New Degree Program & Program Modification Approval Process

Step #1: Chancellor's Office (CO) Approval to Get on the Academic Master Plan (AMP)

- <u>Content/Substance:</u> What is required on the CO's "Projected Degree Proposal" form only but revise question #10 to clarify that "required resources" includes faculty, space, library, etc. (see attached).
- <u>Who is consulted?</u> College Dean, CEIE Dean (if self-support), participating & impacted departments, library
- <u>Who approves?</u> College Dean, CEIE Dean (if self-support), & Provost
- <u>What do they need to see in order to approve?</u> Completed CO form

No new program can be implemented without first getting on the AMP. Once approved by the CO and placed on the AMP, campus has ten years to develop and implement the program.

Step #2: Campus-wide Sharing #1

- <u>Purpose?</u> To allow affected departments to join the conversation
- <u>What should be shared?</u> Program description, Proposed list of courses & descriptions, & link to the "Projected Degree Proposal" form submitted to the CO
- <u>What happens if there is an objection?</u> It's not a veto, but the objection must be included and addressed in further levels of review.

Step #3: Academic Programs consults with Department to Submit the WASC Substantive Change Screening Form Information about this form can be found at this link.

Step #4: Department/Dean (Program Modifications start here.)

- Faculty member(s) develop the following in consultation with the Dean regarding resources & alignment with college mission:
  - o Program description & requirements (catalogue copy)
  - o Rationale for Program
  - o Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)
  - o Course titles, descriptions (including student learning outcomes, sample assignments, & list of potential texts for each course—in order to demonstrate disciplinary perspectives and how outcomes are being supported/addressed—but NOT a whole syllabus with dates and policy statements)
  - o Learning Outcomes Matrix (Courses to PLOs and PLOs to Undergraduate or Graduate ILOs)
  - o Assessment Plan
  - o Data to justify need for the program (student demand, workforce demand, etc.)
  - o Resources Required
  - o 3-year Course Plan (List of when each course is going to be offered)
  - o Roadmaps for Undergraduate Programs
  - o Resolution/Response to any objections raised during Campus-Wide Sharing #1

  *Note that all of the above documents are required by the CO, except the sample assignments, list of potential texts, roadmaps, and the response(s) to objections.

- Faculty member(s) consult with the following on the relevant components of the proposal and gets evidence of such consultation and the consultants' written feedback, including the Dean's impact statement:
  - University Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee (USLOAC) - Faculty Director of Assessment or designee
  - Library
  - University Effectiveness, Planning, and Analytics (UEPA)
  - Information Technology (IT)
  - Affected Departments
  - College dean – Impact statement should address if/how the program aligns with the college mission, its marketability, a willingness (or not) to provide resources (human, financial, etc.) described in the proposal, the substance of the consultations, and the response to any objections that were raised, including consultation with other Deans if there are objections from outside the College. It should also acknowledge whether or not the program requirements comply with Title V.*
  - College of Extended & International Education (CEIE) Dean (if the program is self-support and will be administered through CEIE)

  Note: Dean's Impact Statement Checklist can be accessed here.

Step #5: Department Approval

- **What does the department consider?** Everything created as part of Step #5 plus a response to the Dean's impact statement, if so desired, and any individual departmental faculty objections to the proposal.
- **Who approves?** Curriculum Committee Chair &/or Department chair/program director
- **What does such "approval" indicate to the subsequent committees?**
  - Appropriate consultations have been made and addressed, including with the dean;
  - the proposed program is current & relevant to society's needs.
  - the proposed program meets disciplinary standards and reflects current trends in the field; and
  - a simple majority of voting faculty for curricular matters, as defined by the department approves of the proposal.

Step #6: Campus-Wide Sharing #2

- **What does campus need to see?** Synopsis of the proposal (what we do now) with a link to the whole proposal, any objections that were raised, & explanation of how the objections have been considered.

