



The University of Vermont  
FACULTY SENATE

**Minutes**

Monday, December 14, 2020

Online via Microsoft Teams 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Recording of this meeting is available on Microsoftstream:

<https://web.microsoftstream.com/video/49446028-9d68-49b5-b21c-29079cbdfef1>

---

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 PM

**Senators in Attendance: 68**

**Absent:** Senators Kenny (Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Services), Calkins (Family Medicine), Weinstein (Family Medicine), Ahern (Surgery), Evans (Surgery), Terrien (Medicine), Moore (Pediatrics), Saia (Pediatrics), Dickerson (Psychiatry), Ali (Radiology), VonDoepp (Political Science)

- 
- 1. Faculty Senate President's Welcome Remarks** – Thomas Chittenden made the following remarks:
    - Change to the Agenda Order – Item 6 moved to the third item.
    - The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration this year will feature a free virtual lecture. Slave Health Deficit: The Journey to Health Parity. Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup> 5:30 to 6:45 PM.
    - Academic Organization Restructuring Work Group. Concerns have been raised about the results of the ballot process for faculty representation on the AORWG. Some of the concerns include:
      - Physical Sciences not represented
      - CEMS did not have a ballot section
      - More members than originally envisionedThomas Chittenden and Chris Burns will meet with Dean Jenemann to address these concerns and propose alternative solutions.
    - Thomas expressed appreciation for the support, guidance and advice received during his term as Faculty Senate President. He recognized the contributions to the Faculty Senate made by Vice President Christopher Burns, and expressed appreciation for his willingness to step into the role of President along with Evan Eyler as Vice President for the next six months.
  - 2. Resolution in Memoriam for Dr. James Kraushaar, Associate Professor Emeritus of Business Administration.** Michael Gurdon, Professor Emeritus of Business Administration, Grossman School of Business, presented a Resolution in Memoriam for James Kraushaar, Associate Professor Emeritus of Business Administration. The resolution is attached to these minutes.

**Motion:** Michael Gurdon moved to inscribe the Resolution in Memoriam for Dr. James Kraushaar in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and to send a copy to the family.

**Vote:** 100% approve, 0% oppose, 0% abstain

**Resolution in Memoriam for Dr. Jie Yang, Associate Professor of Physics.** Matthew White, Assistant Professor Department of Physics, presented a Resolution in Memoriam for Jie Yang, Associate Professor of Physics, College of Arts and Sciences. The resolution is attached to these minutes.

**Motion:** Matthew White moved to inscribe the Resolution in Memoriam for Dr. Jie Yang in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and to send a copy to the family.

**Vote:** 100% approve, 0% oppose, 0% abstain

3. **Call for Nominations** – Senate Secretary, Laurie Eddy, announced that emails were sent to faculty with the call for nominations for two Senate leadership positions:

- Faculty Senate President-Elect
- Member At-Large to the Executive Council

The President-Elect will succeed automatically to the office of Faculty Senate President for the two-year term beginning July 1, 2021 and ending June 30, 2023. The President-Elect term will take effect immediately through until June 30, 2021, when the two-year presidential term begins. One nomination has been received. Thomas Borchert has accepted the nomination.

The Member at-Large will complete the final 6-months of the 2-year term being vacated by Evan Eyler, as he takes on the responsibilities of Faculty Senate Vice President. The At-Large member term will begin immediately and end on June 30, 2021. Elected Faculty Senators are eligible to serve. In keeping with our bylaws, no more than two of the members at-large may be from the same School or College. Because there are two members at large from CAS, Senators representing the College of Arts and Sciences are not eligible to fill this vacant seat. No nominations have been received.

The floor was opened for nominations. No nominations were received from the floor. The deadline for nominations is 6:00 PM on Monday, December 14<sup>th</sup>. Nominations may be submitted to [Faculty.Senate@uvm.edu](mailto:Faculty.Senate@uvm.edu), or online via webform on the Senate webpage. The election ballots will be distributed via email the first week of January and be open for one week.

4. **Consent Agenda** - The following items were presented as a consent agenda:

- Minutes of the November 16, 2020 Senate Meeting
- Curricular Affairs
  - a) New Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (CNHS/GRAD)
  - b) Uncontested Deactivation of the Post-Professional Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (CNHS/GRAD)
  - c) New Community Centered Design Major (CALs)

Thomas Chittenden called the vote on the consent agenda. During the vote, President Chittenden opened debate on the new Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy. A Point of Order was made that voting was already in progress when debate was opened. President Chittenden nullified the vote and asked for a motion to pull the New Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy and the Uncontested Deactivation of the Post-Professional Doctorate in Occupational Therapy from the consent agenda, to allow the two items to be debated and voted separately.

