Academic Approvals Process Workgroup

**Final Report,
Spring 2011**

Contents

I. Background

There has been campuswide support for a revision of the current academic approval process and that the various processes could benefit from revisions, particularly in the form of "how to" documents to guide faculty members and departments through the various curricular approval processes.

At the Senate Council meeting on September 15, 2008, the Senate Council (SC) discussed the need for a work group to create a "wish list" of how revised academic approval processes would look, for various different curricular proposals. During this meeting, the SC moved to create the Academic Approval Process Workgroup and requested that the Office of the Senate Council provide a list of possible members and a draft charge.

At the SC meeting on September 28, 2008, the SC passed a motion with the following charge for the committee:

> *After gaining an understanding of the existing curricular approval process, the Academic Approval Process Workgroup is charged with describing the manner by which course and program proposals might be processed in a more efficient manner by the University Senate.*

II. Workgroup Membership
Members and affiliation:

Karen Badger	(Social Work)
Jeannine Blackwell	(Graduate School dean, Assoc. Provost for Academic Admin.)
Sheila Brothers	(convener and informational resource)
Rebecca Flanagan	(Health Sciences/Academic Affairs administrative assistant)
Richard Greissman	(Assistant Provost for Program Support)
Bob Grossman	(Arts and Sciences/Chemistry)
Jacquie Hager	(Associate Registrar)
Brian MacPherson	(Medicine/Anatomy and Neurobiology)
Mike Mullen	(Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education)
Tonya Prince	(Admissions and Registrar)
David Randall	(Chair, Senate Council)

As time progressed, two additional members were added to serve in place of Ms. Hager – Amber Dillon Campbell (Associate Registrar) and Todd Brann (Associate Registrar).

III. Process
The first order of business for the Academic Approval Process Workgroup (AAW) was to investigate the curricular approval processes at UK's 19 benchmarks. There are a wide variety of practices at UK's benchmarks. Some university processes were similar to that of UK, but some universities' processes were largely irrelevant when the institution is part of a very large, statewide system. (See Appendix A.)

Overall, UK's curricular approval processes were in line with the levels and types of review at UK's benchmarks. Below is a representative description of other universities' processes:

Purdue University: There is a faculty senate within each college that takes the lead in curricular reviews, with only a few external-to-college reviews.

University of Arizona: Their faculty senate has an Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee which serves as a conduit of academic issues for both undergraduate and graduate proposals.

University of Illinois: All course matters are reviewed by the Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and then subject to review by the faculty senate and their governing board.

IV. Activities

The AAW looked into the various different types of curricular approval processes at UK, and determined that the overall curricular review process is acceptable. However, AAW members believed that the real problem was a lack of clear, non-legalese language to guide faculty members and departments when preparing and submitting a curricular proposal. The AAW then began the process of creating narrative descriptions for faculty members and departments to refer to, based upon existing rules in the *Senate Rules* (*SR*). There are a few suggestions for changes, noted below in the section, "Recommendations."

In addition, during the summer months of 2009, the AAW reviewed all course and program forms, and modified them so that all information on the forms is utilized by one area or another. (For example, it was determined that the "HEGIS" code requested on program forms was no longer used by any area of the University, so that field was removed.) As a result, forms are now more concise and can be more efficiently filled out and reviewed. (See http://www.uky.edu/Faculty/Senate/forms.htm for current forms.)

With the administrative addition of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration[1], faculty members and department staff have a campus resource for detailed questions pertaining to programs. As such, the revised program forms include language about a required contact with the Associate Provost for Academic Administration.

V. Recommendations

The AAW offers the following recommendations:

1. Require academic councils (Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, and Health Care Colleges Council) to formulate a specific list of review requirements to which they adhere during the review process.

2. With the establishment of specific checklists from each academic council (see recommendation 1), the Senate could eliminate review of new programs by the SAPC, which is redundant to the work of the Councils. The Senate could then either modify the charge of the SAPC or disband it. One possible new role for the SAPC could be to propose standards and procedures for assessing the effectiveness of programs.

3. Narrow the focus of the Senate's Admissions and Academic Standards Committee (SA&ASC). The SA&ASC should only review proposals that:

    a. Affect programs whose requirements are codified in the Senate Rules;
    b. Pertain to university-wide admissions requirements;
    c. Pertains to college-level entrance requirements; and/or
    d. Pertain to a college's requirements for admission to upper-division/standing.

---

[1] The Associate Provost for Academic Administration is responsible for the bulk of UK's interactions with the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE), and helps faculty members and departments with questions about requirements for the CPE and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). For example, if a program change is proposed, this office can help determine if the change is truly just a modification of an existing program, or if the changes are of such magnitude that it is actually a new program.

VI. Documents

One additional omission noted by the AAW is a lack of definitions for even the most basic academic terminology. Also missing are formal definitions of various course meeting patterns (recitation, lecture, seminar, etc.). Working from the SIS Contact Hours Task Force (1994-1995) document, the AAW has identified reasonable definitions of commonly-used academic terms (Appendix B), as well as definitions and associated credit hour requirements for meeting pattern types (Appendix C). Certain Senate committees will need to review these suggestions to ensure that they are consistent with current usage both at UK and at CPE and SACS.

