

The University of Maine
Faculty Senate Standing Committee
on
Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee
(PCRRC)

Policy and Procedures Manual

The standing committee of the University of Maine Faculty Senate is established under Article IV Section 8 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws (consult <http://www.umaine.edu/facultysenate/Bylaws.htm>)

Motion: Through approval and confirmation of the policies and procedures in this manual, the Faculty Senate relegates to the PCRRC lead responsibility in reviewing for the Faculty Senate (1) any proposals at the University of Maine for creation or elimination of academic degree, certificate and similar programs and (2) any proposals for creation or reorganization of academic units.

Motion Approved by Full Faculty Senate: November 19, 2008

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 1 Article IV Section 8 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws (establishing the PCRRC) and Article III Sec 3 of the Constitution	2
Chapter 2 Academic Degree Programs: The University of Maine Fifteen-Stage Process for Approval of New Academic Degree Programs	3
Chapter 3 Academic Degree Programs: The University of Maine Criteria and Process for Academic Program Elimination	5
Chapter 4 Procedures for the Review of Academic Unit Creation and Reorganization by the PCRRC	9
Appendix A: Guidelines for Pre-Proposals for Informal Review (Phase 2) by the PCRRC	12
Appendix B: Guidelines for Proposals for Formal Review (Phase 3) by the PCRRC	14
Chapter 5 Administrative Procedures Manual Section 305 of the University of Maine System	
305.0 Program Inventory	17
305.1 Academic Program Approval	17
305.2 Substantive Changes to Existing Academic Programs	19
305.3 Academic Program Review	20
305.4 Academic Program Suspension	21
305.5 Academic Program Elimination	23
305.6 Brokering Academic Programs	24

Chapter 1

Article IV Section 8 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws establishing the Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (PCRRC)

Section 8. PROGRAM CREATION and REORGANIZATION REVIEW COMMITTEE.

A. Function. The committee has the responsibility to receive and review proposals for the creation and reorganization of academic programs. Once the information is gathered and evaluated, the committee will present a recommendation to the faculty senate for its approval.

B. Membership. This committee will consist of a minimum of ten faculty senators, including two from each college. Members of this committee may be members of other standing senate committee.

Reference: <http://www.umaine.edu/facultysenate/Bylaws.htm>

Note: The PCRRC in 2008 interprets the language of the bylaws such that “creation and reorganization of academic programs “ includes both creation and reorganization of academic degree programs as well as creation and reorganization of academic units and asks for confirmation of this interpretation by formal vote of the faculty senate.

Senate Authority over these Matters as expressed in the Constitution

Extract from Article III of the University of Maine Constitution

Section 3. Review and recommendation. The Senate shall have the authority to review and make recommendations regarding all other academic matters ... or any matter affecting the academic environment including such matters as ..., academic organization, ..., <and> the establishment and elimination of academic programs,

Chapter 2

Academic Degree Programs

The University of Maine Fifteen-Stage Process for Approval of New Academic Degree Programs

Intent to Plan Stage

Stage 1

The college or unit in which the proposed academic degree program will be housed deliberates upon it according to procedures approved by that college or unit.

Stage 2

The sponsoring college or unit files the Intent to Plan (ITP) for review by the Undergraduate Program and Curriculum Committee (UPCC) for undergraduate degree programs or the Graduate Board (GB) for graduate degree programs as well as the Faculty Senate.

Stage 3

The Provost reviews the recommendations of the UPCC or GB and the Faculty Senate and forwards the ITP to the Provost Council for their review. Depending on the outcome of these reviews, the Provost either recommends the ITP to the President or returns it to the originating unit.

Stage 4

If the President approves the ITP, the Provost forwards it to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Stage 5

The Vice Chancellor's Office sends the ITP to the System Chief Academic Officers (CAO) for action. They may accept it, reject it, or return it for modification.

Stage 6

The Provost will receive notification from the Vice Chancellor's Office regarding acceptance of the ITP and the progress report deadline. The Provost's office will send the notification to the Dean and Associate Provost for Graduate studies or the Associate Dean for Undergraduate studies, the appropriate College Dean and the individual sponsor of the ITP. This action will initiate preparation of a full program proposal by the originating unit.

Full Program Proposal Stage

Stage 7

The sponsoring college or unit completes the proposal, along with a separate page that lists at least three potential external reviewers (name, address, telephone number, and email address). If new resources are required, the sponsoring college secures a fiscal note from the Office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Stage 8

The sponsoring college or unit files the proposal with the Provost's Office for review by the UPCC for undergraduate degree programs or the GB for graduate degree programs as well as the Faculty Senate.

Stage 9

The Provost reviews the comments of the UPCC or GB and the Faculty Senate and forwards it to the Provost's Council for their review and recommendation. Depending on the outcome of these reviews, the Provost will either return it to the originating unit or recommend to the President.

Stage 10

The President either returns the proposal to the Provost for further consideration or submits it for review and comment by the University of Maine Board of Visitors (BOV) Academic/Student Affairs Committee.