**Motion:** Jane Knodell moved to remove the New Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy and the Uncontested Deactivation of the Post-Professional Doctorate in Occupational Therapy from the consent agenda. The motion was seconded. Parliamentarian, Evan Eyler confirmed that a vote was not needed to pull the items from the consent agenda. Thomas Chittenden called the vote on the revised consent agenda.

**The revised consent agenda was presented for vote:**

- Minutes of the November 16, 2020 Senate Meeting
- New Community Centered Design Major (CALs)

**Motion:** To approve the two items on the revised Consent Agenda

**Vote:** 91% approve, 3% oppose, 5% abstain. **The motion carried.**

**Debate opened on the two curricular items removed from the consent agenda:**

- **The New Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (CNHS/GRAD)**
- **Uncontested Deactivation of the Post-Professional Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (CNHS/GRAD).**

Topics of debate included topics specific to the proposal, such as educational quality, funding sources, demonstrated community need, and timing to receive the national accreditation required for the program, and topics focused on the broader context, such as a desire for meaningful Faculty Senate involvement in decisions about where the University invests and disinvests, and objections to consideration of this proposal from CNHS when cuts are proposed for programs and departments in CAS. It was confirmed that the program proposal was thoroughly vetted following the policy and process for proposal review, including the unit level curriculum committee, the Graduate College Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate CAC, and Executive Council. In addition, the Chair of the Faculty Senate FPPC reported that Dean Thomas attended an FPPC meeting to answer questions regarding funding sources. A Point of Order was made that motions made in the meeting chat were not being recognized. Evan Eyler stated that it was up to the presiding officer to decide if motions can be made in the chat. Thomas Chittenden reminded the body that as presiding officer he does not actively read the chat, and members must raise their 'hand' to be recognized. Thomas Chittenden asked for motions from the body.

**Motion:** Mary Louise Kete moved to table the two curricular items. The motion was seconded.

**Vote:** 23% approve, 56% oppose, 21% abstain. **The motion to table failed.**

Point of order was called that the motion to approve the two items came moved and seconded by the Curricular Affairs Committee. Debate continued. The question was called, and seconded.

**Vote:** 75% approve, 10% oppose, 15% abstain. **The motion carried, ending debate.**

Thomas Chittenden called the vote on the two curricular items:

**Motion:** To approve the New Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (CNHS/GRAD) and the uncontested Deactivation of the Post-Professional Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (CNHS/GRAD)

**Vote:** 83% approve, 8% oppose, 8% abstain. **The motion carried.**

5. **Curricular Affairs – Laura Almstead, CAC Chair - Faculty Senate Process for Academic Program Deactivations and Terminations (vote).** Laura Almstead presented proposed revisions to the following guidelines:

- Revised Guidelines for Proposals to Deactivate Academic Programs

- Revised Guidelines for Proposals to Terminate Academic Programs

Chair Almstead stated that the proposed guideline revisions are not in response to the latest announcement about program and department terminations in CAS, but are made more important because of that announcement. The proposed revisions are designed to provide clarity and a review structure that is similar to current policy for new and revised programs. The two most significant revisions in the deactivation and termination policies are 1) that there be a unit-level review by the unit curricular committee prior to coming to the CAC, and 2) that the current requirement of a public forum be replaced with a 30-day circulation and comment period.

**Motion:** Jacques Baily moved that the guidelines be amended to allow programs 30-days to respond to comments made during the 30-day comment period. The motion was seconded. Laura Almstead agreed to amend the proposed guidelines to increase the response time to 30-days. Thomas Chittenden ruled that the amendment could be made without a vote.

**Motion:** To approve the revised guidelines for proposals to deactivated academic programs and the revised guidelines for proposals to terminate academic programs, as amended.

**Vote:** 97% approve, 0% oppose, 3% abstain. **The motion carried.**

#### 6. Academic Strategic Planning. Faculty Senate Process & Timeline for considering department closures as well as the creation of new combination of departments into schools.

