



The University of Vermont
FACULTY SENATE

**Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate
Minutes**

Thursday, December 5, 2019, 4:15 – 6:15 pm

Present: Professors Almstead, Dale, Chittenden, Emery, Everse, Gewissler, Goodwin, Hibbeler, Ivakhiv, Kervick, Monsen, Nichols, Rosebush, Seidl, Sisk, Strickler, Teneback, Tomas, Ultsch, Graduate Student Senate Representative Lindsay Worley

Absent: Professor Hazelrigg, Garrison, and Student Government Association Representative Meagan Cummings

Guests: Veronika Carter, J. Dickinson, Cathy Paris, Beth Taylor-Nolan

Chair Almstead called the meeting to order at 4:18 pm in 427A Waterman.

I. **Approval of the Minutes.** The November 7, 2019 minutes were approved as written.

II. **Chair's Remarks** – Laura Almstead provided the following updates:

1. All items approved by the CAC at the November meeting were approved by the Faculty Senate. The new Minor in Bioinformatics (CALs), and the Termination of the Master of Education in Reading and Language Arts (CESS/Grad College) will be presented to the Board of Trustees at their meeting on January 31, 2020.
2. The next meeting of the CAC will be Thursday, January 9th (not January 2nd).

III. **Reports**

- A. **New Minor in Biosecurity - revised, CALS (vote).** Laura Almstead reported that the proposers responded quickly to the concerns raised by the CAC. The revised proposal includes six courses in Political Science as elective options, and notes have also been added regarding the need to take additional elective courses if zero-level electives are chosen.
- Motion:** Laura Almstead called a vote to approve the new Minor in Biosecurity in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALs) with collaboration from the Department of Computer Science in the College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences (CEMS) and the Department of Political Science in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS).
- Vote: 19 Approve, 0 Oppose, 0 Abstain**

IV. **APR Reports** – none at this time

V. **Other Business:**

- A. **General Education Taskforce report** – J. Dickinson provided an update on the work of the General Education Taskforce and shared an early version of the committee’s report. The final proposal will include more detailed outcomes language associated with each area in the framework. The final proposal will be circulated to the President and Provost, and the Deans before being presented to the Faculty Senate at the end of January. At that point, an ad hoc committee will be formed with subcommittees appointed for each of the four requirement categories with a purpose of refining the language for the outcomes and make suggested changes. It is anticipated that the Faculty Senate will have multiple opportunities to discuss the framework as a whole, and vote on the proposal.
- B. **Substantial changes: Global Studies Major and Minor, CAS.** Amy Tomas and Adrian Ivakhiv served as the review subcommittee, and recommend approval of the proposed revisions to the Global Studies Program. The subcommittee report is attached to these minutes. The proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences is to revise the existing major and minor in the Global Studies Program. The proposed revision is a restructuring of course offerings into meaningful groupings (concentrations), a longstanding request of students and faculty participating in the program. The revision addresses the concern of a lack of coherence in the programs’ upper level electives by establishing thematic concentrations to assist students in aligning their upper level courses in the major with one of the program’s introductory core thematic or regional competencies. In the minor, students will select their upper level electives from thematic categories.
Motion: Laura Almstead called a vote to approve the substantial changes to the Global Studies Major and Minor in the College of Arts and Sciences.
Vote: 19 Approve, 0 Oppose, 0 Abstain
- C. **No Contest Termination: BA in Engineering, CEMS (vote)** – Laura Almstead reported that the College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences has requested the termination of the BA degree in Engineering (BAE). Since its inception in AY 2010-2011, only two students have completed this degree. Furthermore, there is only one student currently enrolled in this program. If approved, the BAE degree will be removed from the catalog in AY 2020-2021. The student who is currently enrolled will be able to complete their degree. This proposal has been approved by the CEMS Curriculum Committee, and by the CEMS faculty.
Motion: Rosemary Dale moved to approve the uncontested termination of the BA in Engineering in the College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences
Vote: 18 Approve, 0 Oppose, 0 Abstain
- D. **Prefix request: Music Ensemble (MUE), CAS (vote)** – Laura Almstead reported that the College of Arts and Sciences has requested the creation of a new prefix, MUE, for Music Ensembles. The new prefix would make the process of scheduling and navigation of the schedule of courses easier and also helps students differentiate among the various course offerings. This proposal has been approved by the CAS Dean’s office, and the Registrar has confirmed that the prefix is available.
Motion: Sharon Ultsch moved to approve the prefix MUE for Music Ensemble in the College of Arts and Sciences.
Vote: 18 Approve, 0 Oppose, 0 Abstain

E. **Draft Policy Documents – Program Deactivation & Reactivation (vote)** – Laura Almstead and J. Dickinson presented draft guidelines for proposals to deactivate and proposal to reactivate an academic program. The draft documents are attached to these minutes.