Stage 11

The President considers the recommendations of the Board of Visitors and either returns the proposal for modifications (or withdrawal) or submits the proposal to the Chancellor's office for review by external evaluators.

Stage 12

The Chancellor's Office submits the proposal to external evaluators for review.

Stage 13

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs forwards the reviews by the outside evaluators to the University of Maine for comment.

Stage 14

The sponsoring unit, on behalf of the University of Maine, responds to the external reviewers.

Stage 15

The University of Maine System Board of Trustees acts on the proposal. Notification of their action is then sent to the University of Maine. Copies of the notification are then sent to the sponsor, appropriate college dean, and appropriate associate provost.

Chapter 3

Academic Degree Programs

The University of Maine
**CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR
ACADEMIC PROGRAM ELIMINATION**
Revised 3/25/92

I. Definition of an Academic Program

Any formal program of focused study within the University including certificates, undergraduate majors, graduate degrees, etc.

II. Assumptions

- A. Many measures of program quality, cost effectiveness, etc. are difficult to quantify and must be judged largely subjectively.
- B. Program evaluation should be done primarily by academics, that is, by a group which is composed of representatives of *academic* programs, as opposed to one which includes representation from other units of the University.
- C. Uniform comparative data from peer institutions do not exist for many disciplines at a departmental or program level. Comparative data, such as national means, etc., are available for a number of areas, especially professional and other programs accredited by national associations. These data may best be presented and interpreted by individual programs during the evaluation process.
- D. Because of our own internal division of academic and related research budgets between different accounts, it is often difficult to attribute total cost of instruction or research to a particular program. Therefore institutional data need careful interpretation to assure comparability between departments and colleges.
- E. The criteria and processes adopted should be inclusive enough both to accommodate termination due to long range reallocations of programmatic resources and expedient enough to serve in times of rapid budget rescission or reallocation.

III. Criteria and Measures to Evaluate Programs or Elimination

- A. Centrality to mission of *all* universities -This should be determined by a relatively large faculty group representing the major academic divisions of the institution. The measure should be very coarse, perhaps *high, medium, and low*.
- B. Centrality to the *specific* mission of the University of Maine or to the expected mission of a typical *Land Grant* university -See A., above.
- C. Quality of program -This is highly subjective and should be evaluated on a similarly coarse scale by a faculty panel representing related disciplines. Factors considered should include output measures such as student placement.

- D. Research and scholarly productivity. See C., above, Variables examined should include measures such as success and placement or research students publications, and artistic accomplishments.
- E. Program demand -Consideration should be given to demand current and projected enrollments, and demographic trends.
- F. Public Service Productivity - See D., above. Special consideration should be given to importance of service to constituent groups.
- G. Cost of instruction -Measures here should include cost per credit hour of instruction broken down by level, e.g. graduate, upper division undergraduate, service, etc., number of advisees, and number of graduate students directed or advised. These data should be normalized to the number of full time faculty equivalents. It is understood that there are intrinsic disciplinary differences. [*Caveat* -These data must be made comparable for the entire institution. In particular, either formal released time for research must be attributed to each individual faculty member, or Experiment Station, CMS, LASST, Quaternary Studies, The Margaret Chase Smith Center and other organized research and public service unit appointments with any significant teaching expectation must be attributed entirely to Instructional costs.] In assessing the financial impact of eliminating or severely curtailing programs one should examine the impact on total enrollment.
- H. Cost of Research -This can only be accurately computed if released time is correctly attributed and if budgets of organized research units and other direct or indirect research support are appropriately included. The cost or research should include appropriate offsets for extramural funding.
- I. Cost of Public Service -See H., above. Again care must be taken to appropriately address split appointments.
- J. Other Issues - Care should be given to identify the special needs or constituent groups that may be served by the program.

IV. Procedure for Reviewing Programs for Possible Elimination

- A. Proposal of programs to be considered for elimination will be made by the Dean *of the College within which the program is administered*. In the case of jointly administered programs, this proposal will be made by the deans jointly. In making program proposals, the dean(s) will:
 - 1. Provide a brief describing *specifically* what program is to be eliminated, the reasons for the proposed elimination, and the projected savings (including the number of faculty, support staff, or other positions which will be eliminated) by such action. This brief *must* include but should not be limited to assessing:
 - a. *Program Quality*, including, if possible, comparisons to similar programs in peer institutions and/or to similar disciplines within the University of Maine. Consideration should be given to student placement and other output measures of quality.