- **What is the timeline and process for this step?**
  - The campus has 10 working days to notify the department and Academic Programs (AP) that they have an objection, then they get 10 additional working days to submit their full objection in writing as an attachment to the Department.
  - The department addresses it and submits its response along with the written objection to the College Curriculum Committee
  - Objections can only be made on grounds pertaining to curricular matters, not finances.
  - Intra-college disputes are addressed by the College Curriculum Committee; Inter-college disputes are addressed by UCC. Committees are required to invite both parties to speak to

the objection.

Step #7: College Curriculum Committee

- **What does this committee consider**?
    o Does the program align with the College mission?
    o Does the proposal makes sense/cohere in a way faculty members outside of the discipline can see and understand?
    o Do the outcomes (Courses to PLO's) align?
    o How will this program impact other programs in the College?
    o Is the disciplinary lens/boundary clear and distinctive? Do the course descriptions reflect the disciplinary perspectives and approaches?
    o Have intra-college objections been sufficiently addressed?

- **What does this committee need to see/look at in order to address these questions?**
    o Program description and rationale
    o Course descriptions
    o Outcomes matrix
    o Pre-requisites
    o Dean's impact statement (but only for impact on other programs in terms of curriculum, not in terms of resources)

Step #8: Graduate Council (as appropriate)

- **What does this committee review?**
    o New graduate programs
    o Program modifications making a substantive change to the culminating requirements (other program modifications do not necessitate Graduate Council review).
- **What does this committee consider?**
    o Does the program align with the standards for graduate curricula?
    o Do the program admission policies align with current admission standards?
    o Does the program's culminating experience meet the criteria as defined in Title V?

- **What does this committee need to see/look at in order to address these questions?**
    o Program description and rationale
    o Course descriptions
    o Description of culminating experience

Step #9: University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

- **What does this committee consider?**
    o Is this program beneficial to the campus community?? Is there a need/demand for it?
    o Does the program align with our Institutional Learning Outcomes (PLO to ILO alignment)?
    o Is the modality accurate based on WASC's definitions? (Note, almost everything will now be classified as hybrid for CO purposes, since they define "hybrid" as any mix of face-to- face and online)
    o Does it overlap with other programs offered at the University? Is the disciplinary lens/boundary clear and distinctive? Do the course descriptions reflect the disciplinary perspectives and approaches?

- o Have intra-college objections been sufficiently addressed?
- o Unresolved inter-college objections
- o Any further objections/appeals
- o Is the Assessment Plan for degree programs/concentrations approved by USLOAC?
- • Approval memo/email from USLOAC is attached to the proposal.
  - • Note: this does not apply to the following:
    - • Certificates
    - • Credentials
    - • Minors

- **What does this committee need to see/look at in order to address these questions**?
  - o Program description and rationale that addresses how program meets student need/demand
  - o Course descriptions
  - o Outcomes matrices
  - o Assessment Plan & Curriculum Map

Step #10: Provost's Office (Program Modifications stop here.)

- Ensures that curriculum review process was followed appropriately
- Deals with WASC screening form
- Reviews Dean's Impact Statement
- Reviews roadmaps
- Checks for compliance with Title V and all relevant Chancellor's Office Executive Order's and campus policies

Step #11: President's Office

Step #12: Chancellor's Office

Objections Process

The full details for the objections process can be found on the Curriculum Review webpage at this link.

Appeals Process

- College Curriculum Committee decisions can be appealed to UCC and UCC decisions can be appealed to EPC within 10 working days of having received notification of the decision and must explain, in writing, why the department is not satisfied with the decision.

Differences between old process and what is outlined here:

- Additional campus-wide sharing
- More consultation earlier (USLOAC, Library, IT, dean, campus)
- No syllabi (with policies and schedule with dates) go through this process; instead, course descriptions, sample texts, and sample assignments are provided
- USLOAC consults on outcomes and assessment plan and then this gets re-checked at Provost-level; College Curriculum Committee & UCC are not looking at action verbs and/or the assess-ability of the outcomes
- Focus of College Curriculum Committee & UCC is really on alignment, making disciplinary

perspectives visible and clear to students & non-experts, and working out objections

- Clearer procedures for objections
- More transparency
- Faculty only provide information relevant to the particular type of modification(s) being proposed, as defined on the new Program Modification Form.