

Prepared by Director of Planning and Policy.
This update replaces Policy E5.201 dated March 1987.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I

EXECUTIVE POLICY - ADMINISTRATION

April 1989

P 1 of 13

E5.201 Approval of New Academic Programs and Review of Provisional
Academic Programs

I. INTRODUCTION

This Executive Policy directs implementation of Sections 5-1a(1) & (2) and 5-2a(2) of the Board of Regents Bylaws and Policies. The following objectives, policies and guidelines provide for the systematic monitoring of academic program planning intentions, the authorization of new academic program proposals, and the evaluation of provisional academic programs of the University of Hawai'i. The Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa and Chancellors are called upon to specify implementing procedures as appropriate for their campus(es).

II. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the executive policy are:

- A. To facilitate the advancement and transmission of knowledge resulting from academic program planning and development.
- B. To specify the components of the academic program authorization process and their purposes.
- C. To establish guidelines and procedures for the preparation and processing of authorizations to plan, proposals for new academic programs, and reviews of provisional programs.
- D. To assure the administration and Board of Regents of the academic and fiscal soundness of proposed and provisional programs and their appropriateness to both university-wide and campus missions.
- E. To assure the administration and the Board of Regents that provisions for adequate physical facilities for the programs have been included in campus long-range development plans.
- F. To assure the administration and the Board of Regents that provisions for meaningful assessment of student learning have been included in authorizations to plan,

proposals for new academic programs, and reviews of provisional programs.

III. POLICIES

A. Definition of a Program

For purposes of Board approval, a new academic program is any sequence of courses or instructional activities:

- Culminating in a Board conferred degree or certificate of achievement (requiring a separate notation on any Board-approved credential);
- Requiring a major commitment of general-funded resources to a new instructional area. A new program shall be considered as requiring such resources if: (a) it requires inclusion of a specific request in the Regents' Budget for a workload or program change appropriation, or (b) it involves a reallocation of resources so extensive that it requires a Board action to terminate the program or programs from which the resources are to be drawn.

Board approval is required for non-general funded academic programs culminating in Board-conferred credentials. It is not required for certificates of completion at the community colleges or subject certificates at the four-year campuses which are conferred by the chief executive officers of those units in accordance with Board of Regents policy. An academic program whose sole credential is such a certificate, however, does require Board approval if it meets the definition of a new program as given above.

B. Program Title

The title of the program, including parenthetical information, approved by the Board of Regents at the time of program establishment becomes the official title for purposes of Board-conferred credentials and is used in University publications. A Master List of Board-authorized degree and certificate programs is maintained by the Office of Planning and Policy.

Requests to change academic program titles in order to maintain currency in terminology and involving no substantive change in the program or service group are made to the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or to Chancellors, utilizing the

action memo format. Upon approval, such changes are reported to the Board of Regents as an information item. The Office of Planning and Policy reports such changes to other University offices as appropriate.

Name changes that reflect a substantive program change are handled according to the requirements for new program authorizations as outlined in this policy.

C. Authorization To Plan (ATP)

An ATP is a request to plan a new academic program made at the beginning of the formal program planning process before resources are committed to program planning. Current academic/educational development plans include academic program planning intentions, especially approved ATPs.

1. Purposes. The purposes of the ATP are:

- To monitor, coordinate, decide upon, and provide support for academic program planning actions.
- To alert administrators of new academic programs under consideration within the University, providing them with an opportunity for coordination and for appropriate preliminary input.
- To inform the administration and the Board of Regents of long-term academic program planning intentions; the long-term physical facilities requirements of planned programs; and provide opportunities for appropriate feedback.

2. Internal Procedures and Approving Authority. Each Unit establishes internal procedures for preparation, processing, and approval of ATPs, including a time limitation on each approved ATP. At the Community Colleges, Hilo, and West Oahu, the Chancellors establish their own internal procedures for the processing of ATPs, and are authorized to give final approval. At Mānoa, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the deans, other Vice Presidents as appropriate and the Director of Campus Operations establishes internal procedures; deans of the various UHM colleges, schools and the Graduate Division are authorized to give final approval. Also at Mānoa, the Director of Campus Operations shall advise the

Vice President for Academic Affairs, and other UHM Vice Presidents as appropriate, of the ability of the Mānoa campus to accommodate the planned program's physical facilities requirements. At all campuses, it may be necessary to process amendments to campus long-range development plans for Board of Regents' approval if adequate provisions for physical facilities for planned programs are not provided for in existing plans.

3. Information Procedure. At the end of the Fall and Spring semesters, each Unit prepares a report to the President's Office on the ATP activity, utilizing guidelines provided in Appendix A. The President informs the Board of Regents of approved ATPs as information items.

D. Proposal for New Academic Programs

A program proposal sets forth the description of and justification for new academic programs sought by the campuses.