The AAW created narrative descriptions of a wide variety of curricular processes, for quick "how to" guidance. Assuming the *SR* are changed as suggested above, the narratives listed in Appendix D will be consistent with existing *SR*.

Appendix A – Benchmark Processes

Michigan State University
(http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadpolproc/academicgovernance.htm)
They appear to have a structure like ours (perhaps with more layers). Has an Academic Council (hears concerns related to academic policy) and an Executive Committee of the Academic Council. There are several standing committees of the Academic Council, several of which appear relevant: (1) University Graduate Council (similar to our UGC), (2) Academic Policy (similar to our Undergraduate Council but much of the work is handled in sub-committees), and (3) Curriculum (see structure description that follows). The Curriculum Committee, which has elected faculty representation from each college as well as undergraduate and graduate student representation. The Provost (or designee) is a non-voting member of the committee. The chairperson of the Curriculum Committee is an automatic voting member on the Academic Council as well as on the standing committee of the Faculty Council. There is also an Academic Senate. No further description of the approval process itself could be found.

North Carolina State University (http://ncsu.edu/faculty_senate/)
They have an Academic Senate with sub-committees, one of which is called Courses and Curricula. The committee meets bi-monthly during the academic year and advises the Provost in issues related to courses and curricula, consulting with the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Programs. They review courses, program, degree, certificate, honors, non-degree programs, and develop policies related to these purposes in consultation with college deans. They also periodically review courses. They interact with the Academic Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate when developing policies and procedures in their area. The Senate also has a sub-committee called the Undergraduate Education Council. This committee meets bi-monthly and works with the Office of Assessment and advises the Dean of the Undergraduate Academic programs. The committee seems to be focused on the regulatory aspect of the Gen Ed program for all undergraduate curricula and they review courses and make the decision as to which will be included as part of USP. They also make assessment and evaluation recommendations. I could not find evidence of any standing committee specific to graduate education at this point.

Ohio State (http://senate.osu.edu/)
 Shape: A centralized Council of Academic Affairs.
Composition: It is a 16-member Council made of of 6 regular faculty at least 2 of whom are senate members, the others appointed by the Faculty Council; 4 faculty appointed by the President; 5 students (UG, Grad, Prof), and one administrator (Provost or his designate).
Process: Receives proposals from the colleges and the Graduate School. The Council elects a chair from its membership.

Penn State (http://www.psu.edu/ufs/)
Shape: A centralized Curricular Affairs Committee.
Composition: It is a Senate Committee.
Process: Proposals sent from colleges and Graduate Council directly to a curriculum coordinator. This coordinator gets input from various subcommittees and then puts the proposals on the CAC's agenda. After passage, s/he sends them to the Provost, puts them in the Bulletin and Schedule of Classes. Programs go to the BOT for final action.

Purdue University (http://webapp.calumet.purdue.edu/facultysenate/)

It appears that courses and approvals is a college-based decision. Their faculty have a senate in each college.

New Graduate Degree Program Proposal Review/Approval Flowchart

A. CONCEPT PAPER (two pages)
1.　addressed to the dean of the Graduate School
2.　content:
　　· rationale (brief)
　　· relationship to similar programs on this or other system campuses
　　· sustainability
　　· impact
　　· estimated resource needs and sources (budget, space, faculty, library, other)
3.　dean of the Graduate School consults with the provost

B. PREPROPOSAL
1.　requested by the dean of the Graduate School
2.　content:
　　· rationale (expanded beyond the concept paper to include impact)
　　· relationship to similar programs on this or other campuses
　　· market analysis (state, regional, national)
　　· anticipated demand for program
　　· relationship to and consultation with existing programs
　　· resource needs and sources (budget, space, faculty, library, other)
　　· plans to sustain program
3.　administrative review by the Graduate School
4.　Graduate School provides copy of preproposal to Office of the Provost
5.　Graduate School meets with Office of the Provost to discuss preproposal
6.　Graduate School shares review comments and any issues raised in the review with the program presenter
7.　revised preproposal may be requested

C. FULL PROPOSAL
1.　requested by the dean of the Graduate School
2.　use ICHE full proposal format, including ICHE budget pages
3.　administrative review by the Graduate School
4.　revised proposal forwarded to appropriate Graduate Council area committee for review and recommendation to the council (interactive process between the area committee through its chair and the new program proposer)
5.　Graduate Council recommendation for approval/denial

D. POST GRADUATE COUNCIL REVIEW AND ACTION
1.　dean of the Graduate School forwards recommendation to the provost
2.　Office of the Provost conducts final review/fiscal approval
3.　provost makes a recommendation to the president
4.　proposal brought to Board of Trustees for action
5.　proposal forwarded to ICHE
6.　ICHE reviews proposal and presents recommendation at public hearing
7.　ICHE notifies president and provost of outcome

8. Office of the Provost notifies the dean of the Graduate School, registrar, and originator of proposal
9. Graduate School forwards request to the registrar to set up a new graduate program field of study code

Texas A&M University (http://tamus.edu/offices/policy/policies/pdf/03-02-02.pdf)
TAMU's program proposals are reviewed at several levels including the chancellor, president, board of regents, and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board which sounds like it's rather like CPE in Kentucky. The information in the link references Academic Program Guidelines but a search of the TAMU site only brought up the PDF cited here.

