

**College of Health Sciences
Ad Hoc Policy for Determining the Future of Academic Programs**

Proposed by 2010-2011 Faculty Council

According to Senate Rule 3.3.2.1, “a recommendation to consolidate, transfer, discontinue, or significantly reduce a college, academic program or educational unit may be made by the program faculty, Department Chair/School Director, Dean, Provost or President. (Senate Rules, Page 63). Any decision must involve consultation with the Senate Council”.

According to GR VII.A.4, the faculty of each college shall establish its own rules, including a committee or council structure, necessary for the performance of the faculty's functions in educational policy-making. CHS College Faculty Rules do not encode specific or a clear standing policy on the procedures for consolidation, transfer, discontinuation or significant reduction of an academic program. The CHS Faculty Council (as the representative faculty body) has developed an ad hoc process that is consistent with College Faculty rules in regards to policy recommendations (CHS faculty handbook, p.18) and program change (CHS faculty Handbook, appendix 1), the Senate Rules in regards to these issues (SR 3.3.2), and the Governing Regulations in regards to educational policy (GR VII.A.4). The following outlines a process for dealing with these proposals.

Because a proposal that impacts the future of an academic program has been brought forward, this ad hoc procedure was developed to engage faculty in appropriate discussions and decision-making. In all situations, this process must be facilitated in a timely manner to allow students, faculty, and staff ample time to plan for future change. The policy will become a part of the standard procedures for the faculty and will be included in the Faculty Handbook.

Because the Academic Affairs Committee, a committee appointed by the Faculty Council, has the final vote to determine the recommendation about a given proposal, the Faculty Council will be designated as the faculty governance body to handle this process.

Section A: For Proposal Originating from the Academic Unit Regarding Recommendation to Consolidate, Transfer, Discontinue, or Significantly Reduce a College Academic Program or Educational Unit.

1. Proposals originating from the unit faculty must have in writing the Department Chair’s position on the proposal. If the unit faculty members have made the proposal, the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) will meet with the affected unit faculty, discuss ramifications and then vote support or non-support of the proposal. When AAC and the affected unit faculty and Department Chair are in agreement, the process will proceed as described in the CHS Faculty Handbook for program proposals. In the event of the AAC’s non-support of the proposal, the affected unit faculty has the option of forwarding the proposal to Faculty Council (FC) for additional consideration. Both

groups (affected unit faculty and AAC) and department chair if needed will be asked to provide written documentation about issues surrounding potential changes.

2. FC will meet to review the documents and will then make a motion about how to proceed. In cases with differing opinions between the affected unit faculty, the department chair, and the AAC, FC may elect to engage unit faculty or the broader faculty in further discussions as defined in Section B 5, 6, 7, particularly when the proposal represents substantial changes for students and faculty.

Section B: For Proposals Originating from Another Source Regarding Recommendation to Consolidate, Transfer, Discontinue, or Significantly Reduce a College Academic Program or Educational Unit. Outlined in Senate Rule 3.3.2.1.

If the proposal comes from other sources as outlined in Senate Rule 3.3.2.1., FC or AAC representatives will initially meet with the “appropriate faculty”, defined henceforth as both those originating the proposal and those affected by it.

1. Both the affected unit and the originator of the proposal should meet to discuss ramifications and potential alternative solutions. If the affected unit concurs with the proposal, then the process will proceed as outlined above under Section A 1. If the affected unit does not support the proposal, then the following procedure would be followed.
2. Both groups (the affected unit and the originator of the proposal) will be asked to provide written documentation about issues surrounding potential changes that will facilitate discussion about the future of the academic program. This will be forwarded to both AAC and FC.
3. FC will meet with AAC to review the documents submitted by both parties and will then make a motion about how to proceed and present this motion to the appropriate group(s) of faculty (defined in 4). In cases with differing opinions between the originator and the affected unit, FC may elect to engage the broader faculty in further discussions as defined in steps 5, 6, 7, particularly when the proposal has substantial academic change. Alternately, FC, as representatives of the faculty, may elect to send the proposal directly to the AAC if that committee has not yet been involved, and the AAC may proceed as in A1.
4. Guided by the policies codified in Governing Regulations, Administrative Regulations, and the Rules of the University Senate, the Faculty Council will determine which faculty groups within the College should be involved in the decision-making process. Examples follow but may be altered if needed.
 - a. If the affected program is a graduate program, the graduate faculty will be involved.
 - b. If the affected program is an undergraduate program, all faculty engaged in undergraduate education in the College will be involved.
 - c. If the affected program is a professional program, faculty in professional and graduate programs will be involved.

- d. In all cases, all tenurable and tenured faculty members in the department that houses the academic program will be involved. Additionally, the Faculty Handbook voted on by the faculty grants voting privileges to research title series faculty, clinical title series faculty and lecturers. These faculty members will also be included.
5. If FC elects to send the proposal to the broader faculty, FC will circulate the written documents from both the originator of the proposal and those affected by it for review by the broader faculty.
6. FC members will schedule and lead a forum for discussion. Faculty representing both the affected unit and the originator of the proposal will be asked to present a summary of their positions.
7. Faculty in attendance will be allowed to submit questions in writing to discussion leaders, or pose questions during the discussion. There should also be time during the forum to allow for open discussion as needed. Faculty who are unable to attend, may also submit questions in writing before and after the discussion.
8. FC members will review questions and eliminate redundancies. They will then present the questions to the “appropriate faculty”.
9. Each group will have the opportunity to respond to each question.
10. Following the forum, the faculty (as outlined in Step 4), will receive written ballots after the meeting allowing each faculty member to vote on the motion put forward by the FC as described in step 3.
11. The results of the vote will be reviewed by FC and will be forwarded with a recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee for final disposition.
12. The Academic Affairs Committee will follow the CHS standard process of review of academic proposals. The final recommendation will be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs who will send it forward with a cover letter to the Health Care Colleges Council.