Motion: Stephen Everse moved to approve the policy documents for proposals to deactivate or reactivate an academic program.

Vote: **18 Approve**, 0 Oppose, 0 Abstain

F. **Revisions: Timeline for Policy & Proposal Review Process (vote)** – Laura Almstead presented a draft revision to the document titled, Process for the Development and Review of New Program, Program Revisions, Program Termination, & Name Change Proposals. The draft is attached to this report.

Motion: Colby Kervick moved to approve the revised document and timeline for policy and proposal review process.

Vote: **18 Approve**, 0 Oppose, 0 Abstain

VI. **New Business:** none at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

MEMO

To: Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate
From: Adrian Ivakhiv, Amy Tomas
Date: December 5, 2019
Re: Recommended approval of a proposal to revise the existing major and minor in Global Studies submitted by Pablo Bose and Jonah Steinberg, Program Directors

We have reviewed a proposal to revise the existing major and minor submitted by the Global Studies Program, College of Arts and Sciences, and we recommend approval. If approved, the changes will be implemented starting Fall 2020.

Revisions Overview and Rationale

Global Studies is an interdisciplinary program housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. The program offers a major and a minor exploring global and transnational issues from multiple perspectives through coursework and experiential learning. The proposed revision is a restructuring of course offerings into meaningful groupings (concentrations), a longstanding request of students and faculty participating in the program, also noted by external reviewers in the program's 2017-2018 Academic Program Review. The revision addresses the concern of a lack of coherence in the program's upper level electives by establishing thematic concentrations to assist students in aligning their upper level courses in the major with one of the program's introductory core thematic or regional competencies. In the minor, students will select their upper level electives from thematic categories.

Changes in Relationships and Effects on Other Programs

The Global Studies program offers just two courses GRS 001 (Introduction to Global Studies) and GRS 200 (Seminar in Global Studies). Students take the majority of their credit hours through courses offered by contributing departments. All existing courses in the program will continue to part of the revised curriculum. None of these departments' curricula or course offerings will be affected by the proposed revision.

Changes to the Curriculum

For the Global Studies major, students take two common courses – GRS 001 (Introduction to Global Studies) and GRS 200 (Seminar in Global Studies) as well as a common 'core' of courses drawn from a list of eligible options in three areas – Political-Economic, Human-Environment, and Humanities Perspectives on Globalization, and then four upper level electives from a list of eligible options. 24 of the 30 credits in the major are drawn from courses in cognate fields (Geography, Anthropology, Political Science, Economics, History, Community Development and Applied Economics, Sociology, English, and others). Ancillary requirements for the Global Studies major are four courses at the 100 level in a language. See detailed tables below.

Effects on Students and Faculty/Staff

There will be no changes in the requirements for admission to the program or the selection process. The proposed changes will give coherence and guidance to students as they select upper level coursework in the program. Further, the program directors anticipate the proposed revisions, with the new thematic

concentrations highlighted on transcripts, will be an advantage for program graduates. Students will work with their advisor to identify a thematic concentration by the end of their second semester, first year.

The Global Studies program currently serves 120 majors and 80 minors. Based on a recent survey of existing students, the program anticipates the following breakdown across concentrations:

Political-Economic: 40%

Human-Environment: 40%

Humanities: 20%

Costs of Revisions

There will be no cost to or impact on other academic programs as a result of the proposed revision nor will there be any need for additional resources required to pursue the proposed changes.

Assessment

The proposed revision will not result in any changes to the current assessment plan.

Evidence of Support

The proposal was submitted with a letter of support from the Dean Fall, College of Arts and Sciences.

Summary

Based on the findings of this review, the subcommittee recommends approval of the proposed revisions to the Global Studies program.