Thomas Chittenden stated that there is no existing Faculty Senate or University policy or documented processes currently in place for the closure of a department or re-organization within a school. We do have the process for the creation, deactivation, or termination of programs. The Faculty Senate Office plan is to develop a similar process for considering proposals to change departments. The process would include:

- Predefined questions to address
- Faculty feedback with formal mechanisms
- Votes at the department & college level
- Opportunity for rebuttal
- Review and vote by the faculty senate

Chris Burns reflected on the historical precedent for department closures and re-organization of colleges at UVM. Although there is no existing process in place, there is a record of the previous efforts for re-organization that can be used to help guide the development of a process. Examples include:

- Two CEMS restructurings (2005 and 2016)
- The termination of the School of Dental Hygiene in 2002 (which led to the creation of Appendix C for the termination of programs)
- Reorganizations of the College of Education and Social Services (1979 and 1984)
- Reorganization of Engineering, Mathematics and Business Administration (1981)
- Reorganization of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (1984)
- The elimination of the School of Nursing department structure (1996)
- The consolidation of the College of Nursing and the School of Allied Health Sciences to the College of Nursing and Health Sciences (2002)
- A proposal to terminate the MPA in CAS (2002)

Thomas Chittenden and Chris Burns stated that the next steps will be determined when more is known about potential proposals from CAS. As soon as it is developed, the proposal for a formal review process for department closures and re-organization of colleges will come back to the full Faculty Senate. The next Senate meeting is February 1, 2021.

The floor was opened for discussion. Discussion included both the acknowledgment that change is inevitable and necessary, and expressions of concern about the process and questions regarding the rationale. Topics of discussion included: a desire for stronger faculty governance; a need for transparency in reorganization process; the importance of considering more than one parameter and including feedback loops when deciding program cuts; and the challenge of making curricular upgrades when struggling for resources. Questions were raised regarding the rationale for re-org and cuts conducted in parallel, and the rationale for proposing cuts to programs like Geology when presenting a vision that includes an emphasis on the environment and research.

7. **Comprehensive By Laws Review Committee December Report** - due to time limitations, this report will be distributed via email.
  
8. **New Business** – Chris Burns offered words of appreciation for Thomas Chittenden’s leadership. The technical challenges and weighty issues tackled by the Senate have not been easy. Thomas has set a high bar for future Faculty Senate Presidents with his willingness to talk with everyone about matters before the Senate. Cathy Paris echoed appreciation for Thomas’ eagerness to reach out to every constituent. The Senate showed their appreciation for Thomas with a round of applause.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 PM.



The University of Vermont  
FACULTY SENATE

**Resolution in Memoriam  
Dr. James Kraushaar  
Associate Professor Emeritus of Business Administration  
1945-2020**

**Presented by Michael Gurdon  
Professor Emeritus of Business Administration  
December 14, 2020**

The UVM Grossman School of Business is sad to report that a beloved colleague and friend, Dr. James (Jim) Kraushaar passed away February 4, 2020. He joined the UVM faculty in 1981 and continued his career of teaching, research and service until his retirement in 2011. Jim grew up in Liverpool, N Y. He earned his undergraduate degree in forestry and his master's degree in mechanical engineering from Penn State University. He earned his doctoral degree in quantitative methods from Syracuse University.

Dr. Kraushaar came to Vermont with his family in 1981 and joined the UVM School of Business Administration faculty after 6 years at California State University in Sacramento and Fresno. His major interests were in design, analysis and implementation of management information systems. (His expertise was in the use of computers in business). Dr. Kraushaar consulted with private and public organizations, including IBM, US Small Business Administration, US Department of Interior and Agriculture and the California Department of Education. His research was published in MIS Quarterly, and other journals in his field. He made numerous conference presentations and was awarded significant grants.

Dr. Kraushaar's textbook, Computer Concepts, Structural Programming and Interactive BASIC was published in 1982. He was the UVM director of the Small Business Administration as well as having affiliations with the US Small Business Association, the Decision Sciences Institute and others. Dr. K was known for his dedication to his students. He received awards recognizing his outstanding commitment to teaching and the engagement of students in the pursuit of knowledge. His awards include the Allscripts Teaching Award (2006), the Kroepsch-Maurice Excellence in Teaching Award (2003), as well as being named Teacher of the Year several times. He researched the impact of personal technology on learning in the classroom, further evidence of his devotion to his students. After retirement Jim, who was passionate about the outdoors, spent much time hiking and participating in other outdoor activities he loved. He leaves behind his wife, Kay, his son, Bradley, his daughter Kristine and her husband, Aaron and their two children, Quinn and Skye. His colleagues and friends will remember him fondly for his generous spirit, his cheerful disposition, and rigorous academic standards.

---

Thomas I. Chittenden  
President, Faculty Senate

---

Suresh Garimella  
President, University of Vermont



The University of Vermont  
FACULTY SENATE

**Resolution in Memoriam**  
**Jie Yang**  
**Associate Professor of Physics**  
**1956 - 2020**

**Presented by Matthew White**  
**Assistant Professor, Department of Physics**  
**December 14, 2020**

The faculty, staff and students of the Department of Physics are shocked and saddened by the untimely death of a dear colleague, Dr. Jie Yang, Associate Professor of Physics, who passed away on October 10, 2020. Born in An Shan, China in 1956, the patience and persistence that served him well as a physicist was possibly a result of living through Mao's Cultural Revolution in the sixties and seventies. Dr. Yang was a gifted scholar. He won a full scholarship to pursue his Ph.D. in physics at Princeton University by finishing in 2nd place on the national CUSPEA examination administered by Nobel laureate T.D. Lee.