- b. *Centrality to the Mission of the University*, including centrality to generic university mission, centrality to the Land Grant mission, regional or national importance, and relationship/importance to other programs within the University of Maine.
 - c. *The Cost of Instruction*, including the salary, support, and other costs necessary to provide continuation of the program, and in the case of programs judged to be of low quality, the cost of bringing the program up to an adequate standard. In the case of programs which would potentially eliminate graduate teaching assistants, the cost of offsetting such elimination should be addressed.
 - d. *The Cost of Research*, including the research productivity of the faculty, including, but not limited to scholarly publications, extramural funding, and placement of research students.
 - e. *The Cost of Public Service*, including public service productivity of the faculty, including both paid and unpaid professional consulting,
 - f. *Program Demand*, including current and projected enrollments and demographic trends.
 - g. *Other Costs and Benefits*, including uniqueness of program within the University or region, special needs of constituent groups within Maine or New England, and projected enrollments and other demographic trends.
 - h. *Total Net Cost Savings of Program Elimination*, including an analysis of the cost of lost enrollment net loss of students who would not enroll in other programs, number of faculty and other positions eliminated (present cost of such positions should be shown. and a schedule of reductions by retirement. termination. etc. should be presented), cost of replacement or instruction by other programs, and loss of research revenue, A time profile of cost savings, limitations on registrations, etc., must be included. If appropriate, a statement of the political and other non-financial costs of program elimination should be included.
2. Submit the brief together with any supporting data to the Faculty Senate, and present the same documents in their entirety to the program at a time *no later than* submission to the Faculty Senate.
- B. The program will have *fourteen calendar* days to prepare a *written* response to the brief and to transmit such response to the Faculty Senate, with copy to the dean. By receipt of its copy of the recommendation, the program is put on notice that it should prepare its response.
 - C. Upon receipt of the program's response to the recommendation, the Faculty Senate will immediately schedule a hearing to consider the recommendation. This hearing must be held *no sooner than ten calendar days and no later than fourteen calendar days following receipt of the response*. It is left to the Faculty Senate to adopt such procedural rules and limits on presentations as it deems necessary, but such rules and

limitations should ensure that the issues are fairly addressed, consistent with the need for timely action. It is the intent of these procedural recommendations that *the hearings be completed within three consecutive working days.*

- D. At a time *no sooner than ten calendar days and later than fourteen calendar days* following the hearing, the Faculty Senate will convene to vote upon the recommendation. Again, the Faculty Senate should establish rules for this procedure. The Faculty Senate will *immediately* transmit the results of its vote either in support of the recommendation that the program be eliminated or recommending against such action to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This recommendation will *at the same time* be conveyed to the program and to the dean(s).
- E. *No later than fourteen calendar days* following receipt of the vote of the Faculty Senate, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will recommend action on the matter to the President. To permit additional opportunity for response from the program, this recommendation will be made *no sooner than ten calendar days* from receipt of the vote of the Faculty Senate. At the same time, a copy of the recommendation will be provided to the program and to the dean(s),
- F. *No later no later than fourteen calendar days* following receipt of the recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President will render a decision on the matter, and, if the decision is to terminate the program, notify the Chancellor so that appropriate action can be taken by the Board of Trustees. Again, to permit additional opportunity for response from the program, this recommendation will be made *no sooner than ten calendar days* from receipt of the recommendation or the Vice President for Academic Affairs. At the same time, a copy of the decision will be provided to the program and to the dean(s).

Note that the recommended process is intended to be completed in a time not to exceed sixty calendar days from initiation for review to final disposition by the President.

Respectfully Submitted,

Committee to Study Procedures to be Followed in Proposing Academic Programs for Termination:

Dana Birnbaum

Patricia Burnes

Thomas Duchesneau

Wallace Dunham

Horace Givens

Paul L. Goodfriend

Raymond O'Connor

Charles E. Tarr, Chair

Anatole Wieck

Anita Wihry, Staff to Committee

Clinton Winne

C.E.T. 3/25/92

Chapter 4

Procedures for the Review of Academic Unit¹ Creation and Reorganization Proposals by The University of Maine Faculty Senate Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (Approved by Faculty Senate Motion, May 8, 2007)

Coverage of These Procedures

The University of Maine Faculty Senate is authorized to review and make recommendations regarding proposals for the creation and reorganization of academic units. The procedures explained here relate to the presentation and review of all proposals that fall within the scope of the University's Policy and Procedures for Program Creation and Reorganization, as approved by the Senate and by the President of the University of Maine.

The reorganizations subject to Senate review include "...all proposals required to be approved by the Chancellor's Office or the Board of Trustees, regardless of whether the Board's authority or Chancellor's Office authority has been waived." (University of Maine Policy and Procedures for Program Creation and Reorganization) The types of proposals subject to Chancellor review and Board approval are specified in the University of Maine Board of Trustees Policy Manual, Section 309, Organization and Establishment of Major Units. Therefore, the procedures outlined here apply to the following:

1. All university reorganizations involving major university academic units such as colleges, schools, academic divisions, departments, and academic programs.
2. Reorganization, establishment, or merging of colleges, schools, academic divisions and departments, off-campus instructional centers, and centers, institutes and laboratories.
3. Establishment of university centers or other new units which provide credit bearing courses or degrees.

All proposals falling into these categories are subject to review by the PCRRC regardless of whether the Chancellor of the University of Maine System or the System Board of Trustees have waived the requirement that such proposals, in general or in any specific instance, be submitted to the Chancellor or the Board for review and approval.

¹ The phrase "academic units" includes all degree-granting units and any units that have research or public service responsibilities.

