



# Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee

## Policy and Procedures Manual

### Table of Contents

- Formation and Authority.....2
- Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-P.1, I-II: Academic Program Approval..... 4
  - Intent to Plan..... 4
  - Proposal..... 4
- Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-P.4: Academic Program Suspension.....6
- Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-P.5: Academic Program Elimination.....7
- Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-L: Organization & Establishment of Major Units.....8
- Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-S: Policy for Establishing and Maintaining Centers..... 9
  - Intent to Plan..... 9
  - Proposal..... 9
  - Continuing Approval..... 10

## **Formation and Authority**

---

Article III, Section 3 of the University of Maine [Faculty Senate Constitution](#) authority to review, and make recommendations on, the establishment and elimination of academic programs, as described below:

Section 3. *Review and recommendation.* The Senate shall have the authority to review and make recommendations regarding all other academic matters not specified in Section 2, above, or any matter affecting the academic environment including such matters as institutional plans and priorities, the allocation of the University's financial resources, academic organization, the library, the awarding of honorary degrees, admissions' policies and standards, **the establishment and elimination of academic programs**, and the assessment of academic outcomes.

For this purpose, the standing Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (PCRRC) of the University of Maine Faculty Senate is established under Article VII, Section 9 of the [Faculty Senate Bylaws](#), as described below.

1. *Function.* The Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee has the responsibility to receive and review proposals for the creation, elimination, and reorganization of academic programs. After the information is gathered and evaluated, the committee will present a recommendation to the faculty senate for its approval.

2. *Membership.* The members of the Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee are represented as much as possible by at least one faculty member from each college and Cooperative Extension with the preference being two from each college.

The PCRRC interprets the language of the bylaws such that "creation, elimination, and reorganization of academic programs" includes all proposals in APL Section X-L, X-P, and X-S which are required to be approved by the Chancellor's Office and/or the Board of Trustees, regardless of whether the Board's authority or Chancellor's Office authority has been waived.

The types of proposals subject to Chancellor review and Board approval are specified in

- [UMS Board of Trustees Policy Manual, Section 305.1, APL X-P.1, I-II: Academic Program Approval](#)
  - I. Single University Approval of Undergraduate Majors, Graduate Degree Programs and Certificates of Advanced Study
  - II. Multi-University Approval of Undergraduate Majors, Graduate Degree Programs and Certificates of Advanced Study
- [UMS Board of Trustees Policy Manual, Section 305.1, APL X-P.4: Academic Program Suspension](#)
- [UMS Board of Trustees Policy Manual, Section 305.1, APL X-P.5: Academic Program Elimination](#)
- [UMS Board of Trustees Policy Manual, APL X-L: Organization and Establishment of Major Units](#)
- [UMS Board of Trustees Policy Manual, APL X-S: Policy for Establish and Maintaining Centers](#)

Therefore, the procedures outlined here apply to the following:

- Creation, reorganization, and elimination of single university undergraduate majors, graduate degree programs, and certificates of advanced study
- Creation, reorganization, and elimination of multi-university undergraduate majors, graduate degree programs, and certificates of advanced study
- All university reorganizations involving major university units such as vice-presidential divisions, colleges, schools, academic divisions and departments.
- Reorganization, establishment, elimination, or merging of colleges, schools, academic divisions and departments, off-campus instructional centers, and centers, institutes, laboratories, and bureaus in the research and public service areas.
- Establishment of university centers or other new units which provide academic or student support services and which commit University resources over an extended period of time.

Renaming of a unit where there is neither a substantial change in activity and mission nor a change in organizational level does **not** require approval by the Board of Trustees, but the Chancellor shall be informed of any change in the name of a unit. As such, the PCRRC will not require a review of such changes, but should also be so informed.

## **Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-P.1, I-II: Academic Program Approval**

---

The PCRRC is informed of all Intents to Plan (ITPs) submitted for creation and reorganization of both single- and multi-university academic programs. All full proposals receive a formal review conducted by the PCRRC, followed by a Faculty Senate vote to endorse or oppose the proposal.

### **Intent to Plan**

The Faculty Senate President and Chair of the PCRRC will receive an “Intent to Plan” (ITP) for any proposed program creations or reorganizations, as specified in Sections I & II of [APL X-P.1, Section 305.1, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#).