As a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Chicago, Jie worked closely with Tom Rosenbaum (current President of Caltech) and Gab Aeppli to elucidate the properties of dipolar ferromagnets. He then seamlessly moved from experimental condensed matter physics into biological physics when he accepted a research position at the University of Virginia School of Medicine in the early 1990s. It was there that he made fundamental contributions to the emerging field of atomic force microscopy by co-inventing the cryogenic atomic force microscope (US patent, No. 5,410,910) and using it to obtain the first AFM images of DNA.

Dr. Yang joined the physics faculty in 1994. With funding from the Army Research Office, he continued his research of applying atomic force microscopy to a variety of biological systems such as the condensation of DNA on lipid membranes. His published work appears in top journals in condensed matter physics and biological physics. In recent years, Dr. Yang collaborated with researchers in the College of Engineering in using AFM to explore the microstructure and mechanical properties of engineering materials.

For over 25 years, his students were greatly appreciative of his sincere encouragement, his pleasant disposition, and his enthusiasm about physics. Jie highly valued education, and he was especially proud of the academic accomplishments of his son Jeffrey, an alumnus of Princeton, and his daughter Kailey who is an undergraduate at MIT. His colleagues and students in the physics department will remember Professor Yang fondly for his kindness, his generosity, and his infectious smile.

---

Thomas I. Chittenden  
President, Faculty Senate

---

Suresh Garimella  
President, University of Vermont

# 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 according to the Catalog production timeline 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. Proposals for deactivation are considered no-contest if the program initiates or agrees with the deactivation. Deactivation proposals are considered contested if initiated by a party other than the program itself, and the program does not support the request by a majority vote of the department (if the program is part of a department) or program faculty (if the program is free-standing).

*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; graduate programs also require a letter from the Graduate College 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 Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. Upon successful review by the Provost, proposals will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (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. In the event that continuation of deactivated status is not approved, a program can opt to initiate a reactivation or termination process.

---

**No-Contest Deactivation Requests:** In the case where the program initiates and/or agrees with a request for deactivation, a deactivation proposal can be put forth by the chair/program director in the form of a memo. The 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 request. 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.



Following approval according to college/school-level procedures (e.g. department/program, unit curriculum committee, and dean's office; unit faculty in some units), proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. Graduate programs also require a support letter from the Graduate College Executive Committee and Dean. Upon successful review by the Provost's office, proposals will be sent to the CAC for review and approval. Once received, proposals will be circulated for a minimum of 30 days prior to a vote by the CAC. As noted above, deactivation of a program also requires a vote of approval by the Faculty Senate; deactivations are shared with the Board of Trustees, but do not require Board of Trustee approval. See the Timeline for Policy & Proposal Review Process available [here](#) for further details.

---

**Contested Deactivations:** A contested deactivation process should be initiated *only after other possible avenues for resolution have been explored* including, but not limited to program changes, partnerships with other programs/departments, and compromises that would allow a no-contest deactivation. Proposals for contested deactivations must be prepared using the guidelines below. Proposals should address all questions/items, and data should be provided as support wherever relevant.

Deactivation proposals must be reviewed at the college/school level prior to submission in accordance with college/school procedures (e.g. department, unit curriculum committee, and dean's office; unit faculty in some units). Graduate programs also require a review by the Graduate College Executive Committee and Dean. At each level of review, the head of the relevant voting body should submit a letter in support of the deactivation, or a letter that summarizes the reasons for not approving the deactivation including any additional information relevant to review of the termination by the CAC (e.g. impacts of termination not included in the proposal). Once college/school-level review of a proposal is complete, and review by the Graduate College for graduate programs, proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. The review process and timeline are described in detail following the proposal requirements. Incomplete proposals will be returned with a request for the missing information; the timeline will not begin until a proposal is considered complete by both the Provost's office and the Chair of the CAC. *Proposers should carefully review the timeline below and plan accordingly.* When initiating a contested deactivation, proposers and those contesting the deactivation should be prepared to respond promptly to Provost and CAC subcommittee requests for additional information or materials in order to avoid preventable delays in the process.