The Review Process

The Senate review process involves up to three phases.

Phase 1: Discussion Phase. This phase involves general discussions among interested parties -- including faculty members and administrators -- of a potential reorganization proposal. The Senate's involvement at this phase is limited to conversations between the Provost and the Senate President. It is anticipated that the Senate President will inform the Chair of the Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (PCRRC) of the existence of such conversations and of their general content so that the committee can plan its activities.

Phase 2: Informal Phase. The PCRRC determines whether a proposed program creation or reorganization has "potentially significant academic impacts." This determination is based on a brief, written Pre-proposal and on the Committee's assessment of reactions to the Pre-proposal gathered from interested parties. If the committee determines that the proposed changes have potentially significant academic impacts, the proposal is moved to Phase 3. If the Committee concludes that the proposed changes do not have potentially significant academic impacts, Committee and Senate actions in regard to the proposal will cease, unless the proposal is altered in ways that might reasonably affect the Committee's initial determination, or unless the Senate, by majority vote, instructs the Committee to continue the review process.

Phase 3: Formal Phase. The Formal Phase entails more detailed data collection, additional comments solicited from the University community, and a public meeting at which the Committee will hear testimony on the merits, demerits, and impacts of the proposed reorganization. Based on the information gathered in this phase, the Committee will make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate on whether the proposal should receive Senate approval.

If the Senate chooses not to act on the Committee's recommendation, the Committee's recommendation will be forwarded to the President of the University of Maine and will accompany any submission of the proposal by the University of Maine to the Chancellor or the Board of Trustees.

Phase 2 -- Informal Review

The review process begins when the Committee receives a Pre-proposal. Guidelines for preparing and submitting a Pre-proposal to initiate the Informal Phase of the review process are presented in Appendix A. If the Committee finds the Pre-proposal to be complete, it will distribute it to all faculty members and administrators via First Class and will post the document in an appropriately labeled First Class folder.

Anyone wishing to comment on the pre-proposal will have up to two weeks to do so. Responses should be sent to the Committee chair.

The Committee will review the responses and determine whether the proposed reorganization has “potentially significant academic impacts.” The Committee may request additional information from the proposer in order to complete its Phase 2 review. If the Committee determines that the proposed changes have “potentially significant academic impacts,” the review process will proceed to Phase 3.

Phase 3 -- Formal Review

Formal review requires the submission of a detailed Proposal, which may include elements of the Pre-proposal but which will provide additional information and will respond to a set of review standards specified by the Committee. Guidelines for the preparation and submission of the Proposal are presented in Appendix B.

If the Committee determines that the Proposal is complete, it will distribute the Proposal to all faculty and administrators via First Class and will post the proposal in an appropriately labeled First Class folder.

The Committee will allow a period of two weeks for receipt of written reactions addressed to the Committee chair.

An open meeting will be held by the Committee to provide an opportunity for any interested persons to provide oral comments on the Proposal. The Committee will retain an audio record of oral testimony presented at the meeting. The Committee may seek additional information from the proposer in support of its deliberations.

The Committee will prepare a written opinion on the Proposal and a recommendation to the Senate regarding whether or not the Senate should recommend approval or disapproval.

Committee Members (05/08/07):

BPPH: Dr. Stephanie Welcomer, Dr. David F. Wihry

EHD: Dr. Suzanne Estler, Dr. Dianne Hoff

ENG: Dr. Karen Horton, Dr. Harlan Onsrud

LAS: Dr. Alan Cobo-Lewis, Dr. Kathleen March

NSFA: Dr. Rodney Bushway, Dr. Scott Johnson

Appendix A

Guidelines for Pre-Proposals for Informal (Phase 2) Review by The University of Maine Faculty Senate Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (May 8, 2007)

The purpose of a Pre-Proposal is to provide the Committee with enough information about a contemplated reorganization so that it can determine, after receiving reactions from the University community, whether the proposed changes have “potentially significant academic impacts.” Any proposal deemed to have potentially significant academic impacts will proceed to a formal review process. Guidelines for proposals submitted for formal review are presented in Appendix B.

The Pre-Proposal should contain the three elements specified below, all as part of a single Microsoft Word document or PDF file. The document should be submitted to the Committee chair. The document will be provided, as submitted, to all University of Maine faculty members and to appropriate administrators for comment.

Cover Letter. The cover letter should indicate that the submission is intended to officially initiate the Informal Phase of the Committee’s review. The letter should be signed by the person initiating the process and should identify the person or persons from whom the Committee may seek additional information during the review. The letter should be limited to these elements. All descriptive and persuasive material should be included in Part I of the submission and in responses to questions stated in Part II.

Part I. A statement describing the proposed changes and identifying expected resource costs, expected benefits, and expected impacts on academic programs. This statement should include a justification or rationale for the proposed changes and an assessment of their anticipated net effect on the quality and scope of the University’s academic programs, including instruction, research, and service. Any details about the financial arrangements that have been discussed should be included. The statement may include a brief presentation of any other material the proposer wishes the Committee to consider in its deliberations. The statement should be no longer than one single-spaced page.