SYSTEM REGULATION

03.02.02 Approval Procedures for Degree Programs, Administrative Changes, etc.
Approved September 29, 1995
Revised September 30, 1998
Revised January 19, 1999
Revised June 6, 2000
Supplements System Policy 03.02

1. SYSTEM POLICY

System Policy 03.02 states that new and revised programs, administrative changes, and other substantive changes requiring approval by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (Coordinating Board) must be approved by the Chancellor and the Board before being forwarded for formal action by the Coordinating Board. The purpose of this System Regulation is to provide specific guidelines and procedures for securing those required approvals.

2. PREPARATION, REVIEW AND APPROVAL

2.1 System institutions are required to follow Coordinating Board rules in the development of proposal requests and to follow System procedures in the submission of these proposal requests to the Board of Regents prior to submission to the Coordinating Board. The System's Academic Program Guidelines (APG), Volume I - Policies and Procedures, contains rules and policies of the Coordinating Board about program development as well as other academic program guidelines. The APG also contains System procedures for review of both substantive and nonsubstantive degree programs and administrative change proposal requests. A copy of the APG, issued by the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, is available in the offices of all System academic deans and provosts.

2.2 A request for Board approval of a new or revised degree program, an administrative change, or other substantive change requiring subsequent Coordinating Board approval is to be submitted through the Vice Chancellor Academic and Student Affairs. The agenda item should include the following content and attachments:

(1) The text of the agenda item should describe the rationale for the proposed action; and the proposed minute order should provide for Board approval of the proposed new or revised program or administrative change and authorize the president to forward the request to the Coordinating Board for consideration.

(2) Attached to the agenda item should be an executive summary of not more than two pages which describes the proposed change in terms of its objective, need and quality of programs, issues related to program duplication, and related costs and funding sources.

University of Arizona (http://fp.arizona.edu/senate/)
Faculty Senate - Instruction And Curriculum Policy Committee

This committee considers matters and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to curriculum, academic programs of study, degrees and teaching effectiveness. It serves as the conduit of academic issues from the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council to the Faculty Senate.

Undergraduate Council
The Undergraduate Council is a university-wide committee that participates in the shared governance process at the University of Arizona. The Undergraduate Council reviews all undergraduate curricular action items forwarded from its two subcommittees, the Academic Programs Subcommittee and the Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee.

Action items may be received from academic units, colleges, auxiliary units, the Curriculum Unit of the Office of the Registrar, or the University-wide General Education Committee, any General Faculty Standing Committee or Senate Standing Committee or ad hoc committee. All action items approved by the Undergraduate Council are forwarded to the Provost's Office and Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee for review.

Graduate Council
The Graduate Council provides a forum in which matters of concern to graduate education may be discussed and the mission of the Graduate College fulfilled. The Graduate Council works with the Graduate College to review, establish, and update policies affecting graduate education. The Graduate Council is the shared-governance body for graduate education.

University of California at Los Angeles (http://www.senate.ucla.edu)
 Undergraduate Council
The Undergraduate Council makes policy for undergraduate education at UCLA; recommends to the Legislative Assembly undergraduate programs leading to new degrees; authorizes, supervises and regulates all undergraduate courses and programs of instruction and preparatory education; periodically reviews and evaluates all undergraduate programs of study and all programs of preparatory education in conjunction with the Graduate Council; and sets standards for honors and recommends procedures for awards of undergraduate scholarships.

Undergraduate Council Authority
It is the duty of the Undergraduate Council to authorize, supervise, and regulate all undergraduate courses and programs of instruction at UCLA; to act for the Division in the approval of all undergraduate majors and in the approval or discontinuation of submajors, including specializations, concentrations, and minors; and to review and evaluate periodically all undergraduate programs of study.

II. Delegation of Approval to College and School Faculty Executive Committees
In discharge of these duties, and subject to the continuing monitoring and periodic review by the Undergraduate Council, the Council hereby delegates the following actions to the appropriate College and School Faculty Executive Committees (FEC).
   A. Delegated Approval for Existing Undergraduate Courses
      1. Renumbering within lower- or upper-division levels
      2. Adding or deleting a concurrent graduate-level designation (must also have Graduate Division approval for graduate portion)
      3. Adding or deleting a concurrent undergraduate-level designation
      4. Changing a course title
      5. Changing course unit credit
      6. Adding, deleting, or changing a variable topic or segment title or subtitle (may be submitted directly to the Registrar's Office without FEC approval)