The role of the CAC in contested deactivation is to evaluate the request at a curricular level only; *the outcome of the contested deactivation process is therefore a recommendation solely regarding the curricular viability and quality of the program, not the financial feasibility of maintaining the program.* Data related to program efficiency and resource use provides valuable context in that resources are necessary to support program quality, but financial concerns are not a factor in the CAC's evaluation.

Unless a hiatus in operation is explicitly acceptable to the program faculty (as reflected in a majority vote), the Dean, and the Provost, a program will operate as normal during the deactivation review process; *a deactivation will not be considered finalized until voted on by the Faculty Senate.* If a program is deactivated, students in the program at the time of deactivation will be given the opportunity to complete the program within a reasonable timeframe.

Proposal to Deactivate an Academic Program (established Dec. 2019; revisions approved by the Senate Dec. 2020)

## Guidelines for Contested Deactivation Proposals

### **I. Abstract**

A one-page summary of the essential information from each of the sections below. Please submit this abstract both as an introduction to the proposal and as a separate document; proposals will not be considered complete without the abstract.

### **II. Rationale for Deactivation and Summary of Communications with the Program**

- A. Clearly describe the reasons for requesting deactivation of the program at this time, including reasons why other options such as partnership with another unit/program are not appropriate.
- B. Summarize all communications with the program regarding the requested deactivation, including the details indicated below. Include all written communications (e.g. emails, memos) in an appendix to the deactivation request.
  - individuals involved and roles/positions
  - primary points of discussion
  - any compromises offered by either party
  - outcome(s) of the communication
- C. Describe the specific steps taken to reach an agreement between the proposal initiator and the program faculty.

### **III. Program History**

- A. When was the program initiated?
- B. Have there been any significant changes, including name changes, since the time of initiation? If so, provide a summary of these changes.

### **IV. Program Quality and Internal Demand**

*Address all questions outlined below, providing relevant data as support.*

- A. What are the current learning objectives of the program? For programs that require formal assessment (i.e. degree programs), provide evidence obtained through the assessment process to indicate how well students are meeting the stated learning objectives.
- B. Were any concerns related to program quality raised during the most recent assessment of the program through the Academic Program Review process, or for externally accredited programs, in the most recent accreditation review? Concerns may include whether program staffing was sufficient to maintain quality and/or whether the curriculum reflects expectations within the field.
- C. Are courses required for the program offered on a regular and consistent basis? For graduate programs, are sufficient courses at the 300-level or above offered to maintain program quality?
- D. For programs that include a required, mentored component (e.g. research project; dissertation/thesis; internship; practicum), is there sufficient support and oversight of students?
- E. Provide enrollment data for the past 10 years or lifetime of program, whichever is shorter. How do the trends compare to enrollment in similar programs nation-wide?
- F. Are there any concerns related to advising of students in the program?
- G. Have students in the program raised any concerns related to the quality of their educational experiences?

## **V. External Demand and Societal Needs**

- A. Is there limited or decreasing demand regionally and/or nationally for individuals with the knowledge/skills of graduates of the program? Provide relevant evidence such as employment trends, placement of graduates, etc.
- B. Is the program not providing graduates with the skills/knowledge necessary to be successful following graduation from UVM? If so, have potential changes to remedy the situation been discussed?

## **VI. Contribution to Missions and Long-Range Plans**

- A. Is the program misaligned with current university-level missions, mission as a land-grant university, strategic priorities, vision, and/or academic goals (e.g. university-wide curricular requirements)? If so, explain how; if not, explain the effects of deactivating the program on the ability to achieve the current university-level missions, strategic priorities, and academic goals.
- B. Is the program misaligned with current college/school-level missions, strategic priorities, vision, and/or academic goals? If so, explain how; if not, explain the effects of deactivating the program on the ability to achieve the current university-level missions, strategic priorities, and academic goals.
- C. Do UVM's peer and competitor institutions offer similar programs? Would loss of the program affect UVM's ability to attract high-quality students?

## **VII. Program Sustainability**

- A. Are there currently insufficient faculty resources to teach required courses and/or oversee other required program components (e.g. research projects; internships)? If so, have potential partnerships with other departments/units been explored?
- B. Are there anticipated, voluntary losses of faculty (e.g. via retirement) that could affect the ability of program to maintain quality?
- C. Include data from the Office of Institutional Research that is relevant to the financial sustainability of the program.
- D. Are other programs being negatively impacted by investment resources in the program? If so, provide specific evidence.