For the Global Studies major the existing requirements are as follows:

Course	Title	Credits
GRS 001	Introduction to Global Studies	3
<i>Core Competency Courses</i>	<i>Options from</i>	
Human-Environment	ANTH 021, GEOG 050	3
Political-Economic	CDAE 002, ECON 040, POLS 51, POLS 71	3
Humanities Perspective	HST 009, HST 010, REL 20, REL 29, WLIT 20	3
One additional core	Any one additional course from above list	3
<i>Electives</i>	4 courses, 3 of which must be from 100-level	12
GRS 200	Seminar in Global Studies	3
TOTAL		30

For the Global Studies minor the existing requirements are as follows:

Course	Title	Credits
GRS 001	Introduction to Global Studies	3
<i>Core Competency Courses</i>	<i>Options from</i>	
Human-Environment	ANTH 021, GEOG 050	6
Political-Economic	CDAE 002, ECON 040, POLS 51, POLS 71	
Humanities Perspective	HST 010, REL 29	
<i>Electives</i>	3 courses which must be from 100-level	9
TOTAL		18

Proposed revisions with concentrations incorporated. The proposed changes are illustrated in the tables below.

Proposed Global Studies major catalog table:

Thirty credits, including:

GRS 001	D2:SU:Intro to Global Studies	3
CORE COMPETENCY COURSES		
Choose one course from each of the three categories below:		
Political-Economic Perspectives on Globalization:		3
CDAE 002	D2:SU:World Food, Population & Development	
POLS 051	Intro International Relations	
POLS 071	Comparative Political Systems	
EC 040	D2:SU:Econ of Globalization	
Human and Environmental Perspectives on Globalization:		3
ANTH 021	D2:SU: Cultural Anthropology	
GEOG 050	D2:SU: World Regional Geog	
Humanities Perspectives on Globalization:		3
HST 009	D2: Global History to 1500	
HST 010	D2: Global History since 1500	
REL 020	D2: Comparing Religions	
REL 029	D2: Religion and Globalization	
WLIT 020	D2: Literatures of Globalization	
One additional core course from any of the core competency options.		3
THEMATIC ELECTIVES		
Take four courses at the 100-level or above in one of the following concentrations. Special Topics, study abroad, and other courses may be added to these concentrations with the approval of an advisor.		12
Political-Economic: CDAE 102, CDAE 173, EC 116, EC 240, GEOG 154, GEOG 272 when the title is Migration, Mobility, Transnational, HST 111, HST 191, POLS 150, POLS 154, POLS 246, POLS 259, POLS 277, SOC 112		
Human-Environment: ANTH 173, ANTH 179, ANTH 285, ENVS 154, ENVS 167, ENVS 180, GEOG 145, GEOG 148, GEOG 173, GEOG 174, GEOG 178, POLS 159, SOC 102, SOC 103, SOC 121		
Humanities Perspectives: ENGS 182, ENGS 188, FREN 135, FREN 280, FTS 123, HST 113, HST 209, HST 240, REL 104, REL 133, REL 255, SPAN 111, SPAN 145, SPAN 146, SPAN 264		
GRS 200	D2:Seminar in Global Studies	3
No more than nine credits used toward the major may be taken from any one discipline.		
In addition, majors must complete either four courses at or above the 100-level in any foreign language or a minor in a foreign language.		

Proposed Global Studies minor catalog table:

Eighteen credits, including:

GRS 001	D2:SU:Intro to Global Studies	3
CORE COMPETENCY COURSES		
Two of the following courses:		6
CDAE 002	D2:SU:World Food, Population & Development	
POLS 051	Intro International Relations	
POLS 071	Comparative Political Systems	
EC 040	D2:SU:Econ of Globalization	
ANTH 021	D2:SU: Cultural Anthropology	
GEOG 050	D2:SU: World Regional Geog	
HST 009	D2: Global History to 1500	
HST 010	D2: Global History since 1500	
REL 020	D2: Comparing Religions	
REL 029	D2: Religion and Globalization	
WLIT 020	D2: Literatures of Globalization	
THEMATIC ELECTIVES		
Take three courses at the 100-level or above in one of the following categories. Special Topics, study abroad, and other courses may be added to these concentrations with the approval of an advisor.		9
Category A: Political-Economic: CDAE 102, CDAE 173, EC 116, EC 240, GEOG 154, GEOG 272 when the title is Migration, Mobility, Transnational, HST 111, HST 191, POLS 150, POLS 154, POLS 246, POLS 259, POLS 277, SOC 112		
Category B: Human-Environment: CDAE 102, CDAE 173, EC 116, EC 240, GEOG 154, GEOG 272, HST 111, HST 191, POLS 150, POLS 154, POLS 246, POLS 259, POLS 277, SOC 112		
Category C: Humanities Perspectives: ENGS 182, ENGS 188, FREN 135, FREN 280, FTS 123, HST 113, HST 209, HST 240, REL 104, REL 133, REL 255, SPAN 111, SPAN 145, SPAN 146, SPAN 264		
No more than six credits used toward the major may be taken from any one discipline.		
Ineligible Major: Global Studies		