7. Changing a class type (e.g., lecture, discussion, seminar, fieldwork)
8. Adding or deleting a fieldwork component to a class
9. Changing the number of in-class hours for a type of class
10. Changing prerequisites, preparation, requisites, co-requisites, enforced requisites, recommended courses, or restrictions (requires submission of a brief academic impact statement to appropriate FECs and to relevant units and staff when other departments and programs are substantively affected)
11. Changing a course description (substantial changes require a request for a new course)
12. Changing a grading designation (e.g., letter grade, passed/not passed)
13. Changing repeatability of a course for credit
14. Changing from upper-to lower-division level and vice versa (requires submission of a brief academic impact analysis to appropriate FECs and relevant units and staff when other departments and programs are substantively affected)
15. Changing from upper-division level to graduate level and vice versa (graduate changes also require Graduate Division approval)
16. Adding or deleting a departmental multiple listing with the consent of each participating departmental unit
17. Deleting restrictions (requires submission of a brief academic impact analysis to appropriate FECs and to relevant units and staff when other departments and programs are substantively affected)
18. Deleting a course [requires submission of a brief academic impact analysis to relevant units and staff when other departments and programs are affected]

B. Delegated Approval for New Undergraduate Courses
   1. Approving new or restored courses for an existing program (including the undergraduate portion of concurrently scheduled courses)
   2. Approving one-time-only courses within an existing program that adheres to Senate regulations

C. Delegated Approval for Existing Undergraduate Majors
   1. Changing the number of units, within Senate requirements for minimum and maximum unit limitations, for a major
   2. Adding or deleting approved courses in a major

D. Delegated Approval for Existing Undergraduate Minors and Specializations
   1. Changing the number of units, within Senate requirements for minimum and maximum unit limitations, for a minor
   2. Adding or deleting approved courses

E. Delegated Approval for Existing Variable Topics Courses
   1. Topics and subtitles with the department/program chair's approval
   2. May be submitted directly to Registrar's Office

Each of the delegated actions by an FEC is subject to review and rescission by the Undergraduate Council.

III. Approval NOT Delegated to Faculty Executive Committees

Approval of all other actions related to courses, programs, or undergraduate policy is undertaken directly by the Undergraduate Council, subject to prior review and approval by the appropriate departmental unit and FEC in the following circumstances:

A. Actions not Delegated for Undergraduate Courses
1. Approval of new courses for new majors
2. Approval of partial-term courses
3. Approval of University Extension courses and instructors
4. All other actions not specifically delegated.

Note: Any course not offered for five consecutive years is subject to cancellation by the Undergraduate Council.

B. Actions not Delegated for Undergraduate Majors

Proposals must include required support material, such as letters of support from appropriate Dean, an enrollment analysis from Academic Planning and Budget, etc.

1. New majors (Undergraduate Council consults with appropriate committees)
2. New concentrations in majors
3. Approval of University Extension programs

C. Actions not Delegated for New Undergraduate Minors and Specializations
1. New departmental minors
2. New independent minors (proposals must include letters of support from the
3. appropriate dean(s), a resource analysis, and a proposed administrative committee)
4. Deleting the minor or specialization (requires submission of a brief academic
5. impact analysis to appropriate FECs and to relevant units and staff when other
6. departments and programs are substantively affected)

D. Actions not Delegated for Policy Issues
1. Changing College or school requirements and regulations (Undergraduate
2. Council forwards proposals to appropriate committees for final approval)
3. Conferring or revoking General Education designations and requirements
4. Changing criteria for departmental participation in established
5. Interdepartmental Programs and Centers for Interdisciplinary Instruction
6. Recommendation of Departmental, IDP, or CII status (Undergraduate Council
7. consults with appropriate divisional committees and forwards recommendation)
8. Approval of special instructors (see SR750[B])
9. All other actions not specifically delegated

Graduate Council

Committee Charge: The Graduate Council is delegated to make policy for graduate education at UCLA, except for the M.D., J.D., LL. M., S.J.D. and D.D.S degrees. It recommends to the Legislative Assembly graduate programs leading to new degrees, as well as disestablishment or consolidation of existing degrees. It periodically reviews and evaluates all graduate programs of study (in conjunction with Undergraduate Council's review of the related undergraduate program, where appropriate). It also recommends to the systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs proposals for new graduate programs leading to existing degrees and new programs leading to graduate level certificates.

Subcommittees: The Council has two main policy subcommittees, the Committee on Degree Programs and the Committee on Fellowships and Assistantships, and an Administrative Committee:

* Committee on Degree Programs: The charge of this Committee includes the review and recommendation of graduate educational policy matters; admission and enrollment issues; proposal of new fields of study; degree procedures and requirements; proposals for extensive changes to existing degree programs; and matters pertaining to courses of instruction.

     * Fellowships and Assistantships: The Committee acts for the Council on fellowship matters and has responsibility for recommending policy where teaching and research assistantships are involved. It also develops policy for the campus-wide Chancellor's and Cota-Robles fellowships.

     * Administrative Committee: consists of the Graduate Council Chair and Vice-Chair, the subcommittee chairs, the Dean of the Graduate Division, and appointed members of Graduate Council. The committee previews the program review reports submitted by review teams and establishes the agenda for Council meetings.

University of Illinois (http://senate.illinois.edu/)

Their approval process is very similar to ours:

All new, revised and discontinued courses must be approved by the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs upon the recommendation of the department, the college, and, in the case of 400-500 level courses, the Graduate College.

