

College Responses to the proposal to change the Approval Chart to allow for Provost-initiated program closure proposals

Arts and Sciences

In the CAS Chair's meeting on October 3, we discussed the current Program Approval Chart and noted that, while it handles the addition of new majors and degrees in an appropriate manner, it was not as effective in handling discontinuing majors or degrees. After considerable discussion, we arrived at a suggestion that would provide an alternate means for proposing the closing of a major, minor, or degree in a way that better reflects the origin of the proposal.

The CAS Chairs and Deans request that the UUAC consider revising the Program Approval Chart in two ways:

- First, for lines 7 (Major - Add or Discontinue), 9b (Minor - Add or Discontinue), and 10 (Degree - Add or Discontinue), separate the "Add" and "Discontinue" functions, keeping the "Add" process the same as it is currently.
- Second, for the Discontinue process, change the currently listed "Approval" at the levels of *Department/School*, *College Academic Council*, and *Dean* to "Approve or Advise/Respond" (A/Ad+R) adding an asterisk to "A/Ad+R" label to provide additional context. The asterisk would read: "When the proposal to discontinue an academic program originates with the department, approval must be sought at the department, college academic council, and dean levels. When the proposal originates with the Provost, the Provost must meet with faculty in the department, the college academic council, and the dean to seek advice and receive a written response regarding the proposal. Only after those meetings would the proposal be considered by the UUAC or Grad Council. The written responses must be included in the documentation provided to all subsequent voting bodies, namely the appropriate council and full faculty."

This suggestion was made and endorsed unanimously by the College of Arts and Sciences Chairs.

Thank you for considering this request.

--

Gregory Straughn, PhD
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

College of Education & Human Services
ACU Box 28276
Abilene, Texas 79699
325-674-2700



October 14, 2013

Memo

To: Dr. Susan Lewis, Vice-Provost, Abilene Christian University

From: Dr. Donnie Snider, Dean-College of Education & Human Services

Subject: UUAC Agenda Item-Changes in Academic Approval Chart

In the CEHS Chair's/Leadership Team meeting on October 11, we discussed the current Program Approval Chart and noted that, while it handles the addition of new majors and degrees in an appropriate manner, it was not as effective in handling discontinuing majors or degrees. After considerable discussion, we arrived at a suggestion that would provide an alternate means for proposing the closing of a major, minor, or degree in a way that better reflects the origin of the proposal.

The CEHS Chairs and Deans request that the UUAC consider revising the Program Approval Chart in two ways:

- First, for lines 7 (Major - Add or Discontinue), 9b (Minor - Add or Discontinue), and 10 (Degree - Add or Discontinue), separate the "Add" and "Discontinue" functions, keeping the "Add" process the same as it is currently.
- Second, for the Discontinue process, change the currently listed "Approval" at the levels of *Department/School*, *College Academic Council*, and *Dean* to "Approve or Advise/Respond" (A/Ad+R) adding an asterisk to "A/Ad+R" label to provide additional context. The asterisk would read: "When the proposal to discontinue an academic program originates with the department, approval must be sought at the department, college academic council, and dean levels. When the proposal originates with the Provost, the Provost must meet with faculty in the department, the college academic council, and the dean to seek advice and receive a written response regarding the proposal. Only after those meetings would the proposal be considered by the UUAC or Grad Council. The written responses must be included in the documentation provided to all subsequent voting bodies, namely the appropriate council and full faculty."

This suggestion was made and endorsed unanimously by the College Education & Human Services Chairs/Leadership Team.

Business Administration email responses

I agree that the current program-closure process seems unlikely to be exercised where it may need to be, given that it requires a department chair to sacrifice what he/she is the lead advocate for. Assuming the decision for program closure rests with the UUAC based on provost, dean, and chair arguments, my comments on the proposed policy would be:

- The "collection of measures" in #3 is undefined at present and likely to be general rather than specific when finalized. In the past, it seems to me that there are always reasonable opposing arguments and that the decision comes down to university identity and a constellation of factors that are impressionistically combined. That is not necessarily a substantial issue assuming the program closure decision does not rest with the provost.
- Centralizing the decision with the Provost seems problematic (not for Dr. Rhodes but with an imaginary autocratic provost) so that doesn't seem to be an effective process. But I'm trying to imagine what campus relations would be like with the proposed policy if the provost recommended a closure and the UUAC voted against the recommendation.

All things considered, I am okay with the policy.

Monty Lynn
Associate Dean

I am generally OK with this. The attachment implied that the faculty should vote to approve Provost-initiated program closures. You cannot run a rail road that way. The senior executives must have the power to do whatever needs to be done to make budget.

Don Pope, chair of management sciences

It is a good step forward. I wish things did not have to be so complicated. From my perspective it seems as if the number of majors fell below a certain number (a ratio to the faculty in the department) and automatic review would be initiated.

This makes things a little more objective and requires the Provost office to initiate more program reviews. If the program is not meeting quantitative viability then there should be an action plan put in place to correct the situation. After the action plan is complete. If the program participation does not meet the designated standards the dissolving process begins.

I know this is too simple.

My two cents.

Tim Johnston, Assistant Dean

