1. **Introductions**: KSCM project manager Martha Stephenson was introduced for the first time in person, having met the group at the June 16 meeting via Skype. Chris Chan of the UH system ITS, our new Technical lead, met the group for the first time. All ten campuses were represented.

2. **Campus Visits**: Tentative plans for Martha to visit Honolulu CC and Windward CC were postponed to October, as Martha's emerging schedule of meetings this week precludes her leaving campus.

3. **Common Questions**: Martha addressed important questions that have recurred in meetings the past week:
   - Timeline for implementation: -- This has undergone some changes over the past week, as additional information has been shared by the various groups, and it might change again. At this point, CM Courses will be fully implemented (used by all campuses) in October 2015, and in Summer 2016, CM Programs will be implemented along with system upgrading to the next version of CM. Integration with STAR will be part of the implementation of CM Programs.
   - Whatever the Courses implementation date, all course approvals will need to be completed and ready to be rolled into Banner by that date. The new data entry/proposal/approval cycle can begin with CM implementation. This means that campuses will need to change deadlines in preparation for first implementation; for subsequent years, they can return to their current proposal/approval schedules.
   - All Curriculum Central data will be retained and accessible as read-only for courses at the point of implementation in Oct 2015; and Curriculum Central program data will become read-only when Programs are implemented in Summer 2016.
   - Why are we doing this? -- CM [following Martha's practice, we will use "CM" here instead of "KSCM"] will replace the system that serves some of our campuses very well, but that depends entirely on a single system manager and is not part of a larger technical support community. For those campuses that have not adopted Curriculum Central and rely on paper processes or their own unique campus database, CM offers the advantages of an online curriculum management system: ready document and process access as well as transparency. The adoption of CM is an ongoing opportunity for all campuses to work together collegially and thoughtfully to develop a "system" curriculum management system.
   - Course assessment? -- The system Vice President for Community Colleges, one of the prime movers for the adoption of CM, acknowledges that CM does not have the capacity to handle course/program assessment as practiced by campuses in compliance with the
regional accrediting commissions for community colleges and senior colleges, and that alternative means will need to be employed by campuses. [An alternative means for recording and tracking course assessment information within CM has been suggested: campus-specific assessment templates to be completed and attached to each CM course proposal.]

• Banner integration? -- This is essential: whatever course data Banner requires will be integrated into CM Courses. Martha has met with the Banner Group and will continue to do so frequently to ensure complete integration.
  • Banner integration will include nightly batch updating from CM to Banner.

4. **Vanilla User Interface (UI):** We are aiming for as "vanilla" a version of the UI as is consistent with Banner needs and the ten-campus realities. "Vanilla" means the out-of-the-box version of CM as displayed in the Kuali website:

   go to [demo.ks.kuali.org](http://demo.ks.kuali.org)
   login as fred/fred or admin/admin
   select Curriculum Management from the "Select an Area" dropdown list on upper left

   • vanilla means minimizing changes. Changes include terminology, removal of items that are required for CM functioning (e.g., Proposal Title), addition of new fields, and the order of items/fields on each page
   • vanilla means using field descriptions to clarify unfamiliar terms/vocabulary
   • vanilla means using the help option as well as including links in field descriptions to helpful web pages

   Martha will recommend the following changes, and others that emerge from further discussions:

   • Accommodating the curricular differences among the ten campuses, user login will identify the CM fields and dropdown options selected by the user's campus for certain fields (e.g., types of course Activity),
   • Duplicate course checking function will be modified by adding a third criterion, Location (campus), to the existing Subject Code (alpha) and Course Number, to avoid duplication of alpha/number on user's campus but allowing the adoption of alpha/number (and associated course title, description, etc.) from other campuses.
   • Other recommended changes are indicated below in section 5

5. **Walk-through of the out-of-the-box:** (See item 4 above for how to use the Kuali version located at [demo.ks.kuali.org](http://demo.ks.kuali.org).)