The ITP is provided for informational purposes, and allows the Senate and PCRRC to conduct initial discussions in anticipation of the full proposal. After receipt of the ITP, the Committee may also request additional information from the proposers of the program creation or reorganization.

While ITPs that meet the criteria specified in APL X-P.1 will be considered complete, the PCRRC is likely to request the following additional information, especially if the proposal is for a program reorganization. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, proposers are strongly encouraged to preemptively include these items in their ITPs:

- Endorsement of the College Dean and other relevant Unit Leadership
- Description of the current organizational structure and functional responsibilities of the unit or units that will be affected by the proposed changes. The description should identify the entities to which the unit or units currently report and briefly characterize the units’ missions in regard to research, instruction, and service.
- Description of faculty and staff who will be affected by the proposed changes.

PCRRC will make efforts to avoid unnecessary burdens in the request for information at this stage, knowing that the length of the ITP is limited by the APL specifications, and that additional information will be forthcoming in the full proposal.

### **Proposal**

For all proposed program creations and reorganizations, the Faculty Senate President and Chair of the PCRRC will receive the full Program Proposal for review as part of the University’s “normal curricular processes”, as specified in Sections I & II of [APL X-P.1, Section 305.1, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#).

The Committee will use the proposal to make a recommendation that the Faculty Senate move to endorse or oppose the proposed program creation or reorganization. The Committee will present the Program Proposal for discussion at a Faculty Senate meeting and distribute it to all University of Maine faculty. Two weeks will be allotted for written comments to be submitted to the Committee Chair. During this period, the Committee may also request additional information from the proposers of the program creation or reorganization. If deemed necessary, based on Faculty

Senate discussion or written comments received from faculty, the PCRRC may elect to hold a public, campus-wide meeting for further discussion of the Program Proposal.

While proposals that meet the criteria specified in APL X-P.1 will be considered complete, the PCRRC is likely to request the following additional information, especially if the proposal is for a program reorganization. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, proposers are strongly encouraged to preemptively include these items in their proposals:

- Endorsement of the College Dean and other relevant Unit Leadership
- The timeline for implementation of any decisions
- (if applicable) Description of how reorganization will better serve the strategic focus of The University of Maine
- (if applicable) Description of how the clarity of the program's identity and function will be increased by transfer to or consolidation with another program.
- (if applicable) Description of the budgetary constraints that require reorganization of a program within a department, school or college.
- (if applicable) If any of the following criteria contraindicating reorganization are true, please describe:
  - The reorganization is sufficiently uncommon within higher education so as to render difficulty in recruitment and retention of quality students and faculty.
  - The reorganization would endanger the quality and/or accreditation status, where applicable, of one or more of the programs affected.
  - The programs, though dealing with similar subject matter, are substantially different in orientation, objective, or clientele.
  - The cost reduction of reorganization would be so modest as to make such reorganization rather pointless if cost savings is the primary objective.
  - The program's reorganization would have a substantially negative impact on education and societal concerns to Maine.
  - The program's reorganization would have a substantially negative impact on strategic goals of The University of Maine.
  - The program's reorganization would result in substantial loss of revenue currently derived from grants, contracts, endowments or gifts.

After completing its review, the PCRRC will draft a motion to endorse or oppose the proposed program creation or reorganization and bring it to the Faculty Senate for vote. Unless extenuating circumstances are documented in advance, the time between the Senate/PCRRC's receipt of the full proposal and the Senate's vote on a motion of endorsement or opposition shall not exceed 60 days.

## **Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-P.4: Academic Program Suspension**

---

Upon the initiation of a Program Suspension Procedure, as specified in [APL X-P.4, Section 305.1, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#), the Faculty Senate President and PCRRC Chair shall be informed of the intent to develop a Program Suspension Proposal.

Following the development of the Program Suspension Proposal, as specified in Step Two of [APL X-P.4, Section 305.1, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#), the PCRRC will use the proposal to make a recommendation that the Faculty Senate move to endorse or oppose the proposed program suspension. The Committee will present the Program Suspension Proposal for discussion at a Faculty Senate meeting and distribute it to all University of Maine faculty. Two weeks will be allotted for written comments to be submitted to the Committee Chair. During this period, the Committee may also request additional information from the proposers of the program suspension (or other relevant stakeholders). If deemed necessary, based on Faculty Senate discussion or written comments received from faculty, the PCRRC may elect to hold a public, campus-wide meeting for further discussion of the Program Suspension Proposal.