Part II. Concise responses to the following questions. Responses should be numbered to correspond with the questions.

1. Describe 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.

2. Identify the principal arguments that have surfaced to date both for and against the proposed reorganization. Avoid general statements, and list concrete examples of specific benefits and costs.
3. Provide an overview of the discussions that have occurred to date relating to the proposed changes. Over what time period have discussions taken place? Have faculty been involved in these discussions? All faculty or a subset of faculty? Which administrators have been involved in these discussions? Who initiated the discussions?
4. Identify faculty and staff who will be affected by the proposed changes.
4. Indicate whether potentially affected parties have been systematically polled (by ballot or straw vote, for example) on their positions relative to the proposed changes. If so, describe the results of any polling.

Appendix B

Guidelines for Proposals for Formal (Phase 3) Review by The University of Maine Faculty Senate Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (May 8, 2007)

The purpose of the Proposal is to initiate the Formal (Phase 3) Review of any structural reorganization subject to review and recommendation by the Faculty Senate. Proposals enter Formal Review stage if the PCRRC determines, based on a Pre-proposal and reactions to it, that the proposed reorganization has “potentially significant academic impacts.”

The Proposal for formal review should contain the three elements specified below, all as part of a single Microsoft Word document or PDF file. The document should be submitted to the Committee chair. The document will be provided, as submitted, to all University of Maine faculty members and to appropriate administrators for comment and will be the subject of a public meeting at which testimony on the proposals merits and demerits will be heard.

Cover Letter. The cover letter should indicate that the submission is intended to officially initiate the Formal Phase of the Committee’s review. The letter should be signed by the person initiating the process and should identify the person or persons from whom the Committee may seek additional information during the review. The letter should be limited to these elements. All descriptive and persuasive material should be included in Parts I and II of the submission as described below.

Part I. A detailed statement including all of the following elements, numbered as they are numbered below:²

1. A description of the proposed program creation or reorganization and identification of the program(s) involved. The description should address changes in reporting relationships, organizational designators (e.g., school vs. department), and the location of faculty lines.
2. A rationale for the proposed reorganization. The rationale should include concrete examples of expected benefits for students, faculty, the University, and the people of the State of Maine.

² The proposer may use materials appearing in the Pre-proposal, but additional detail is expected where appropriate.

3. A list of potential impacts, including budget impacts. The discussion of budget impacts should identify the amount of E&G budget to be transferred between units, the magnitude of any additional expenses that the receiving unit will be expected to bear as a result of the restructuring, and the number of budgeted positions to be transferred between units. The response should also project the number of faculty positions the reorganized unit is expected to have budgeted to it three years and five years after the reorganization is implemented. To the extent possible, the narrative should identify expected changes in the support budget of the reorganized unit three and five years hence.
4. The timing for implementation of any decisions
5. Any other information that the proposer wishes the Committee to examine in its deliberations.

Part II. Below are two lists of considerations (supportive and not supportive) that may be pertinent to an evaluation of the desirability of the proposed reorganization. The proposer should identify those items (e.g., 1a, 2b, etc.) that pertain to the proposal under consideration and include a statement explaining the relevance of each checked item.

1. Criteria Supporting Reorganization:

- a. On a national or international level, the profession or discipline has changed.
- b. Reorganization will better serve the strategic focus of The University of Maine.
- c. The proposed reorganization provides a competitive advantage to the unit.
- d. The viability of the unit is at risk without refocus of direction.
- e. The program's scope is too narrowly focused and needs broader, perhaps interdisciplinary, focus or conversely the program scope is too broadly focused and needs tighter focus.
- f. Two or more programs have a substantial similarity or affinity of objectives such that economics of operation or improvement in quality may reasonably be expected from their consolidation.
- g. The clarity of the program's identity and function will be increased by transfer to or consolidation with another program.
- h. The program's contribution to The University of Maine missions of teaching, research, and service does not justify maintenance of its present size.
- i. The program is one that if reduced will not substantially impair the viability or quality of other university programs.
- j. Budgetary constraints require reorganization of a program within a department, school, or college.

2. Criteria Contraindicating Reorganization:

- a. The reorganization is sufficiently uncommon within higher education so as to render difficulty in recruitment and retention of quality students and faculty.
- b. The reorganization would endanger the quality and/or accreditation status, where applicable, of one or more of the programs affected.
- c. The programs, though dealing with similar subject matter, are substantially different in orientation, objective, or clientele.
- d. The cost reduction of reorganization would be so modest as to make such reorganization rather pointless if cost savings is the primary objective.
- e. The program's reorganization would have a substantially negative impact on education and societal concerns to Maine.
- f. The program's reorganization would have a substantially negative impact on strategic goals of The University of Maine.
- g. The program's reorganization would result in substantial loss of revenue currently derived from grants, contracts, endowments or gifts.