1. Contents. The proposal must contain sufficient information to permit assessment of the academic integrity and quality of the program, to determine its fiscal soundness and efficiency relative to other University activities, and to determine its appropriateness to the mission of the University and the campus. Specifically, the proposal addresses the questions listed in Appendix B. In the case of graduate programs the Board criteria as summarized in Appendix B are addressed. In addition, the proposal must clearly address the physical facilities requirements of the planned new academic program.
2. Procedures and Processing. Each Unit establishes internal procedures for the preparation and processing of new program proposals, ensuring appropriate faculty and student input and attention to the questions outlined in Appendix B. Also, the proposal shall include a "Plan Amendment" request if the campus long-range development plan does not include adequate provisions for physical facilities for the program.

Program proposals are sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or to Chancellors according to the procedures established for the Unit. Approved proposals are sent to the President with a recommendation for his approval

in action memorandum format; a copy of the recommendation is sent to the initiating department. The office of the President reviews the proposal and (if it is acceptable) forwards it to the Board of Regents with a recommendation for approval. No commitments (of resources or anything else) may be made to a proposed program until final approval has been granted by the Board. Resources for newly approved academic programs are sought in accordance with standard budgetary policies and procedures.

3. Timetable. In general, program proposals must be approved by the Board in time to permit the commitment of those new or reallocated resources required for the program to be implemented by the desired date.
 - Program proposals that do not require new or reallocated resources may, at the Unit's recommendation, become operational upon Board approval.
 - Program proposals to be implemented through internal reallocation of resources are submitted to the Office of the President five to seven months prior to the proposed date of program implementation. The President submits proposals to the Board for action at least four months prior to program implementation.
 - Program proposals whose implementation is contingent on the acquisition of additional ("new") general-funded resources must be approved by the Board in time to permit the inclusion of the necessary resource requests in the biennium budget preceding the proposed implementation date. Therefore, such proposals should reach the Office of the President by December 1 in the first year of the biennium preceding proposed program implementation (i.e., a minimum of 21 months prior to proposed implementation). The President transmits approved proposals to the Board of Regents by February 1 in time for consideration at the March Board meeting.) In order to respond in a timely manner to extraordinary programming needs, the President may waive the above proposal submission deadlines to his office. In such cases, justification for a waiver is provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or the Chancellor concerned.

E. Provisional Programs

1. Definition. All programs approved by the Board of Regents are placed on provisional status during their first cycle of operation. That cycle is defined as two years for programs normally completed in one or two years (e.g., certificate, associate, master's and supplementary programs). For all other programs the cycle equals the number of years students are normally expected to take to complete the program (e.g., four years for the baccalaureate and four to five years for doctoral degrees). Upon Board approval, the Office of the President determines the specific length of the first cycle and the timing of the provisional review in consultation with the respective Vice President or Chancellor. No tenure appointments or tenure commitments shall be made in new programs until the Board of Regents has reviewed the provisional cycle and elected to continue the program.

2. Content and Procedures. Each provisional program is reviewed during the year following completion of the provisional cycle, with the review document reaching the Board of Regents not more than one year after completion of the provisional cycle. Vice Presidents and Chancellors establish procedures for the preparation, review and approval of reviews of provisional programs within their Units ensuring appropriate faculty and student input. The review document forwarded for Board approval shall include a program self-study that considers quantitative information on program activities and resources, utilizing the quantitative profile format of Appendix C, and that provides in general the following information (see Appendix D for specific guidelines):
 - (a) A statement of program objectives. Differences with those found in the program proposal should be explained.
 - (b) An assessment of whether or not the program is meeting its objectives and a summary of the evidence used to reach this conclusion.
 - (c) A discussion of any substantial changes made in the program since its approval and any substantial discrepancies in program indicators or activities from those identified in the program proposal.



(d) A projection of resource needs for the next five years.



Appendix D includes the Board criteria (Section 52a (2)) that must be addressed in the case of graduate programs.

3. Processing. Reviews of provisional programs are sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Mānoa or to the Chancellor according to the procedures established for the Unit. Approved reviews are sent to the Office of the President along with an action memo. The action memo summarizes the facts developed in the program review document to support the recommendation to continue or terminate the program. A copy of this memo should be shared with the initiating department. The Office of the President analyzes each review and sends it to the Board of Regents with a recommendation for program continuation or termination. The final decision to continue or terminate the program resides with the Board of Regents.

APPENDIX A

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF AUTHORIZATION TO PLAN (ATP) ACTIVITY

_____ Hilo
 _____ West Oahu
 _____ Community College
 _____ Manoa

Reporting Period: _____ Spring 19_____
 _____ Fall 19_____

Name of ATP	Type of Program (e.g. AA, BS, etc.)	Contact Person	Date of Approval	Status	Comments

APPENDIX B

GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS FOR NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The proposal addresses each of the questions below. Parenthetical materials suggest the kinds of information that may be relevant in answering each question.