While proposals that meet the criteria specified in APL X-P.4 will be considered complete, the PCRRC is likely to request the following information as part of its review. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, proposers are strongly encouraged to preemptively include these items in their proposals:

- Endorsement of the College Dean and other relevant Unit Leadership
- Timeline for implementation

After completing its review, the PCRRC will draft a motion to endorse or oppose the proposed program suspension and bring it to the Faculty Senate for vote. The motion and vote results shall be included upon submission of the Proposal to the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (Step Three of APL X-P.4). Unless extenuating circumstances are documented in advance, the time between the Senate/PCRRC's receipt of the full proposal and the Senate's vote on a motion of endorsement or opposition shall not exceed 60 days.

## **Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-P.5: Academic Program Elimination**

---

Upon the initiation of a Program Elimination Procedure, as specified in [APL X-P.5, Section 305.1, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#), the Faculty Senate President and PCRRC Chair shall be informed of the intent to develop a Program Elimination Proposal.

Following the development of the Program Elimination Proposal, as specified in Step Two of [APL X-P.5, Section 305.1, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#), the PCRRC will use the proposal to make a recommendation that the Faculty Senate move to endorse or oppose the proposed program elimination. The Committee will present the Program Elimination Proposal for discussion at a Faculty Senate meeting and distribute it to all University of Maine faculty. Two weeks will be allotted for written comments to be submitted to the Committee Chair. During this period, the Committee may also request additional information from the proposers of the program elimination (or other relevant stakeholders). If deemed necessary, based on Faculty Senate discussion or written comments received from faculty, the PCRRC may elect to hold a public, campus-wide meeting for further discussion of the Program Elimination Proposal.

While proposals that meet the criteria specified in APL X-P.5 will be considered complete, the PCRRC is likely to request the following information as part of its review. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, proposers are strongly encouraged to preemptively include these items in their proposals:

- Endorsement of the College Dean and other relevant Unit Leadership
- Timeline for implementation
- Comparisons of program quality metrics (enrollment, graduation rates, program demand, student placements, etc.) to other peer institutions/programs

After completing its review, the PCRRC will draft a motion to endorse or oppose the proposed program elimination and bring it to the Faculty Senate for vote. The motion and vote results shall be included upon submission of the Proposal to the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs (Step Three of APL X-P.5). Unless extenuating circumstances are documented in advance, the time between the Senate/PCRRC's receipt of the full proposal and the Senate's vote on a motion of endorsement or opposition shall not exceed 60 days.

## **Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-L: Organization & Establishment of Major Units**

Following the development of a proposal for major university reorganization, the establishment of a new unit, the merger of two or more units or elimination of a unit, as specified in [APL X-L, Section 309, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#), the proposal shall be provided to the Faculty Senate President and PCRRC Chair.

The PCRRC will use the proposal to make a recommendation that the Faculty Senate move to endorse or oppose the proposed action. The Committee will present the proposal for discussion at a Faculty Senate meeting and distribute it to all University of Maine faculty. Two weeks will be allotted for written comments to be submitted to the Committee Chair. During this period, the Committee may also request additional information from the proposers of the unit establishment/reorganization/elimination (or other relevant stakeholders). If deemed necessary, based on Faculty Senate discussion or written comments received from faculty, the PCRRC may elect to hold a public, campus-wide meeting for further discussion of the proposal.

While proposals that meet the criteria specified in APL X-L will be considered complete, the PCRRC is likely to request the following information as part of its review. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, proposers are strongly encouraged to preemptively include these items in their proposal:

- Endorsement of the College Dean and other relevant Unit Leadership
- Timeline for implementation

After completing its review, the PCRRC will draft a motion to endorse or oppose the proposal and bring it to the Faculty Senate for vote. The motion and vote results shall be included upon submission of the Proposal to the Chancellor by the University President. Unless extenuating circumstances are documented in advance, the time between the Senate/PCRRC's receipt of the full proposal and the Senate's vote on a motion of endorsement or opposition shall not exceed 60 days.

