Yes.
Comment: Should I submit in just Hawaiian, I hope the college will find a translator.

Comment: One of the current problems was people suggesting wording changes. I want to eliminate wordsmithing.
S.Pope: That's where clarification in roles and responsibilities comes in.
W. Jonen: We propose that the Curriculum Committee not question wording. We are suggesting the proposer seek out help from within their department before submitting.

Comment: Being Department Chair, I send the proposal out to the department, they send comments, I relay to the proposer. Sometimes the comments are not well received.
S.Pope: One difference between the systems, in Curriculum Central all reviewers can make comments; in KSCM only ones with approval rights can make comments.
Question: When you share with your department, what do department members see?
S.Pope: A read-only version. They cannot comment in the document. They have to relay their comments to the Chair. The Chair then summarizes the comments.
Comment: In Health Sciences the proposal goes out on the department listserv and feedback goes directly to the proposer.
Comment: That approach works on a small scale.

Comment: It might be great at the start to identify 5 colleagues to collaborate on the proposal.
S.Pope: The proposer can share the proposal before it starts the approval process. They can ask colleagues to review. They can ask SLO experts to take a look.

Comment: You might want to include programs the course is tied to in the review.

S.Pope: KSCM has a thing called "dependency." It shows when courses depend on another course.

S.Pope: In item 4 (Linked Institution Subject Codes = Nā Papa Like Ma Nā Kula Nui 'Ē A'e) it shows similar courses at other UH campuses. That information no longer has to be entered manually.

S.Pope: The very first approver is the Department Chair, recording the department vote, the same as now. We used to do a pre-approval review. Those reviewing entities now receive FYIs.
Comment: Do the FYIs at the start involve talking to the proposer?
S.Pope: It is up to those notified if they choose to have a conversation with the proposer. It is not required. For STAR, the unit needs a heads up at the start and confirmation at the end.
W. Jonen: If those receiving FYIs have concerns, it doesn't stop the proposer, it just provides the proposer with additional information.
S.Pope: The FYIs provide opportunities for conversations before the department vote.

Question: Can Marketing and Enrollment get FYIs at the end like the Library?
S.Pope: At the UH System KSCM meeting recently, they said the proposed flow should have one more entry for Banner in the process because some information that is now entered manually into Banner will feed in automatically from KSCM. There needs to be a step where a Banner person reviews that information in a proposal before it loads into Banner. That Banner person is not an approver, just a reviewer.

Question: When does the FYI go to counselors?
S. Pope: It should be at the beginning and end. In the diagram, after the Chancellor approves a proposal, there should be three parallelograms – Catalog, STAR, and Academic Advisors.

Question: What are other campuses looking at doing?
S. Pope: Back in October 2014 when the switch to KualiCo happened, the then-head of UH ITS told everyone in the room to look at their existing process and think about change. Of the 10 campuses – everyone is looking; a lot of decisions haven't been made.

Question: Will KSCM items have more description?
S. Pope: Those are labels. In KSCM there is help. There is an explanation.

Question: Will we have the same effective dates and deadlines as now?
S. Pope: We will still have the same overall curriculum process. If the Chancellor approves a proposal by January 20, the earliest effective date for that proposal is Fall semester of that year. That's true of catalog listed courses. Programs have to be approved by the Board of Regents by January 20 to have an effective date of Fall semester of that year. These dates are due to STAR, not our curriculum management system.

<u>Question</u>: What is the difference between item 21 (Requested Effective Semester = Kau Hoʻomaka) and item #30 (Effective Term = Kau Hoʻomaka)?
<u>S. Pope</u>: Some Banner questions have slipped into the faculty interface and need to be removed.

<u>S. Pope</u>: As much as possible the interface uses pulldown menus and yes/no checkboxes rather than free-text entry boxes.
<u>S. Pope</u>: I'm waiting for Faculty Senate to discuss and vote on the proposed workflow.
<u>V. Ogata</u>: Faculty Senate has an upcoming general meeting on March 7, but we need to give faculty time for feedback so maybe the Senate will vote in April.

Faculty should send comments to their Senator who should already have distributed the proposed flow diagram and accompanying memo to their constituents.

<u>S. Pope</u>: The soft launch is in May.
<u>V. Ogata</u>: Our next meeting is in 1 week. We will do our best to vote by the April 4 meeting, but additional issues have come up and we don't want to rush.
<u>Comment</u>: Faculty Senate needs to get a list of questions and send it out.
<u>Comment</u>: Also a list of roles.
<u>V. Ogata</u>: One recommendation of the Disappearing Task Force to Faculty Senate was to create roles and responsibilities. Maybe an ad hoc committee needs to be formed.
Please share ideas. We are open to suggestions and any and all feedback from faculty.