Chapter 5

University of Maine System

Section 305 - Administrative Procedures Manual

Reference: <http://www.maine.edu/system/asa/adminprocman.php>

Section 305.0 Program Inventory

Effective: 3/28/79

Last Revised:

Procedures for Submission of Program Inventory

Board of Trustees policy states that the Academic Program Inventory is the definitive list of all academic degree programs offered by the institutions or units of the University of Maine System. An academic program is defined as a course of study identified by a specific degree title and a specific subject matter area with a prescribed set of requirements which a student must complete.

The Academic Program Inventory is maintained by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Each summer the institutions are requested to update their portions of the Inventory. The completed document is submitted to the Board of Trustees for the Board's information each September.

See: Policy Manual Section 305: Program Inventory

Section 305.1 Academic Program Approval

Effective: 1/29/87

Last Revised: 1/14/08

Academic Program Approval

The approval process requires the following sequential steps:

1. Faculty/staff initiation on campus with appropriate consultation with the campus administration in order to prepare an Intent to Plan.
2. The Intent to Plan, when approved by the campus President, will be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who will acknowledge receipt of the document. The Vice Chancellor will make copies of the Intent to Plan available to the President and the Chief Academic Officer of each campus for their information.

3. All Intent to Plan documents will be submitted to the University of Maine System Chief Academic Officers who will review submissions and decide upon one of four actions:

- a. Intent to Plan accepted.
- b. Intent to Plan accepted with qualifications.
- c. Intent to Plan returned with suggestions for revision.
- d. Intent to Plan rejected with rationale to substantiate decision.

Intent to Plan Statements will be considered by the Chief Academic Officers at regular business meetings or at other special meetings called by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The submission deadline is 30 days prior to the meeting of the Chief Academic Officers at which the Intent to Plan is to be considered, to provide adequate time for individuals to prepare and distribute written statements in support of or in opposition to the Plan. Those submitting Plan statements, who so request, as well as other interested parties, will be invited to attend the Chief Academic Officers meeting. Items not submitted within the time frame established will not receive consideration until the next meeting at which Intent to Plan Statements are scheduled for discussion.

In their review of Intent to Plan statements, the Chief Academic Officers will take into consideration the appropriateness of the program to the mission and goals of the submitting campus, the need for the program and the rationale for any duplication, and the availability of adequate resources to support the program.

The Chief Academic Officers will recommend approval of an intent to plan during regular business meetings and if necessary, will postpone approval to work toward consensus. In order to determine how best to provide statewide delivery of a needed program, intent to plan proposals should specify the statewide need and corresponding interest, the mode of delivery, and the potential catchment area from which students would be drawn.

The Chief Academic Officers will make their recommendation(s) on an Intent to Plan to the Vice Chancellor who in turn will make his/her recommendation concerning an Intent to Plan to the Chancellor. The minutes of the Chief Academic Officers will be the record of action on an Intent to Plan. If the Intent to Plan is approved, the Vice Chancellor will notify the Chief Academic Officer of the originating campus in writing that the development of a full proposal may proceed, with copies of the action to all other campuses. The Board of Trustees will be informed when Intent to Plan Statements have been approved by the Chancellor.

4. Once an Intent to Plan has been approved, a status report must be filed in the Vice Chancellor's Office at the end of a six-month period in order to keep the plan active if a program proposal has not yet been submitted. An approved Intent to Plan which is not followed by the submission of a program proposal within one year from the time of initial acceptance will be automatically voided unless a specific request for an extension of time has been received and approved by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

5. Approval of an Intent to Plan is to be followed by a program proposal development on campus through the appropriate faculty units and committees. The campus administration

will review the progress and may elect to share, for informational purposes, an early draft or preliminary program proposal with other campuses and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The completed proposal, with the approval of the campus President, will be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs 100 days before the Board meeting at which the proposal is to be considered, to permit careful internal and external review of the proposal.

6. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will acknowledge receipt of the proposal and distribute copies to the Chief Academic Officers. The Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Chief Academic Officers and those most closely involved with the proposed program on the originating campus, will appoint an ad hoc review committee, when appropriate, to provide an independent assessment of the proposal. The ad hoc review committee will report in writing its findings and recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

7. The Vice Chancellor has three action options:

- a. forward the proposal with a recommendation for approval to the Chancellor.
- b. return the proposal to the originating campus with specific critiques and suggestions for revision.
- c. return the proposal to the initiating campus with specific written rationale for its rejection.

8. The Chancellor will recommend program proposals to the Board of Trustees for its review and approval. Notice of final approval of program proposals will be transmitted to all campuses.

Section 305.2 Substantive Changes to Existing Academic Programs

Effective: 1/14/08

Last Revised: 1/14/08

When a university plans to make substantive changes to a previously-approved academic program, the program should be brought to a regular business meeting of the Chief Academic Officers for review and discussion.

Substantive changes to an existing academic program (degree, certificate, or other form of academic recognition) include:

- * a significant departure in terms of either the content or method of delivery from those that were offered when the academic program was most recently evaluated, such as distance learning or correspondence courses;

- * changes in the geographic area in which a degree program is being offered, either physically or through distance learning technologies

The Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs will make a decision, based on the recommendation of the Chief Academic Officers, whether to approve or reject the proposed changes to academic programs.

