

## Talking points for Program Prioritization Conversations

1. Currently ACU has **no procedure** for closing a program other than a scenario in which the chair proposes the closure.
2. **The current Curriculum Approval Chart** indicates that adding or closing a program (major or degree) requires approvals from the department, college council, college dean, UUAC, faculty, Provost and President. While this list of approvers seems appropriate for additions and department-originated closures, it does not provide for any other source of proposal for program closure.
3. Based on a **collection of measures** agreed upon by the deans, programs may need to be closed. To maintain **good working relationships** within a department or college, a chair or dean should not be required to propose and/or approve that sort of closure. In these cases, the **Provost should propose** the closure to the UUAC.
4. Program closures that the **Provost proposes** should be treated differently than department-originated proposals.
5. The **Provost** should propose a closure only after he or she has **consulted with the dean and department** about the reasons for the proposed closure, using the measures the deans agreed upon.
6. The **Provost** should provide the dean and department a clearly articulated document that **explains the decision** to propose the closure of the program.
7. The **department and/or dean** should have the opportunity to **respond in writing** to the Provost's document.
8. Both the Provost's **proposal** and the department/dean **response should be reviewed by the UUAC** prior to its vote on the closure of the department.
9. Additionally, in a situation in which the Provost has proposed to close a program based on the agreed upon set of measures, a **full faculty vote** may seem to be a formality. We need to discuss whether the full faculty should vote on programs that have been proposed for closure by the Provost.

