Proposed Adjustments to New Course and Undergraduate Program/Degree Review Process
(developed by ABB/Duplicative Courses Implementation Working Group)

**Principles and Goals Motivating Proposed Process Changes:**

- Create a mechanism that assures faculty and units proposing new undergraduate programs and degrees receive feedback early in their development process to facilitate their leverage of that feedback to enhance proposed program/degree design.
- Assure early identification of potential conflicts of interest between units that are fiscal or strategic in nature—as well as opportunities for inter-unit collaboration—potentially arising from adoption of the proposed course or undergraduate program/degree.
- Provide a consistent and efficient means by which new courses and undergraduate programs/degrees that give rise to fiscal or strategic conflicts of interest may be assessed and determinations as to whether and how to proceed made early before significant investments of faculty/unit time, energy and resources have been made.

**Working Group Implementation Recommendations**

- See attached flow charts for proposed additions and changes to our existing new course and new undergraduate program/degree proposal processes (i.e., 1503 process).
- Adoption of proposed revision of the existing tri-campus review process. Replacement of the final step tri-campus review stage in our current 1503 process in favor of new “Stage Zero”. During Zero stage, unit proposing a new undergraduate program/degree completes a “PNOI” form (to be designed by FCAS) which will be posted online. Notifications of new PNOIs will be sent to faculty across all three campuses by the registrar and subject to a 30-day comment period. Registrar will forward comments received back to proposing unit for response and integration into formal 1503 proposal.

- SCPB review stage
  - SCPB will review new program/degree or course proposals that generate fiscal or strategic concerns.
  - A working group of the SCPB will gather the data, generate needed information, and develop the expertise required to present contested cases to full SCPB for discussion and provision of advice to Provost.
  - The full SCPB will review case and make a recommendation to Provost as to resolution of case.

- Enhance and regularize coordination and communication between SCPB and FCAS. To implement, the following approaches have been adopted/proposed:
  - Short term (2017-2018)
    - Recruit FCAS member to meet with SCPB regularly at invitation of SCPB chair.
    - This member’s FCAS subcommittee work will be acting as the formal liaison between FCAS and SCPB.
Liaison will attend all SCPB meetings and FCAS and SCAP meetings, to begin with 10/09/2017 SCPB meeting

- Requires no code or other changes

**Mid term (2 – 3 years)**
- Nominate FCAS member willing to serve as formal liaison between FCAS and SCPP to fill upcoming 2018-2019 vacancy in SCPB membership for a regular 3 year SCPB term.
  - Requires no code or other changes

**Long term (3-4 years)**
- Add FCAS representative (as appointed by FCAS membership) to serve as ex officio voting member of SCPB
  - Requires revision of section 22-91c of the Faculty code.

**NEXT STEPS**
1. Coordinate with registrar to assure smooth implementation of Stage Zero process – FALL 2017 (FCAS)
2. Coordinate with registrar to identify appropriate comment period and notification process to be employed during Stage Zero – FALL 2017 (FCAS/FCTCP)
3. Revise EO to shift tri-campus review from end of 1503 process to “Stage Zero” of proposed revised process – FALL 2017 (FCTCP)
4. Recruit FCAS member to serve as SCPB/FCAS liaison for 2017-2018 – SEPTEMBER 2017 (Chair SCPB) - COMPLETED
5. Vet final proposed adjustments to new course and undergraduate program/degree review process as proposed here with Board of Deans and Chancellors (BODC) and SEC – OCTOBER 2017 (Chair SCPB)
6. Communication campaign: Alert full faculty, academic unit curriculum offices and bodies of changes in New Course/New Program/New Degree procedures – LATE FALL 2017 (FCAS/FCTCP)

**PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION:** JANUARY 2018

**INITIAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW OF NEW PROCESSES:** MAY/JUNE 2018 (FCAS, SCPB, BODC)
**New Programs/Degrees Process Flow**

### PNOI DEVELOPMENT

Tri-Campus “PNOI”
- Identify and contact potentially impacted units or potential collaborators

**Approvals Required**
1. Department
2. Dean/Chancellor

### STAGE ZERO

Registrar
- Posts PNOI to online list
- Tri-campus Notification of:
  - All Voting faculty
  - Curriculum directors
- 30 day comment period
- Provides comments back to proposing unit

**Substance of Comments**
- None/Positive
- Negative pedagogical concerns raised
- Fiscal or strategic concerns raised

### PROPOSING UNIT DEVELOPS FORMAL 1503 PROPOSAL

Develop 1503 Proposal
- Respond to comments
- Identify and contact impacted units

### FCAS REVIEW

**Academic or Pedagogical**
- Accept (continues on 1503 path)
- Rework (back to proposing unit for revision)
- Reject (dies)

**Newly Emergent Fiscal or Strategic Concerns Identified**

### SCPB PRE-REVIEW

SCAP evaluates whether fiscal or strategic concerns are valid

### SCPB REVIEW

Evaluates and makes recommendation to Provost
- Halt (dies)
- Rework (back to PNOI development)
- Proceed (continues on 1503 path from previous point of departure: either back to Proposing Unit to develop formal 1503 proposal or return to FCAS for review on academic merits)

### DEANS CONVENE

**Potential Outcomes**
- Withdraw (dies)
- Collaborate (SCPB reviews MOU)
- Deans stay firm (SCPB evaluates initial proposal and makes recommendation to Provost)

---

If changes are so substantive it’s become a “new” proposal
New Courses Process Flow

**STAGE ZERO**
Online Form to identify impacted departments before unit faculty agree to vote
Department Chair Reviews, elicits rework if needed.

**SCHOOL/COLLEGE OR CAMPUS REVIEW (Deans/Chancellors)**
- Responds “Yes” or says nothing
- Responds “No” or objects to aspects of content

**UCC REVIEW**
**Possible Actions**
- Lists proposed course online
- More input required
- Questions or concerns

**FCAS REVIEW**
**Academic or Pedagogical Focus**
- Accept (list online)
- Reject (dies)
- More input needed or identifies other potentially impacted units

**Newly Emergent Fiscal or Strategic Concerns Identified**

**DEANS CONVENE**
**Potential Outcomes**
- Contesting unit(s) concede (to UCC for listing online)
- Deans resolve (SCPB reviews MOU and makes recommendation to Provost)
- Deans stay firm (SCPB evaluates initial proposal and makes recommendation to Provost)

**SCP CONVENES DEANS/CHANCELLORS FROM PROPOSING AND IMPACTED UNITS**

**SCPB REVIEW**
Recommendation to Provost
- Adopt (to UCC for listing online)
- Reject
- Rework