1. What are the objectives of the Program?
(Objectives should be stated in terms of meeting student, community or State needs, and should devote considerable attention to student learning objectives.)
2. Are the program objectives appropriate functions of the college and University?
(Relationship to University and campus mission and development plans, evidence of continuing need for the program, projections of career opportunities for graduates, etc. In the case of graduate programs attention must be directed to Board criteria, Section 5-2a(2) requiring relevance of the program:
 - (a) To the professional, economic, social, occupational and general educational needs of Hawai'i.
 - (b) To national and international needs where Hawai'i and the University have unique or outstanding resources to respond with quality.
 - (c) To basic education needs for which there is a demand by Hawai'i's population.
 - (d) As a necessary supporting discipline for quality programs.)
3. How is the program organized to meet its objectives?
(Description of curriculum organization, requirements, admission policies, advising and counseling, and other aspects of the program, with reference to its objectives.)
4. Who will enroll in the program?
(Special target groups, if any; number of majors expected by year; expected service to non-majors; evidence of student interest.)
5. What resources are required for program implementation and first cycle operation?
(Number, source, and cost of faculty; library requirements; support personnel; estimated cost of supplies, equipment and CIP; facilities to be utilized; total funds required for

program implementation and operation; expected sources of funds, including sources of reallocated funds.)

6. How efficient will the program be?
(Compare anticipated cost per SSH, cost per major, SSH/faculty, average class size or other quantitative measures with other programs in the college and similar programs on other UH campuses.)
7. How will effectiveness of the program be demonstrated?
(Describe the plan for assessing the quality of student learning. In addition, information should be gathered on projected number of graduates yearly; placement of graduates; special accreditation; student satisfaction; career and employer satisfaction, etc.)

APPENDIX C

Quantitative Indicators for Program Reviews

The following are provided for each of the provisional years. Whenever possible, data are broken down by level of instruction (e.g., lower division, upper division, graduate or C.C., C.A., A.S.).

- (1) Number of majors
- (2) Number of SSHs offered, fall semester
- (3) Number of FTE Course Enrollments (SSHs divided by 15 for undergraduates and by 12 for graduates)
- (4) Number of classes (sections) offered, fall semester
- (5) Average class size (number of SSHs divided by number of classes offered)
- (6) Number of FTE faculty
- (7) FTE student-faculty ratio
- (8) Performance of majors on program-administered assessments of student learning.
- (9) Information on overall satisfaction of majors with the program.
- (10) Number of graduates (annual)
- (11) Budget allocation
- (12) Cost per SSH

APPENDIX D

GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSMENT OF PROVISIONAL AND ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS

The self-study addresses the questions below. Parenthetical materials suggest the kinds of information that may be relevant in answering each question.

The specific information included in self-studies varies with program circumstances.

- (1) Is the program organized to meet its objectives?
(Discussion of curriculum, requirements, admissions, advising and counseling, and other aspects of the program, with reference to its objectives.)
- (2) Is the Program meeting its learning objectives for students?
(An assessment of the quality of student learning as indicated by systematic analysis of student performance with reference to standard expectations, surveys of student satisfaction with instructional aspects of the program, etc.)
- (3) Are program resources adequate?
(Analysis of number and distribution of faculty, faculty areas of expertise, budget and sources of funds, and facilities and equipment.)
- (4) Is the program efficient?
(An assessment of productivity and cost/benefit considerations within the overall context of campus and University "mission" and planning priorities. Include quantitative measures comparing, for example, SSH/faculty, average class size, cost per SSH, cost per major with other programs in the college, on the campus and, as appropriate, similar programs on other UH campuses.)
- (5) Evidence of program quality.
(A qualitative assessment of the program in relation to competing demands for resources by new programs and continuing programs. Accreditation or other external evaluation, student performance [e.g., on external exams], satisfaction, placement and employer satisfaction, awards to faculty and students faculty publication record, evaluation of faculty, etc.)
- (6) Are program outcomes compatible with the objectives?
(Analysis of numbers of majors, graduates, SSHs offered, service to non-majors, employment of graduates, etc., in relationship to objectives.)
- (7) Are program objectives still appropriate functions of the college and University?
(Relationship to University mission and development plans,

evidence of continuing need for the program, projections of employment opportunities for graduates, etc.)

In the case of graduate programs, attention should also be given to the following need factors.

- (a) The direct relevance of the contribution of the field of study to the professional, economic, social, occupational and general educational needs of Hawai'i.
- (b) A "national needs factor" that emphasizes the direct relevance of the contributions of the field of study to national needs and where Hawai'i and the University have unique or outstanding resources to respond with quality.
- (c) An "international needs factor" that emphasizes the direct relevance of the contributions of the field of study to international needs and where Hawai'i and the University have unique or outstanding resources to respond with quality.
- (d) An educational needs factor that indicates the direct relevance of a field of study to basic education needs for which there is a demand by Hawai'i's population.
- (e) The relevance of a field of study as a necessary supporting discipline for quality programs identified by the above criteria.