## **VIII. Impact of Deactivation**

- A. What are the potential impacts of deactivation on any closely associated programs at UVM (e.g. a minor or certificate program in the case of a request to deactivate a major)?
- B. Will course offerings be affected if the program is deactivated? If so, provide:
  - a list of the courses including enrollment trends for the past six semesters
  - evidence of communication with any units/departments/programs that include the courses listed above in their required and/or elective courses
- C. Are the enrollments in other programs and/or courses outside the program being considered for deactivation likely to be affected? Include evidence of communication with any potentially affected units/departments/programs.
- D. Would deactivation of the program affect research projects of any faculty outside the program (e.g. via loss of collaborations)?

- E. Are there any community partners that would be affected by deactivation (e.g. service learning projects; practicums; internships)? If so, provide evidence of communication with the community partners, including offers to maintain those partnerships in new administrative locations.
- F. How would deactivation affect the responsibilities and roles of faculty involved the program?
- G. Provide a detailed teachout plan for accommodating program completion for all students currently enrolled in the program should it be deactivated.

#### Process and Timeline for Contested Deactivations

As noted previously, completed proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. If the Provost determines that the proposal is complete and a reasonable case has been made for deactivating the program, the Provost will forward the proposal to the Faculty Senate with a request for review by the CAC. The Provost has **two weeks (14 days)** to make a decision.

The proposal abstract will then be circulated via email to all faculty, academic deans, and department chairs with a link to a survey to submit feedback/comments; the survey will be available for **30 days**. The full proposal will be made available on the Faculty Senate webpage.

At the time of circulation, a subcommittee consisting of two CAC members who are *not* part of the home unit (college/school) of the program will be appointed to review the proposal. All feedback collected during the public comment period will be made available to the CAC subcommittee. During their review, the subcommittee may ask the proposers to respond to specific comments. Additionally, the subcommittee will meet with the authors of the proposal, the dean of the responsible unit, and program faculty, and may request additional information as part of their review. Upon completion of their review, the subcommittee will write a report summarizing any additional information gathered during the review process, make a recommendation to support or reject the deactivation proposal, and provide rationale to explain their position.

The full **CAC will discuss and vote on the subcommittee's report at the meeting following the close of the 30 day comment period, unless significant issues arise that require additional time for the CAC subcommittee to complete its review**. CAC members will be provided with the full proposal along with the subcommittee's report as part of the meeting materials. The CAC will vote to support or reject the proposal for deactivation.

Following the meeting, the Chair of the CAC will write a memo that includes the CAC decision and a brief summary of the rationale for the decision. The memo and the CAC subcommittee's report will be sent to the Faculty Senate President and the director/department chair of the program **within 5 days** of the CAC vote. A copy of the memo will be sent to the Provost for information purposes only.

After receiving the memo, the program has **30 days** to submit a written rebuttal to the Faculty Senate President; the program can also choose not to submit a rebuttal.

The CAC memo and rebuttal (if submitted) will be **considered by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) at their next meeting**. The FSEC 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. If additional consideration is requested, the FSEC will consider it at their next meeting.

Once accepted by the FSEC, the deactivation will be placed on the agenda for a vote the **next Faculty Senate meeting**. Materials including the CAC memo, rebuttal submitted by the program if any, and any other information deemed relevant by the FSEC will be **sent to all Faculty Senators immediately** to allow sufficient time for consideration prior to the Faculty Senate meeting.

Results of the Faculty Senate vote will be communicated as advisory to the President and Provost **the day after the Faculty Senate meeting**.

# Proposal to Terminate an Academic Program

---

A proposal to terminate an academic program may be initiated by a department, the Dean's office of the home unit, or the Provost. The sections below describe the proposal requirements and processes related to no-contest and contested terminations. Proposals for termination are considered no-contest if the program initiates or agrees with the termination. Termination proposals are considered contested if initiated by a party other than the program itself, and the program does not support the request by a majority vote of the department or program. Following review by the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC), all termination proposals must also be considered by the Faculty Senate and presented to the Board of Trustees for a vote.

**No-Contest Termination Requests:** In the case where the program initiates and/or agrees with a request for termination, a termination proposal can be put forth by the chair/program director in the form of a memo. The 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 termination request. Following approval according to college/school-level procedures (e.g. department/program, unit curriculum committee, and dean's office; unit faculty in some units), proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. Graduate programs also require a support letter from the Graduate College Executive Committee and Dean. Upon successful review by the Provost's office, proposals will be sent to the CAC for review and approval. Once received, proposals will be circulated for a minimum of 30 days prior to a vote by the CAC. As noted above, termination of a program also requires a vote of approval by the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees. See the Timeline for Policy & Proposal Review Process available [here](#) for further details.