Section 305.3 Academic Program Review

Effective: 1/29/87

Last Revised: 1/14/08

Academic program review must be institution-based and reflect an institution's mission and capacity. Program review should focus on student outcomes and should support a systematic and broad-based approach to the assessment of student learning focused on educational improvement through understanding how and what students are learning in their academic program.

Regular program assessment will improve the program review process. Specific identification of program goals and student learning objectives is a critical first step.

1. All academic degree programs are to be reviewed within an established time frame. The schedule of academic program reviews is to be revised biennially in concert with the review and revision of the university operational plan of which it becomes a part. Academic program review schedules are to be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and any deviations from these review schedules must be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Program review should be undertaken within five years for new programs and at least every seven years for continuing programs, unless a shorter interval is deemed necessary for specified conditions resulting from a review. The schedule should allow for flexibility and can change to coordinate with the timing of reviews by specialized accrediting bodies. University-level processes should be developed for programs less than degree-level.

2. Academic program review should ensure broad institutional and community representation in the process, including but not limited to appropriate faculty and program alumni. Structures and mechanisms that blend academic affairs and student affairs in a constructive fashion should be encouraged.

3. The program review process on each university should include:

a. a self-study by the unit being reviewed.

The self-study should include:

- rationale for the program
- five-year summary of program enrollment (number of majors and number of graduates)
- course section enrollments
- number of full-time faculty equivalents
- budgets
- an assessment of progress made in relation to the recommendations of previous program reviews.

The self-study should address the quality of the faculty and the methods used to ensure that quality (such as post-tenure review practices). The quality and appropriateness of the curriculum should be examined, with attention to such matters as student outcomes assessment and pluralistic perspectives. In addition, the self-study should discuss the relation of the program to the university mission.

b. a report by external reviewers based on a review of the self-study, additional materials as required, and a site visit.

c. a final report by the university, endorsed by the President.

The final report should include:

- a statement on how the program enhances the mission of the university
- a statement on the value of the program to the state and the nation
- a set of recommendations, with rationale, for future action,
- budget implications based on the self-study and the external review, and
- actions taken as a result of previous reviews.

Attention should be given to whether or not a program having had few graduates over a period of years as well as low course section enrollments should be continued. Professional accreditation processes may substitute for appropriate components of this section. The University of Maine System encourages program review and accreditation assessments be held at the same time where possible and appropriate.

4. Program reviews carried out during the previous two years shall become a part of the biennial review and revision of the university operational plan and the recommendations emanating from the review should be taken into consideration in the development of the biennial budget request.

5. Each year, each Chief Academic Officer will submit a report to the Vice Chancellor that summarizes program review activity at the universities. This report should include information on reviews in progress, reviews completed in the past year, an executive summary of the results of completed reviews and actions taken as a result of those reviews. The Vice Chancellor will review the documents submitted and, based on this review, will recommend that the Chancellor accept the reviews and the recommendations in the final report and initiate any appropriate action(s), or recommend that the Chancellor discuss the review documents with the university President and examine possible future actions. Institutions and the System should fully vet program reviews and provide adequate responses to programs.

Program review documents will be kept on file in the Chancellor's Office where they can be reviewed by members of the Board of Trustees.

Section 305.4 Academic Program Suspension

Effective: 1/29/87

Last Revised: 1/14/08

An academic program may be suspended for many reasons, including change in campus mission, low enrollments, and lack of resources. A campus may choose to suspend a program in order to gain time before restructuring the program or eliminating it. The following procedure should be followed in the case of suspending an academic program.

An academic program can be assessed for possible program suspension:

- 1) as a result of the program review process, or
- 2) at any time at the initiative of the campus offering the program, or
- 3) at any time at the initiative of the Chancellor.

A program should not remain in the suspended state for longer than three years. By the end of the third year, a decision should be made to restructure and re-institute the program or to eliminate it. In the case of a decision to eliminate, the formal program elimination process will be initiated.

Academic degree program suspension process shall include the following:

1. The initiation of the Program Suspension Procedure, including notification in writing by the President to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to the Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System of the intent to develop a Program Suspension Proposal.
2. The development of a Program Suspension Proposal, which shall normally include the following:
 - a. A five-year summary of program enrollments (number of majors and number of graduates) and number of faculty equivalents (FTEs) associated with the program.
 - b. The specific rationale for the suspension of the program.
 - c. The relationship of the program suspension to the institutional mission and to other programs at the institution. Where faculty positions are involved, UMS will follow the AFUM agreement and will consult with the appropriate faculty governance body.
 - d. A plan for the assignment of faculty during the suspension period.
 - e. The impact of the program suspension on students, including plans for assisting students to complete an appropriate degree program.
 - f. A timetable for the program suspension, with date for consideration of the program for reinstatement or elimination.
 - g. The input obtained from meeting and discussion with the appropriate faculty committees and with the Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System prior to completion of the proposal.
3. Campus submission of the Program Suspension Proposal to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor will make copies of the Program Suspension Proposal available to the Presidents and Chief Academic Officers of each campus for their information.
4. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' recommendation, after consultation with the Chief Academic Officers, to the Chancellor for approval of the Suspension Proposal.