Proposal to Deactivate an Academic Program

The program deactivation process allows for the formal suspension of an academic program for a period of up to five years. The program will not be able to accept students once the deactivation is approved by the Faculty Senate. Detailed information on the deactivated program will be removed from the University Catalogue and department/program webpage(s). The program title will be listed in the graduate or undergraduate catalogue under the heading “Programs Not Currently Accepting Students.” Unless the program has been reactivated or terminated, the unit and the department housing the program will be notified by the Office of the Provost during the fourth year that action must be taken prior to the catalogue deadline in the coming academic year. At that point, the sponsoring unit has three choices: request continuation of deactivated status (see below), begin a Program Termination process, or reactivate the program. Guidelines for proposals to terminate programs and to reactivate programs are posted on the Faculty Senate Curricular Resources page (see [here](#)).

A proposal to deactivate an academic program may be initiated by a faculty committee, a department/unit, or the Provost.

Requests for Continuance of Deactivated Status: Continuance of deactivated status beyond five years can be granted on the grounds that the conditions that prompted deactivation are likely to change in the near future. Changes might include approved hires in the next three years, evidence of increased demand for the program, or new collaboration with another unit/department that will help support the program. Requests for continuance of deactivated status should be made by the department chair/program director in the form of a memo, accompanied by a support letter from the unit dean. The memo should provide sufficient rationale for remaining deactivated rather than reactivating or terminating the program and a brief history of the program, including why it was deactivated. Memos should be submitted to the Office of the Provost. Upon successful review by the Provost, proposals will be forwarded to the CAC for review and approval. Requests for continuation of deactivated status do not require approval beyond the CAC. If a request for continuation of deactivated status is not approved by the CAC, the program may appeal to the Provost’s Office. In the event that continuation of deactivated status is not approved by the Provost’s Office, a program can opt to initiate a reactivation or termination process.

No-Contest Deactivation Requests: In the case where the request to deactivate comes from the program itself (a “no-contest” deactivation) and where there are no implications for loss of faculty and/or staff, a request for deactivation can be made by the chair/program director in the form of a memo, accompanied by a support letter from the unit dean as well as department chairs/deans of other departments/units that could be affected by the deactivation. The request for deactivation memo should present the rationale for the request, a brief history of the program, the number of students currently enrolled in the program and a plan to facilitate their completion, and a record of the faculty vote on the deactivation proposal. If there are no students enrolled in the program being deactivated, the deactivation proposal should also address plans to deactivate any courses offered solely for this program.

Contested Deactivations: Parties are encouraged to work towards no-contest deactivations prior to launching a contested deactivation process. All proposals for a contested program deactivations will be prepared using the format given below, explaining the reasons, and providing supporting evidence and rationale for the proposed deactivation. A Proposal to Deactivate an Academic Program (established XXXX 2020)

program deactivation review will be conducted using this format as a guideline and adhering to the timeline presented at the end of this document.

This format does not address the employment situation of the faculty involved in the program should it be deactivated. That issue is addressed elsewhere in the contractual agreement covering the bargaining unit faculty.

Operation of the Program During the Deactivation 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 deactivation, making the anticipated review by the Curricular Affairs Committee 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 deactivation.

Guidelines for Proposals to Deactivate a Program (Contested Deactivations)

The proposal must include the sections indicated below. Relevant support letters should also be provided as appropriate.

1) An abstract summarizing 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 deactivate must present an adequate argument that the program is not performing up to expected standards with respect to some of these criteria in order for a Review for Deactivation to be authorized. The proposal must specifically identify which criteria are deemed deficient, and clearly state why program deactivation is being requested.