---

**Contested Terminations:** A contested termination process should be initiated *only after other possible avenues for resolution have been explored* including, but not limited to program changes, partnerships with other programs/departments, compromises that would allow a no-contest termination, and program deactivation. Proposals for contested terminations must be prepared using the guidelines below. Proposals should address all questions/items, and data should be provided as support wherever relevant.

Termination proposals must be reviewed at the college/school level prior to submission in accordance with college/school procedures (e.g. department, unit curriculum committee, and dean's office; unit faculty in some units). Graduate programs also require a letter from the Graduate College Executive Committee and Dean. At each level of review, the head of the relevant voting body should submit a letter in support of the termination, or a letter that summarizes the reasons for not approving the termination including any additional information relevant to review of the termination by the CAC (e.g. impacts of termination not included in the proposal). Once college/school-level review of a proposal is complete, proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. The review process and timeline are described in detail following the proposal requirements. Incomplete proposals will be returned with a request for the missing information; the timeline will not begin until a proposal is considered complete by both the Provost's office and the Chair of the CAC. *Proposers should carefully review the timeline below and plan accordingly.* When initiating a contested termination, proposers and those contesting the termination should be prepared to respond promptly to Provost and CAC subcommittee requests for additional information or materials in order to avoid preventable delays in the process.

The role of the CAC in contested terminations is to evaluate the request at a curricular level only; *the outcome of the contested termination process is therefore a recommendation solely regarding the curricular viability and quality of the program, not the financial feasibility of maintaining the program.* Data related to program efficiency and resource use provides valuable context in that resources are necessary to support program quality, but financial concerns are not a factor in the CAC's evaluation. Faculty employment, *including as a result of program terminations approved by the Board of Trustees*, is addressed in the contractual agreement covering bargaining unit faculty, and in the Larner College of Medicine Faculty Handbook (for LCOM faculty) and is outside the purview of the CAC.

Unless a hiatus in operation is explicitly acceptable to the program faculty (as reflected in a majority vote), the Dean, and the Provost, a program will operate as normal during the termination review process; *a termination will not be considered finalized until voted on by the Board of Trustees.* If a program is terminated, students in the program at the time of termination will be given the opportunity to complete the program within a reasonable timeframe.

### Guidelines for Contested Termination Proposals

#### **I. Abstract**

A one-page summary of the essential information from each of the sections below. Please submit this abstract both as an introduction to the proposal and as a separate document; proposals will not be considered complete without the abstract.

#### **II. Rationale for Termination and Summary of Communications with the Program**

- A. Clearly describe the reasons for requesting termination of the program at this time, including reasons why other options such as deactivation or partnership with another unit/program are not appropriate.
- B. Summarize all communications with the program regarding the requested termination, including the details indicated below. Include all written communications (e.g. emails, memos) in an appendix to the termination request.
  - individuals involved and roles/positions
  - primary points of discussion
  - any compromises offered by either party
  - outcome(s) of the communication
- C. Describe the specific steps taken to reach an agreement between the proposal initiator and the program faculty.

#### **III. Program History**

- A. When was the program initiated?
- B. Have there been any significant changes, including name changes, since the time of initiation? If so, provide a summary of these changes.

#### **IV. Program Quality and Internal Demand**

*Address all questions outlined below, providing relevant data as support.*

- A. What are the current learning objectives of the program? For programs that require formal assessment (i.e. degree programs), provide evidence obtained through the assessment process to indicate how well students are meeting the stated learning objectives.
- B. Were any concerns related to program quality raised during the most recent assessment of the program through

the Academic Program Review process, or for externally accredited programs, in the most recent accreditation review? Concerns may include whether program staffing was sufficient to maintain quality and/or whether the curriculum reflects expectations within the field.

- C. Are courses required for the program offered on a regular and consistent basis? For graduate programs, are sufficient courses at the 300-level or above offered to maintain program quality?
- D. For programs that include a required, mentored component (e.g. research project; dissertation/thesis; internship; practicum), is there sufficient support and oversight of students?
- E. Provide enrollment data for the past 10 years or lifetime of program, whichever is shorter. How do the trends compare to enrollment in similar programs nation-wide?
- F. Are there any concerns related to advising of students in the program?
- G. Have students in the program raised any concerns related to the quality of their educational experiences?

#### **V. External Demand and Societal Needs**

- A. Is there limited or decreasing demand regionally and/or nationally for individuals with the knowledge/skills of graduates of the program? Provide relevant evidence such as employment trends, placement of graduates, etc.
- B. Is the program not providing graduates with the skills/knowledge necessary to be successful following graduation from UVM? If so, have potential changes to remedy the situation been discussed?