## **Review of Proposals Submitted under APL X-S: Policy for Establishing and Maintaining Centers**

The PCRRC is informed of all Center Intents to Plan (CITPs) submitted for creation and reorganization of campus centers or institutes (hereafter referred to as “centers”), as defined in [APL X-S, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#). All full proposals receive a formal review conducted by the PCRRC, followed by a Faculty Senate vote to endorse or oppose the proposal.

### **Intent to Plan**

The Faculty Senate President and Chair of the PCRRC will receive a “Center Intent to Plan” (CITP) for any proposed center creations or reorganizations, upon approval of the CITP by the Chancellor, as specified in [APL X-S, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#).

The CITP is provided for informational purposes, and allows the Senate and PCRRC to conduct initial discussions in anticipation of the full proposal. After receipt of the CITP, the Committee may also request additional information from the proposers of the program creation or reorganization.

While ITPs that meet the criteria specified in APL X-S will be considered complete, the PCRRC is likely to request the following additional information, especially if the proposal is for a program reorganization. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, proposers are strongly encouraged to preemptively include these items in their ITPs:

- Endorsement from the most closely-related academic units

PCRRC will make efforts to avoid unnecessary burdens in the request for information at this stage, knowing that the length of the CITP is limited by the APL specifications, and that additional information will be forthcoming in the full proposal.

### **Proposal**

For all proposed center creations and reorganizations, the Faculty Senate President and Chair of the PCRRC will receive a full Center Proposal for review, as specified in [APL X-S, Board of Trustees Policy Manual](#). The Committee will use the proposal to make a recommendation that the Faculty Senate move to endorse or oppose the proposed center creation or reorganization. The Committee will distribute the proposal to all University of Maine faculty and allow two weeks for written comments to be submitted to the Committee Chair. During this period, the Committee may also request additional information from the proposers of the center creation/reorganization. If deemed necessary, based on Faculty Senate discussion or written comments received from faculty, the PCRRC may elect to hold a public, campus-wide meeting for further discussion of the Center Proposal.

While proposals that meet the criteria specified in APL X-S will be considered complete, the PCRRC is likely to request the following information as part of its review. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, proposers are strongly encouraged to preemptively include these items in their proposal:

- Endorsement from the most closely-related academic units

After completing its review, the PCRRC will draft a motion to endorse or oppose the proposed center creation/reorganization and bring it to the Faculty Senate for vote. Unless extenuating circumstances are documented in advance, the time between the Senate/PCRRC's receipt of the full proposal and the Senate's vote on a motion of endorsement or opposition shall not exceed 60 days.

### **Continuing Approval**

Following the establishment of a center, the Faculty Senate President and PCRRC Chair shall be provided with any Center Review documents which are produced and submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs. Center Review documents which recommend the continuance of the center will be for informational purposes only. However, PCRRC and the Faculty Senate will be provided the opportunity for a formal review of any Center Review documents which recommend the discontinuance of a center. If the discontinuance of a center is proposed by any process separate from the "Process for Continuing Approvals" outlined in APL X-S, PCRRC and the Faculty Senate will be provided the opportunity to review and vote on endorsement or opposition of the discontinuance proposal.

Upon the receipt of a Center Review document which recommends discontinuance of a center (or other document proposing a center discontinuance), the PCRRC will review the proposal and make a recommendation that the Faculty Senate move to endorse or oppose the proposed center discontinuance. The Committee will distribute the Center Review (or other proposal) to all Faculty Senators and allow two weeks for written comments to be submitted to the Committee Chair. During this period, the Committee may also request additional information from the proposers of the center discontinuance. If deemed necessary, based on Faculty Senate discussion or written comments received from faculty, the PCRRC may elect to hold a public, campus-wide meeting for further discussion of the center discontinuance proposal.

While Center Review documents that meet the criteria specified in APL X-S will be considered complete, the PCRRC is likely to request the following information as part of its review. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, proposers are strongly encouraged to preemptively include these items in their proposal:

- Endorsement from the most closely-related academic units

After completing its review, the PCRRC will draft a motion to endorse or oppose the proposed center discontinuance and bring it to the Faculty Senate for vote. Unless extenuating circumstances are documented in advance, the time between the Senate/PCRRC's receipt of the full proposal and the Senate's vote on a motion of endorsement or opposition shall not exceed 60 days.