2) Evaluation Based on Criteria

Whenever appropriate, the initiator must present supporting evidence in the form of data provided by the University’s Office of Institutional Research and any relevant ratings, rankings, accreditation reviews or “best practices” benchmark information from external sources. Citations of sources for all external evaluative data should be identified. For each category cited in the request for deactivation, the initiator must substantiate the problems or deficiencies and indicate why these are cause for deactivation.

A. Contribution to Mission and Plans

Is the program misaligned with or not currently making sufficient contributions to the department, unit, and/or 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:

- graduates with particular types of knowledge or skills required to make social institutions work?
- 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:

- in the program?
- elsewhere in the University?

D. Quality

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

- recruitment or retention of qualified and productive faculty?
- recruitment, retention or performance of good students?
- 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:

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

F. Efficiency

Does the program represent a deployment of resources that is not in line with the strategic priorities of the sponsoring unit and the University? 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 Research and Assessment such as:

- FTE students taught per FTE faculty;
- headcount majors per FTE faculty;
- student credit hours taught by full time versus part time faculty;
- instructional costs per student credit hour;
- sponsored research dollars per FTE faculty.

What are the opportunity costs and tradeoffs of continuing the program or deactivating the program for a period of up to five years? Impact on enrolled students? Impact on faculty, staff and administrative personnel?

3) 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 deactivation. These specifications should identify the data analyzed, faculty committee analysis, feedback from advisory groups, communication with other units/departments

that could be affected by the deactivation, 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 as well as other units/departments if, based on the initiator's report, a formal program deactivation review subsequently is undertaken.

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

Dissemination and Review of the Proposal

If the Provost determines that a prima facie case has been made that warrants a deactivation review by the Curricular Affairs Committee, the Provost is responsible for forwarding the proposal to the Faculty Senate Office and Chair of the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee within 14 days of receipt. The Faculty Senate Office will distribute the proposal abstract to the faculty for public comment as well as all department chairs, deans, appropriate student groups, and other relevant parties identified in the proposal. Copies of the full proposal may be requested by any faculty, student, or staff member. The Curricular Affairs Committee will review the proposal according to the guidelines presented above for proposal preparation.

Timetable for Contested Deactivation Review

Note that weekend days count, but holidays, summer and days in the December – January break do not.)

Within 14 days of receipt by the Provost's office: The Provost will evaluate the proposal. If the Provost determines that a prima facie case has been made for deactivation, 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 (CAC).

Within 7 days of receipt by the Faculty Senate office: The Faculty Senate office will forward the proposal to the Chair of the CAC and the program faculty. The Chair of the CAC will appoint a subcommittee to conduct a review. As part of their review, the subcommittee will meet with the program faculty and unit dean. The proposal abstract will be circulated for a public comment period of 30 days as described above.

At the first CAC meeting following the 30 day comment period: The subcommittee will make a recommendation to CAC to approve or reject the proposal. The CAC will discuss the recommendation and vote to support or reject the proposal to deactivate.

Within 7 days of the CAC meeting: The Chair of the CAC will communicate the CAC's decision with a written report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Provost (for information only), the chair/director of the program under consideration, and the unit dean.

Within 14 days of receipt of the CAC decision: The program may prepare a rebuttal to the CAC position, and submit it to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Proposal to Deactivate an Academic Program (established XXXX 2020)

At the next Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee may accept the CAC decision to approve or reject the proposal to deactivate, 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.

If approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the CAC report and any rebuttal from the program will be distributed with the materials for the next Faculty Senate meeting. If approved by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate, the decision to approve or reject the proposal for deactivation will be forwarded to the President and Provost for a final decision.

DRAFT

Proposal to Reactivate an Academic Program

The program reactivation process should be followed to restore a deactivated program to active status. Once reactivation has been approved, the program may begin accepting students and include information about the program on their website. If reactivation is approved prior to February 15, updated program information will appear in the next year's Catalogue; if approved after the catalogue deadline it can be included in the addendum published around June 30. Requests for reactivation should be submitted to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. They will be reviewed by the same process as substantial changes to existing programs, which includes a 30 day public comment period, review and approval by the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee, and a report shared with the Faculty Senate. If a request for reactivation is not approved by the CAC, the program may appeal to the Provost's Office. In the event that reactivation is not approved by the Provost's Office, a program can opt to request a continuation of deactivated status or initiate a termination process.