#### **VI. Contribution to Missions and Long-Range Plans**

- A. Is the program misaligned with current university-level missions, mission as a land-grant university, strategic priorities, vision, and/or academic goals (e.g. university-wide curricular requirements)? If so, explain how; if not, explain the effects of deactivating the program on the ability to achieve the current university-level missions, strategic priorities, and academic goals.
- B. Is the program misaligned with current college/school-level missions, strategic priorities, vision, and/or academic goals? If so, explain how; if not, explain the effects of deactivating the program on the ability to achieve the current university-level missions, strategic priorities, and academic goals.
- C. Do UVM's peer and competitor institutions offer similar programs? Would loss of the program affect UVM's ability to attract high-quality students?

#### **VII. Program Sustainability**

- A. Are there currently insufficient faculty resources to teach required courses and/or oversee other required program components (e.g. research projects; internships)? If so, have potential partnerships with other departments/units been explored?
- B. Are there anticipated, voluntary losses of faculty (e.g. via retirement) that could affect the ability of program to maintain quality?
- C. Include data from the Office of Institutional Research that is relevant to the financial sustainability of the program.
- D. Are other programs being negatively impacted by investment resources in the program? If so, provide specific evidence.

#### **VIII. Impact of Termination**

- A. What are the potential impacts of termination on any closely associated programs at UVM (e.g. a minor or



- certificate program in the case of a request to terminate a major)?
- B. Will course offerings be affected if the program is terminated? If so, provide:
    - a list of the courses including enrollment trends for the past six semesters
    - evidence of communication with any units/departments/programs that include the courses listed above in their required and/or elective courses
  - C. Are the enrollments in other programs and/or courses outside the program being considered for termination likely to be affected? Include evidence of communication with any potentially affected units/departments/programs.
  - D. Would termination of the program affect research projects of any faculty outside the program (e.g. via loss of collaborations)?
  - E. Are there any community partners that would be affected by termination (e.g. service learning projects; practicums; internships)? If so, provide evidence of communication with the community partners, including offers to maintain those partnerships in new administrative locations.
  - F. How would termination affect the responsibilities and roles of faculty involved the program?
  - G. Provide a detailed teachout plan for accommodating program completion for all students currently enrolled in the program should it be terminated.

#### Process and Timeline for Contested Terminations

As noted previously, completed proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. If the Provost determines that the proposal is complete and a reasonable case has been made for terminating the program, the Provost will forward the proposal to the Faculty Senate with a request for review by the CAC. The Provost has **two weeks (14 days)** to make a decision.

The proposal abstract will then be circulated via email to all faculty, academic deans, and department chairs with a link to a survey to submit feedback/comments; the survey will be available for **30 days**. The full proposal will be made available on the Faculty Senate webpage.

At the time of circulation, a subcommittee consisting of two CAC members who are *not* part of the home unit (college/school) of the program will be appointed to review the proposal. All feedback collected during the public comment period will be made available to the CAC subcommittee. During their review, the subcommittee may ask the proposers to respond to specific comments. Additionally, the subcommittee will meet with the authors of the proposal, the dean of the responsible unit, and program faculty, and may request additional information as part of their review. Upon completion of their review, the subcommittee will write a report summarizing any additional information gathered during the review process, make a recommendation to support or reject the termination proposal, and provide rationale to explain their position.

The full **CAC will discuss and vote on the subcommittee's report at the meeting following the close of the 30 day comment period, unless significant issues arise that require additional time for the CAC subcommittee to complete its review**. CAC members will be provided with the full proposal along with the subcommittee's report as part of the meeting materials. The CAC will vote to support or reject the proposal for termination.

Following the meeting, the Chair of the CAC will write a memo that includes the CAC decision and a brief summary of the rationale for the decision. The memo and the CAC subcommittee's report will be sent to the Faculty Senate President and the director/department chair of the program **within 5 days** of the CAC vote. A copy of the memo will be sent to the Provost for information purposes only.

After receiving the memo, the program has **30 days** to submit a written rebuttal to the Faculty Senate President; the program can also choose not to submit a rebuttal.

The CAC memo and rebuttal (if submitted) will be **considered by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) at their next meeting**. The FSEC 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. If additional consideration is requested, the FSEC will consider it at their next meeting.

Once accepted by the FSEC, the termination will be placed on the agenda for a vote the **next Faculty Senate meeting**. Materials including the CAC memo, rebuttal submitted by the program if any, and any other information deemed relevant by the FSEC will be **sent to all Faculty Senators immediately** to allow sufficient time for consideration prior to the Faculty Senate meeting.

Results of the Faculty Senate vote will be communicated to the President and Provost **the day after the Faculty Senate meeting**. As noted previously, all program terminations must be approved by the Board of Trustees.