Changes to existing programs and proposals for new programs are reviewed by the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and are subject to approval by the faculty Senate, the Board of Trustees and the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

University of Iowa (http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/)

The course approval process begins with a faculty or program initiated proposal, discussed and approved by the other program faculty, followed by DEO (Departmental Executive Officer) review and evaluation. The DEO recommends approval and it then goes to the Dean's office where it is reviewed by the Administrative Council. Graduate level courses go to the graduate college. If approved, they go to the Registrar's office. They indicate this process takes about 1 week (amazing!).

The process for programs is that the program is developed by a department and sent to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Curriculum, who places the request on the agenda of the Educational Policy Committee. If approved, it goes to the faculty assembly who vote to recommend that it be forwarded to the provost for possible approval. New programs also have to be approved by the Board of Regents. For graduate programs, it goes to the Graduate school after development by the department.

Appendix C – Definitions of Commonly-Used Academic Terms

- <u>Course</u>: A discrete subject studied during one semester or quarter.

- <u>Program</u>: Consists of a degree type plus major.

- <u>Degree</u>: An award conferred as official recognition for the successful completion of a program of studies.

- <u>Major</u>: A major is a primary area of study defined by a set of courses and/or credit-hour requirements within specified disciplines.

- <u>Minor</u>: A secondary concentration of courses, typically 18 to 21 credit hours, in a selected discipline area allowing the student to develop expertise or pursue an interest in a subject area outside of their major. The minor may be a subset of a major, or may be a stand-alone program in a disciplinary area.

- <u>Option</u>: A particular area of emphasis within a degree program.

- <u>Specialty</u>: An area of focus within an option.

- <u>Sub-specialty</u>: An area of focus within a specialty.

- <u>Graduate Certificate</u>: ~~A formal certification of the satisfactory completion of a series of thematically related graduate courses which require up to 15 graduate credits, usually taken over two years and are limited to a specific professional, research, or occupational focus.~~ A graduate certificate has a clear and focused academic topic or competency as its subject; meet a clearly defined educational need of a constituency group, such as required continuing-education or accreditation for a particular profession; respond to a specific state mandate; or provide a basic competency in an emerging, preferably interdisciplinary, topic.

-

- The length of the certificate curriculum must be a minimum of 9 graduate credit hours and should encompass no more than 15 graduate credit hours, so as to provide a minimum core content, yet be clearly distinguishable from a graduate degree program.

- <u>Undergraduate Certificate</u>: An integrated group of courses (defined as 12 or more credits) that are 1) cross-disciplinary, but with a thematic consistency; and 2) form a distinctive complement to a student's major and degree program; or 3) leads to the acquisition of a defined set of skills or expertise that will enhance the success of the student upon graduation. Undergraduate Certificates meet a clearly defined educational need of a constituency group, such as continuing education or accreditation for a particular profession;

- <u>Service-learning courses</u>: Pairs academic work with public service to enable students to understand their disciplines in a social context.

- <u>Other Community-Based Learning Experience Courses</u>: For-credit courses wherein a student applies theoretical knowledge gained in classes in a real-world setting, under the supervision of a faculty member. Examples include experiential education, internships, externships, co-ops, practica, clinicals, field experiences, and capstone courses.

- <u>Extended-campus Course/Program</u>: Academic courses/programs offered at off-campus sites either within or outside UK's area of geographic responsibility

- <u>Off-campus Site</u>: a location that is geographically apart, but not independent of the main campus.

- <u>Distance Learning Course/Program</u>: A formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction in a course occurs when students and instructors are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous.

- <u>Credit Hour</u>: The equivalent of one hour (50 minutes) of instruction per week over an entire term. May also be measured as 800 minutes per credit per semester. Also, three credit hours are equivalent to meeting for 2.5 hours per week.

- <u>Dual Degree Program</u>: A single academic program that involves a student studying for two different degrees at the same time, either at UK or at UK and another institution (sometimes in different countries), completing them in less time than it would take to earn them separately. The two degrees could be in the same subject or in two different subjects.

- <u>Suspended Program</u>: An academic program that no longer accepts new students but allows students who entered the program before it was closed to complete the program. The program can be re-opened within five years without going through the CPE's new program approval process. After five years, if the program has not been re-opened, it is considered a closed program.

- <u>Closed Program</u>: An academic program that is no longer offered by an institution and has been removed from the institution's catalog. The institution has no intention of re-opening a closed program at a future date.

- <u>Bachelor's Degree</u>: An award that normally requires at least four but not more than five years of full-time equivalent college-level work. It requires at least 120 semester credit hours or the

equivalent. This includes all bachelor's degrees conferred in a five-year cooperative (work-study) program and degrees in which the normal four years of work are completed in three years.

- <u>Master's Degree</u>: An award that requires the successful completion of an academic program of at least the full-time equivalent of one but not more than two academic years beyond the bachelor's degree. It requires at least 30 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the post-baccalaureate, graduate, or professional level.

- <u>Doctoral Degree</u>: The highest award a student can earn for graduate study.