A proposal to reactivate an academic program must be initiated by the housing department/unit.

Reactivation with minimal curricular changes: In the case where reactivation request would restore a deactivated program with minimal changes to its curriculum, the reactivation request should be made by the department chair/program director in the form of a memo, accompanied by a support letter from the unit curriculum committee and dean. The request for reactivation memo should present the rationale for the request and a brief history of the program, including why it was deactivated. Any deficiencies, including resources, student demand, or program quality that prompted the deactivation must be fully addressed in the memo, including any changes that are prompting the reactivation request. The letter of support from the dean should indicate that there are sufficient and sustainable resources, including faculty, to support the program, as well as indicators of sufficient student demand to make the program viable. Any other deficiencies that were raised as part of the deactivation process should also be acknowledged as resolved by the dean's letter. The dean's letter must indicate the unit-level procedures followed in reviewing the proposal, and that the proposal has appropriate faculty approval.

Reactivation with substantial revision of the program curriculum: In many cases, the sponsoring unit may decide to reactivate a program with substantial changes to the curriculum, for example, by updating more than 40% of required coursework, or undertaking other significant restructuring of the curriculum. For information on what constitutes as substantial revision see the *Substantial Revisions to Existing Academic Programs: Approval Process and Definitions* document posted on the Faculty Senate Curricular Resources website (see [here](#)). Proposals for reactivation with substantial revisions should follow the format described in the *Proposal to Substantially Revise an Existing Academic Program* document also posted on the Curricular Resources webpage. In the case of reactivation with substantial revision, the sponsoring unit should also include a cover memo and Dean's letter with the same information as described above for reactivations with minimal curricular changes.

Process for the Development and Review of New Program, Program Revisions, Program Termination, & Name Change Proposals

All proposals must undergo the appropriate unit-level review prior to submission. This includes review and approval by the:

- proposing department(s)/program(s)
- college/school curriculum committee(s) and college/school faculty
- college/school Dean(s)
- Graduate College Executive Council and Dean [graduate programs only]

Once unit-level review is complete, proposals (including all letters of support and an abstract if required) should be submitted to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. Upon successful review by the Office of the Provost, proposals will be sent to the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) for review and approval. If approved by the CAC, proposals needing further approval by the Faculty Senate will be presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Council who will approve their inclusion on the next Faculty Senate meeting agenda. Following approval by the Faculty Senate, the Provost then reviews the final proposal and presents it to the President; they have 30 days to respond. If approved by the President, proposals that require Board of Trustees approval will be presented to the Board.

IMPORTANT NOTES

- ❖ All proposals must be circulated for public comment for a minimum of 30 days prior to being voted on by the CAC (see Critical Dates below).
- ❖ Proposers should allow a minimum of one week between submission to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and circulation.
- ❖ Catalogue edits are due prior to March 30 of each year. Proposals approved by the Faculty Senate and/or Board of Trustees after March 30 may be included in the Catalogue addendum that is posted on or about June 30th of each year. Proposers should contact the Assistant Provost and their unit's Catalogue Editor as soon as the program is approved by the Board of Trustees at the May meeting, to discuss its inclusion in the addendum.

Critical Dates – AY 2019-2020

NOTE: These dates represent a best-case scenario. Missing items (e.g. abstracts, support letters), concerns raised during the public comment period, etc. can delay things.

Circulated for Public Comment	CAC Meeting	Faculty Senate Meeting	Board of Trustees Meeting
April 2, 2019	May 2, 2019	May 16, 2019	October 25, 2019
August 6, 2019	September 5, 2019	September 23, 2019	
September 3, 2019	October 3, 2019	October 28, 2019	January 31, 2020
October 8, 2019	November 7, 2019	November 18, 2019	
November 5, 2019	December 5, 2019	December 16, 2019	
December 10, 2019	January 9, 2020	January 27, 2020	May 15, 2020
January 7, 2020	February 6, 2020	February 24, 2020	
February 4, 2020	March 5, 2020	March 23, 2020	
March 3, 2020	April 2, 2020	April 20, 2020	
March 31, 2020	April 30, 2020	May 14, 2020	October 23, 2020