

APPENDIX C

Format for Proposals to Terminate an Academic Unit, Curriculum, Research or Service Endeavor

A proposal to terminate an academic unit, curriculum, research or service endeavor (hereafter referred to as a *program*) may be initiated by a faculty committee, a department, a school, a college or the provost. All initiators of proposals for program termination will prepare a report using the format given below, explaining the reasons, and providing supporting evidence and rationale, for why termination is proposed. A program termination review will be conducted using this format as a guideline and adhering to the timeline presented below.

This format does not address the employment situation of the faculty involved in the program should it be terminated. That issue is addressed elsewhere in sections 226 and 227 of the [*Officers' Handbook*](#) and the contractual agreement covering the bargaining unit faculty.

The Operation of the Program During the Termination Review

In many cases, suspending operation of the program or calling for a hiatus in admission to the program could be sufficiently damaging to the program that it would constitute a de facto termination, making the anticipated review by Curricular Affairs irrelevant. Consequently, *unless a hiatus in operation is explicitly acceptable to the program and the Provost*, the University will operate the program on a “business as usual” basis. Students in the program will be given the opportunity to complete the program in a reasonable time, regardless of the decision on termination.

Guidelines for Proposals to Terminate a Program

The proposal should include:

- I. An executive summary of the program’s position, problems, performance and prospects based on criteria adapted from the established process for academic program reviews:**
 - A. Contribution to mission and objectives
 - B. External demand and societal need
 - C. Internal demand
 - D. Quality
 - E. Effectiveness
 - F. Efficiency

The proposal to terminate must present an adequate argument that the program is deficient with respect to some of these criteria in order for a *Review for Termination* to be authorized. The proposal must specifically identify which criteria are deemed deficient.

II. Criteria

Whenever appropriate, the initiator should present supporting evidence in the form of data provided by the University's Office of Institutional Studies and any relevant ratings, rankings, accreditation reviews or "best practices" benchmark information from external sources. Citations of sources of all external evaluative data should be identified.

For each category deemed to be problematic, the initiator must substantiate the problems and indicate why the problems cited are cause for termination.

A. Contribution to Mission and Plans

Is the program misaligned with or not expected to make sufficient contributions to Department, School or College, and University level missions, strategic priorities, and academic plans? Would another alignment be appropriate?

B. External Demand/Societal Needs

Is the program deficient with respect to indicators of external demand for:

1. graduates with particular types of knowledge or skills required to make social institutions work?
2. persons who are informed and responsible citizens?

C. Internal Demand

Is the program deficient with respect to trends in enrollments of students whose primary area of study is:

1. in the program?
2. elsewhere in the University?

D. Quality

Does the program show weaknesses or downward trends with respect to:

1. recruitment or retention of qualified and productive faculty?
2. recruitment, retention or performance of good students?
3. external reputation as judged by external scholarly and professional groups?

E. Effectiveness

What are the barriers and problems with respect to accomplishing the educational, research, and service purposes of the program, including where relevant:

1. collaboration with other programs within the University?
2. connections with institutions outside the University?
3. capacities to assess and use student outcomes for making improvements in curriculum design and delivery?

F. Efficiency

Is the program inefficient in deploying resources to accomplish its purposes and sustain viable operations based on trend analyses provided by the Office of Institutional Studies of data such as:

1. FTE students taught per FTE faculty;
2. headcount majors per FTE faculty;
3. student credit hours taught by full time versus part time faculty;
4. instructional costs per student credit hour;
5. sponsored research dollars per FTE faculty.

What are the opportunity costs and tradeoffs of continuing versus terminating the program?

1. Impact on enrolled students?
2. Impact on faculty, staff and administrative personnel?

III. Information gathering and deliberative steps

Indicate specifications of the major information gathering and deliberative steps concerning the program's status that preceded the initiator's report proposing program termination. These specifications should identify the data analyzed, faculty committee analysis, feedback from advisory groups, discussions and votes taken in faculty meetings, and other evaluative process steps.

Explain communications and other actions that will be carried out to address concerns of affected student, faculty, staff and alumni constituencies if, based on the initiator's report, a formal program termination review subsequently is undertaken.

Describe major features of an orderly program phase-out plan based on the assumption that a termination review is conducted and that program termination subsequently is approved.

IV. Dissemination of the Proposal

If the Provost determines that a prima facie case has been made that warrants a termination review by the Curricular Affairs Committee, the Provost is responsible for forwarding the proposal to the Faculty Senate within 14 days of receipt.

The initiator(s) will include a one-page abstract with the proposal. The Faculty Senate Office will distribute the abstract to the following:

- The Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee
- The Senate Executive Council
- All Department Heads/Chairpersons
- All Academic Deans
- All Chairpersons of College/School Curriculum Committees
- Representatives of Appropriate Student Groups

and other interested parties. Copies of the proposal may be studied online, at the Senate Office and Bailey/Howe Library.

The Curricular Affairs Committee will review the proposal according to the guidelines presented above for proposal preparation guided by the following timetable.

Timetable for Termination Review

Days are counted from receipt of the proposal in the Provost's Office.

(Weekend days count, but holidays, summer and days in the
December – January break do not count.)

1.	The Provost will evaluate the proposal. If the Provost determines that a prima facie case has been made for termination, the proposal will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate; if not, the Provost will advise the author(s) of the proposal of its rejection, with explanation, and copy the chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee.	Day 14
2.	The Senate office will immediately forward the proposal to the chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC).	Day 16
3.	The chair of CAC will appoint a subcommittee to conduct the review and will forward the full proposal to the program faculty and invite comments.	Week 3
4.	The subcommittee will undertake the following activities: (a) Set up on request a public forum to collect input from the University and public about the proposed termination. The forum will be announced by and held by (The forum will be announced to the University by email, and, if appropriate, to the public by newspaper and other media. The proposal will be made available on a Senate web page, at the Senate office and in the Bailey-Howe library.) (b) Meet with the faculty of the program suggested for termination. (c) Meet with the dean(s) of the program suggested for termination.	Week 4 Week 7 Week 6 Week 6
5.	The subcommittee will make a recommendation to CAC to approve or reject the proposal. CAC will discuss the recommendation and vote to support or reject the proposal to terminate.	Week 9*
6.	CAC immediately reports its action to the Senate Executive Council (EC), to the Provost (for information only), and to the director of the program under consideration.	3 days after #5
7.	The program may prepare a rebuttal to the CAC position, and submit it to the Executive Council.	2 weeks after #5
8.	The Executive Council may accept the CAC position or send the matter back to CAC for further discussion, with specific instructions about what aspects of the report require additional consideration and a deadline for the CAC response.	No later than next meeting of EC after receipt of #6 and #7.
9.	With EC approval, the CAC report and program rebuttal (if available) are reported to the Faculty Senate.	At next meeting of the Senate.
10.	Unless the Senate overturns the decisions of CAC and EC, the recommendation is officially forwarded to the President and Provost.	3 days later

* Reported at the regularly scheduled CAC meeting after the 9-week mark.