Appendix C – Meeting Pattern Definitions and Associated Credit Hours

Meeting Pattern	Definition	# Minutes Per Semester Required for 1 Credit Hour
Colloquium	A course activity in which students attend a series of lectures delivered by experts in the field, but arranged by faculty.	800
Discussion	A course activity (generally associated with a lecture course) in which small groups of students, under the direction of a faculty member, are encouraged to interact and study various aspects of the subject through oral and written communications.	800
Independent Study	A course in which students learn independently, meeting periodically with a faculty member to discuss and report progress; provides the opportunity to study material not normally covered or offered in the regular curriculum or course offerings.	800
Laboratory	A course activity in which students test, analyze, or demonstrate the applications of ideas, theories, techniques, and/or methods.	1,600
Lecture	A course activity in which students learn primarily through a series of lectures delivered by the faculty member.	800
Recitation	Course activity that supplements a lecture and includes discussion and problem-solving activities, often under the supervision of someone other than the instructor of record.	800
Research	A course in which the principal student activity is to conduct independent investigation under the supervision of a faculty member (pre-qualifying only).	800
Residency	A course offered exclusively to provide residence credit for a graduate or professional degree.	800
Seminar	A course activity (generally offered as an independent course) in which small groups of students, under the direction of a faculty member, engage in the advanced, intensive study of a selected topic(s) through oral and written communications.	800
Clinical	A course activity in which students, under the supervision of a faculty member, are involved with direct treatment or observation of patients/clients.	800
Practicum	A required course activity designed to help students integrate classroom learning with actual work experience emphasizing the practical applications of theory; includes non-clinical internships/externships and specifically includes student teaching.	800

| Studio | A course normally associated with visual/creative arts activities that require specialized facilities beyond those of a normal classroom/lab and emphasize individual development through expressive media | 800 |

Appendix D - Narratives

Process to Create New Course

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed course meets department/college/University goals, and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal for a new course, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.

2. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council.
    a. Council reviews proposal.
    b. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

3. Approving council forwards new course proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
    a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is reviewed by the OSC administrative coordinator and posted to a web transmittal for Senate Council and Senate approval (due to lack of objection). (Senate Council and Senate conduct simultaneous 10-day reviews.)

4. If approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the approved new course proposal to the Registrar and Provost.

5. New course can be offered as per a future requested effective date, or the semester following approval.

Process to Change Existing Course

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed changes to the course meet department/college/University goals, and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal to change a course, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.
    a. Please note the following items to consider:
        i. Removing a cross-listing does not automatically drop the other course. An un-crosslisted course will remain in the Schedule of Classes until it is officially dropped.
        ii. Any change to a course previously approved for DL delivery requires special consideration. See note on Course Change Form.
        iii. Requests to add distance learning (DL) delivery must also be accompanied by the Distance Learning Form.

2. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council.
    a. Council reviews proposal.
    b. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

3. Approving council forwards course change proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
    a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is reviewed by the OSC administrative coordinator and posted to a web transmittal for Senate Council and Senate approval (due to lack of objection). (Senate Council and Senate conduct simultaneous 10-day reviews.)

4. When approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the approved course change proposal to the Registrar and Provost and other interested parties.

5. Changed course can be offered as per a requested future effective date, or the semester following approval.

Process to Add Distance Learning Delivery to a Course

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed changes to the course meet department/college/University goals, and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal to add Distance Learning (DL) delivery to course, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.
   a. A Course Change Form must be submitted, along with the Distance Learning Form and a sample syllabus.

2. DL requests for an <u>existing special topics course</u> will follow this process:
   a. The request for DL delivery requires only the Distance Learning Form and a sample syllabus.
   b. Such requests will move from directly from the college to the Office of the Senate Council.
   c. Approval by the Senate Council Chair will result in approval to offer the course via DL delivery for four semesters.
   d. If the instructor desires to convert a special topics course into a regular course, then the procedure will follow the approval path for a new course, and a new request for DL delivery must also be made.

3. DL requests for <u>800- and 900-level courses from one of the health care colleges</u> will follow this process:
   a. A Course Change Form must be submitted, along with the Distance Learning Form and a sample syllabus.
   b. Such requests will receive final approval authority from the HCCC chair.
   c. Notices of approvals must be sent to the Office of the Senate Council, Distance Learning Programs, the Associate Provost for Academic Administration, and the Registrar's office.

4. For <u>all other DL requests</u>, the college dean's office submits a Course Change Form, the Distance Learning Form and a sample syllabus to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council.
   a. Council reviews proposal to add DL delivery.
   b. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

5. Approving council forwards course change proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
   a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is reviewed by the Senate Council Chair, who may approve or reject the proposal.

6. When approved by Senate Council Chair, the OSC forwards the approved DL delivery request proposal to the Registrar, Distance Learning Programs, Provost and other interested parties.

DATE

7. DL delivery can be offered as per a requested future effective date, or the semester following approval.

8. In the event that a new course proposal includes a request for DL delivery, the request for a new course and the request for DL delivery will be considered approved at the end of the 10-day review period by the Senate Council and Senate if there have been no objections.

Process to Drop Existing Course

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed drop meets department/college/University goals.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal to drop a course, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.

2. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council.
   a. Council reviews proposal.
   b. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

3. Approving council forwards drop course proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
   a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is reviewed by the OSC administrative coordinator and posted to a web transmittal for Senate Council and Senate approval (due to lack of objection). (Senate Council and Senate conduct simultaneous 10-day reviews.)