5. The Chancellor's informing the Board of Trustees of the Suspension at the January or July Board meeting.

Section 305.5 Academic Program Elimination

Effective: 1/29/87

Last Revised: 1/14/08

An academic program can be assessed for possible program elimination

(1) as the result of the program review process as indicated,
(2) at any time at the initiative of the campus offering the program, or
(3) at any time upon the recommendation of the Chancellor based on enrollments and the centrality of the program to the campus mission. In those situations in which the Chancellor believes there is sufficient reason for a campus to consider invoking the program elimination process, he/she will make such a recommendation, accompanied by the rationale for the recommendation, to the campus President. Following receipt of such a recommendation, the campus will either initiate the program elimination process or provide justification for not eliminating the program.

Academic degree program elimination shall include the following:

1. The initiation of the Program Elimination Procedure including notification in writing by the President to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to the Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System for the programs to which unit members are assigned, of the intent to develop a Program Elimination Proposal.
2. The development of a Program Elimination Proposal which shall include the following:
 - a. A five-year summary of program enrollments (number of majors and number of graduates), course section enrollments, number of full-time faculty equivalents associated with the program, and budgets.
 - b. The specific rationale for the elimination of the program including an indication of the campus process used to reach the recommendation.
 - c. The relationship of the program elimination to the campus mission and to other programs on the campus.
 - d. A plan for the retrenchment or reassignment of faculty.
 - e. The impact of the program elimination on students.
 - f. A timetable for the program elimination.
 - g. The input obtained from meeting and discussion with the Associated Faculties of the University of Maine System prior to completion of the proposal.
3. Campus submittal of the Program Elimination Proposal to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor will make copies of the Program Elimination Proposal available to the President and Chief Academic Officer of each campus for their information.

4. Program Elimination Proposals submitted to the University of Maine System Chief Academic Officers, who will review all proposals and decide upon one of the following three actions:

- a. Program Elimination Proposal accepted.
- b. Program Elimination Proposal returned with request for additional information.
- c. Program Elimination Proposal rejected with rationale to substantiate decision.

5. The Chief Academic Officers' recommendation to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who will in turn make his/her recommendation concerning the Program Elimination Proposal to the Chancellor.

6. The Chancellor's recommendation of the Program Elimination Proposal to the Board of Trustees for its review and final approval, to come before the Board twice a year at the January and July Board meetings.

See: Policy Manual Section 305.1: Program Approval, Review and Elimination

Section 305.6 Brokering Academic Programs

Effective: 5/19/86

Last Revised: 4/2008

Administrative Procedures for Brokering of Academic Programs:

A brokered program is a collaboration between two universities where one University (the "provider" institution) allows another university (the "receiver" institution) to offer a curriculum resulting in a degree from the provider institution. The receiver generally admits the students and offers the curriculum based on guidelines set by the provider institution.

A. Letter of Intent. A Letter of Intent signed by the President of the provider institution and the President of the receiver Institution is to be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for approval. The Letter of Intent is to include:

1. The name of the proposed brokered program
2. The providing and receiving institutions
3. Rationale (need)
4. Tentative cost and revenue projections
5. Anticipated starting date

Upon receipt of the Letter of Intent the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will forward a copy for review and comment to each campus president and chief academic officer. Within thirty (30) days thereafter the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will:

1. Approve the Letter of Intent, with or without qualifications, authorize the development of a written agreement and notify the Chancellor and the involved campus presidents and chief academic officers of the decision, or;

2. Reject the Letter of Intent and notify the involved presidents and chief academic officers and the Chancellor.

B. Written Agreement.

1. Upon approval of the Letter of Intent by the participating campuses a written agreement between the campuses involved is to be developed.

2. The written agreement signed by the respective campus presidents is to be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor will forward a copy of the agreement for review and comment to each campus president and chief academic officer. Within thirty (30) days thereafter, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will:

- a. Approve the written agreement and notify the Chancellor and each campus president and chief academic officer, or;
- b. Reject the written agreement and notify each campus president and chief academic officer and forward a copy to the Chancellor.

3. The agreement should specify:

- a. the name and description of the program;
- b. any variance in the curriculum from the degree-granting, provider institution, and the plan for offering and supporting the curriculum at the receiving institution;
- c. arrangements under which faculty at the receiving campus are approved for delivery of the program;
- d. who will be responsible for making admissions decisions and advising students admitted into the program;
- e. the cohort size and the length of time the program will be available;
- f. a plan for how records for students in the program will be managed;
- g. that students enrolled in the brokered program will be subject to the rules, regulations and procedures of the receiving campus;
- h. program budget;
- i. a plan for review and evaluation of the program, and;
- j. a plan for resolution of disagreements.

See: Policy Manual Section 305.2: Brokering Academic Programs

See: Policy Manual Section 305.1: Program Approval, Review and Elimination