**Course Information:**

• Need Proposal Name for CM to track the proposal; can use a version of the catalog title
• Catalog title
• Transcript title
• Subject Code
• Course Number: need to allow for more digits
• Instructor: Hide since no campus uses it
• Course description: allow up to 1000 characters (will be set to whatever the Banner field maximum is for course description). Some campuses restrict the course description length in their official "printed" catalog. Perhaps meet the unique campus catalog needs for maximum characters by use of a report/extract for campus catalogs.
• Rationale: in field description, links, samples, encourage proposers to describe justification, impact, mission of dept/institution, student demand, etc. This is not a Banner field but is needed for the CM approval process

Governance
• Changes needed here: with the login serving to identify the user's campus, the list of Locations can be hidden. Administering Organization might also be hidden, as campuses do not seem to require it. More discussion needed.
• The appropriate department and therefore workflow (approver sequence) is selected on this page

Course Logistics
• Further discussion is needed about Duration Count and Type to determine if UH needs these and if so, in what form
• "Alternate Years" may need to be added to list of terms offered
• Final Exams can be hidden
• Pilot course = Experimental course -- further discussion might be needed as different campuses may treat these differently (length of experimental period affects Banner end term). Need to standardize to x97 and x98 for all campuses.
• Add a cluster of General Education fields for those campuses that wish to incorporate GE review in CM: Is this course being proposed for GE, Which GE category(s), date(s). Martha to research Banner field requirements with Banner team for (1) new Gen Ed courses, (2) Gen Ed courses that change designation category, (3) renewal of existing Gen Ed course where designation is being continued, (4) non-renewal of existing Gen Ed course where designation is being dis-continued.
• Activity type: dropdown list will include options relevant to user's campus
• Anticipated class size: hide--not needed by Banner, question can be included in uploaded template for course content

Course Prerequisites
• Course prerequisites/corequisites list will need to be modified to show Banner options
• Antirequisites: needs clarification in the URL accessed via the field description, needs clarification as to which campuses use the feature – at least 2 campuses use it

Learning Objectives
• Much discussion as to whether Objectives should be replaced by Outcomes. Unresolved, but it was pointed out that the regional accrediting commissions are using Outcomes.
• Field description can include links to webpages showing campus ILOs, PLOs, and explaining how to write LOs

Collaborators
• Further discussion as to whether this is relevant for UH campuses

[Financials -- not discussed at this meeting. At a UI conference call, we discussed that some vanilla items are not relevant for UH, and discussed either replacing with a new Additional]
Resources Needed field, or eliminating entirely, because it was questioned if proposers answer this accurately. Not Banner items, in any case.]

Other

- Course Catalog: user browses by Subject area and School (college); we will add "Campus" to allow user to view all courses on all campuses
- CM shows the current (approved) version of the course side-by-side with the proposed course, with changes highlighted so that the approver can easily observe changes (This is an existing feature that must be shown in the campus demos.)
- CM allows editing by approvers. This needs further discussion, as different campuses have different policies in who can edit proposals.
- CM allows proposals to be sent back to the proposer, to the previous approver, etc. Can different campuses apply different policies? One campus might return proposal to proposer then back to the requesting approver; another might have such proposals reenter the approval process from the beginning. Further discussion is needed.
- Workflow: CM can add post-campus approvers to workflow, i.e., CCAO, BOR, for Programs
- Out of the box, CM does not allow a campus CM administrator to login as another user/proposer to make changes. BC has written code that enables the system administrator to grant someone else access.

6. Making the CM landing page the UH CM page: Martha showed us UMaryland and Boston College's landing pages. UH system color is gold with black type on a white page (PMS 872 and black, HTML (hexadecimal) B3995D). The link to UH system graphics standards is located at http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/eaur/graphicsguide.html Having campus colors show up with login (as featured in Curriculum Central) not only would be costly but would promote the silo effect. This is a system implementation therefore the use of system colors is more appropriate. Other changes we might make include adding a section for links to Useful Documents, such as instructional videos. Martha invites suggestions and will start the conversation by sending around a first-shot adaptation.

7. Campus workflows: Each campus representative should send a display of the various workflows on his/her campus to Martha (mstephenson@vivantech.com) or April (komenaka@hawaii.edu) by August 15. April will email the link to the rSmart report so that campuses have a starting sample for workflows. rSmart workflow information might need to be revised, updated, or corrected.

Sample workflows from Hilo are:

**College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) Undergraduate programs:**
proposer
Curriculum Central campus administrator
Department chairperson
Division chairperson
College Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) chairperson
Associate Dean of college
Congress Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) chairperson
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
College of Pharmacy (COP) Graduate programs: 
proposer
Curriculum Central campus administrator
Academic associate dean
Dean of college
Graduate council chairperson
Congress Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) chairperson
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

8. Next steps:

• Begin detailed UI requirements sessions
• Document workflows