4. When approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards notice of approval of the dropped course proposal to the Registrar and Provost and other interested parties.

5. Dropped course will be made effective as of a future requested effective date, or the semester following approval.

   a. PLEASE NOTE: the effective date is the first term that the course will not be offered.

Process to Request New Degree Program

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed program meets department/college/University goals and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal for a new degree program, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

PLEASE NOTE: The request for an *en passant* master's degree in a proposal for a new PhD program must be documented separately and completely, and be posted to the CPE along with the PhD degree proposal.

1. Contact Associate Provost for Academic Administration.
    a. Determine if proposed degree program is truly new.
    b. Determine if proposed degree program is within UK's band of CIP codes that do not require full review by CPE.
        i. If not in UK's band, the CPE will have specific questions that must be answered and will need to approve the new degree program subsequent to BoT approval. (see #9)
    c. College dean's office requests statement of administrative feasibility from Office of the Provost to ensure sufficient resources for the new program.
    d. Determine what other program(s), if any, should be contacted for input.
    e. Send new degree program proposal to CPE for 45-day "pre-posting" to gain insight into whether the proposal is likely to need substantial modification after the regular CPE posting. If the pre-posting does not result in requests for modification, 3. and 4. below can be done concurrently.

6. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.
    a. Inform Associate Provost for Academic Administration of college faculty approval or disapproval.

7. College dean's office sends new degree program proposal, including administrative feasibility statement, to Registrar for 45-day CPE posting.
    a. If there are objections/comments from other schools, contact them for interaction.
    b. CPE sends results of posting to Office of the Provost; results are then forwarded to the proposing units by the Associate Provost for Academic Administration.

8. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council.
    a. Council reviews proposal with "Question List" for new degree programs.
    b. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

9. Approving council forwards new degree program proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).

DATE

       a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is sent to Senate Council for live meeting review.
           i. Contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.
       b. If approved by Senate Council, the proposal is sent to the University Senate for live meeting review.
           i. Contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.

10. If approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the approved new degree program proposal to the Registrar and Provost.

11. Provost forwards Senate-approved new degree program proposal to Board of Trustees (BoT).

12. BoT reviews, and approves or rejects the new degree program proposal.

13. If the BoT approves, the Office of the Provost (through the Associate Provost for Academic Administration) notifies the CPE, Registrar and college. (CPE will need to approve if proposed new degree program is outside UK's band; if so, college is responsible for preparing and forwarding specified materials to CPE in coordination with Associate Provost for Academic Administration.)

14. New degree program can be offered as per a future requested effective date, or the next semester.

Process to Change Degree Program

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department should agree that the proposed changes to the course meet department/college/University goals, and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

Changes to degree programs include changes in posted electives, core requirements, GPA, degree program and major name changes, etc. If the degree program change is associated with other changes, (e.g., department name change) additional procedures may need to be followed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal to change a program, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. Contact Associate Provost for Academic Administration.
    a. The APAA will determine if the changes must be processed as a new degree program, e.g., if change involves a change to the CIP code, or involves changing a large portion of the core courses or changing intent of the degree program.
        i. If 25% of the <u>core</u> requirements for the major change levels or the CIP code changes – then it constitutes a new program.
        ii. If 25% of the <u>total</u> requirements change levels or change or the CIP code changes – then it constitutes a new program.

2. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.
    a. Inform Associate Provost for Academic Administration of college faculty approval or disapproval.

3. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council.
    a. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

4. Approving council forwards degree program change proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
    a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is sent to the University senators for a ten-day web review.
        i. If objection is raised and resolution not accomplished, a senator may have the issue placed on the agenda of the next regular Senate meeting by sending a written objection, supported by five senators, to the OSC.
        ii. If no objection is raised within the ten days, the item is considered approved.

5. If approved by the University Senate, the OSC notifies the proposal contact person and the college contact person and forwards the approved program changes to the Registrar and Provost.

Process to Suspend New Admissions to Degree Program

Suspending new admissions to a degree program (suspending the degree program) does not automatically drop the courses involved in the program. Drop Course Forms must be used to drop unneeded courses.

It takes a *minimum* of *one academic year* to review a proposal to indefinitely suspend new admission to a degree program. Plan accordingly!

If any reviewing body does not approve the proposal , it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

Students must continue to be admitted to the degree program until the Senate approves the suspension.

1. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty to suspend new admissions to the program. Determine how long currently active students will require for graduation - be generous.
   a. Inform Associate Provost for Academic Administration of college faculty approval or disapproval.

2. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s).
   a. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

3. Approving council forwards request to suspend program proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
   a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is sent to Senate Council for live meeting review.
      i. Contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.
   b. If approved by Senate Council, the proposal is sent to the University Senate for live meeting review.
      i. Contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.

4. If approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the request to the Board of Trustees for final approval through the Office of the Provost, and informs the Registrar.
   a. The Registrar will inform the department of the effective date The department may request an effective date, but under no circumstances will the effective date occur prior to approval by both the Senate and Board of Trustees.

Process to Request New Minor

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed minor meets department/college/University goals and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal for a new minor, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. Contact Associate Provost for Academic Administration.
   a. Determine if there are any issues with the proposal.

2. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.
   a. Inform Associate Provost for Academic Administration of college faculty approval or disapproval.

3. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council
   b. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

4. Approving council forwards new minor proposal with notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
   c. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is sent to Senate Council for live meeting review.
      i. Contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.
   d. If approved by Senate Council, the proposal is sent to the University Senate for live meeting review.
      i. Contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.

5. If approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the approved new minor proposal to the Registrar and Provost, and informs the Associate Provost for Academic Administration.

Process to Change Minor

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed minor meets department/college/University goals and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal to change a minor, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.

2. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council
   a. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

3. Approving council forwards change minor proposal with notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
   a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is reviewed by the OSC administrative coordinator and posted to a web transmittal for Senate Council and Senate approval (due to lack of objection). (Senate Council and Senate conduct simultaneous 10-day reviews.)

4. If approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the approved proposal to change a minor to the Registrar and Provost.

Process to Request New Graduate Certificate

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed program meets department/college/University goals and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal for a new graduate certificate, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

6. Contact Associate Provost for Academic Administration.

7. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.
    e. Inform Associate Provost for Academic Administration of college faculty approval or disapproval.

8. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council & Graduate Council.
    a. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

9. Approving council forwards new graduate certificate proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
    a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is sent to Senate Council for live meeting review.
        i. Contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.
    b. If approved by Senate Council, the proposal is sent to the University Senate for live meeting review.
        ii. Contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.

10. If approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the approved new degree program proposal to the Registrar and Provost.

Process to Change Graduate Certificate

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed minor meets department/college/University goals and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal to change a graduate certificate, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.

2. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council
   a. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

3. Approving council forwards proposal to change graduate certificate and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
   a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is reviewed by the OSC administrative coordinator and posted to a web transmittal for Senate Council and Senate approval (due to lack of objection). (Senate Council and Senate conduct simultaneous 10-day reviews.)

4. When approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the approved change graduate certificate proposal to the Registrar and Provost and other interested parties.

5. If approved by University Senate, the OSC forwards the change minor proposal to the Registrar and Provost.

Process to Create/Change Dual Degree Program from Existing Degree Programs

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed minor meets department/college/University goals and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a dual degree proposal, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. College(s) proposing/changing dual degree program complete Dual Degree Program Checklist and contact Associate Provost for Academic Administration.
    a. The APAA will determine how much of the core curriculum is sharable, how tuition will be addressed, minimum GPA, etc.

2. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.
    a. Inform Associate Provost for Academic Administration of college faculty approval or disapproval.

3. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges Council, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council.
    a. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

4. Approving council forwards request to suspend program proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
    c. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal will be reviewed either in a live meeting or via a web transmittal.
        i. A <u>new</u> dual degree program from existing programs is processed in this manner:
            1. The proposal is sent to Senate Council for live meeting review and the contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.
            2. If approved by Senate Council, the proposal is sent to the University Senate for live meeting review and the contact person attends for Q&A at meeting.
        ii. A <u>change</u> to a dual degree program is processed in this manner:
            1. The proposal is reviewed by the OSC administrative coordinator and posted to a web transmittal for Senate Council and Senate approval (due to lack of objection). (Senate Council and Senate conduct simultaneous 10-day reviews.)

5. If approved by the University Senate, the OSC notifies the proposal contact person and the college contact person and forwards the approved new dual degree program to the Registrar and Provost.

Process to Create or Change University Scholars Program

Prior to formally initiating the approval process, the college and department agree that the proposed drop meets department/college/University goals, and determine whether additional resources will be needed.

If any reviewing body does not approve a proposal for a University Scholars Program, it must provide a written explanation of the reasons. If a reviewing body suggests modifications, it must also explicitly state whether the suggestions are significant enough that approving bodies earlier in the approval process should have the opportunity to re-review any modified proposal. In any case, the faculty making the proposal may approve the revision or abandon it.

1. College(s) proposing University Scholars Program complete University Scholars Program Checklist and contact Associate Provost for Academic Administration.

2. Follow college procedures to seek approval of college faculty.
    a. Inform Associate Provost for Academic Administration of college faculty approval or disapproval.

3. College dean's office submits proposal to appropriate council(s) – Health Care Colleges or Graduate Council. *New University Scholars Program proposals do not require review by the Undergraduate Council.*
    a. If the council suggests changes that the council chair determines to be substantial enough that they may warrant re-review by one or more earlier councils, s/he shall consult with the chair(s) of the earlier council(s), and a decision regarding re-review will be made by all involved chairs.

4. Approving council forwards degree program change proposal and notification of approval to Office of the Senate Council (OSC).
    a. Upon receipt of all required approvals, the proposal is sent to the University senators for a seven-day web review.
        i. If objection is raised and resolution not accomplished, a senator may have the issue placed on the agenda of the next regular Senate meeting by sending a written objection, supported by five senators, to the OSC.
        ii. If no objection is raised within the seven days, the item is considered approved.

5. If approved by the University Senate, the OSC notifies the proposal contact person and the college contact person and forwards the approved program changes to the Registrar and Provost.