Protocol *of* Understanding:
Academic Program Initiation, Change, *or* Termination

Effective Date: **September 30, 2015**

I. PURPOSE

This document addresses stages in the process for the initiation, termination, or change of academic programs at Drexel University. This function resides with the Faculty Senate and its Subcommittee on Academic Affairs (SCAA) working in collaboration with the Office of the Provost. Thus collective faculty experience, expertise and dedication, faculty concern for academic excellence and vitality, and faculty determination that Drexel's resources be used efficiently, should assure that sound academic decisions are made and that the program curricula are composed of appropriately interrelated components.

II. GENERAL GUIDELINES AND DEFINITIONS

General Guidelines

Academic programs for which this review process is applicable and required include:

- University academic programs
- Core or general curriculum requirements that are components of degree requirements for an academic programs

The SCAA makes recommendations for the initiation, termination, or change of academic programs to the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Senate in turn makes recommendations to the VPAA.

Submission of academic program proposals is channeled to the SCAA and Office of the Provost.

Proposals and pertinent documents will be filed via an online portal that is accessible to the Drexel community for review.

Definitions

- An Academic Program is an academic major, minor, or certificate for which degrees are awarded under the administration of the Office of the Provost and the Office of the University Registrar. Multiple units may be involved if the proposal concerns an Institute, an interdisciplinary program, or the faculty of more than one academic unit.
- The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs ("VPAA") is the Provost who is the highest ranking academic administrator of Drexel University.
- The Senate Committee on Academic Affairs ("SCAA") is a subcommittee of the Drexel University Faculty Senate as defined in the Charter of Faculty Governance.

III. PROCESS FOR PROGRAM INITIATION

1. One or more faculty members of one or more academic units, or one or more academic administrators, will write/sponsor a proposal for the initiation of an academic program.

2. The Senate Committee on Academic Affairs (SCAA) and the Office of the Provost shall receive a written proposal in an electronic file format, responsive to the criteria defined in Section VI and containing all of the pertinent information to permit a substantive review of the new program.

The proposal shall have been evaluated by the faculty and the head(s) of the academic unit(s) responsible for the operation of the program as well as the respective college/school curriculum committee(s) and academic dean(s),

3. An academic program proposal will be implemented only if both the VPAA and the Faculty Senate concur that the program:

   • is academically excellent and desirable

   • is appropriate to the University's goals

   • is fiscally sound

The VPAA will render a final decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of the proposed program only after a positive recommendation by the Faculty Senate.

Verification of acceptance or rejection of a proposal will be provided by the SCAA, Faculty Senate and VPAA via the online portal.

IV. PROCESS FOR PROGRAM TERMINATION

1. One or more faculty members of one or more academic units, or one or more academic administrators, or the Office of the Provost will write/sponsor a proposal for the termination of an academic program.

2. The SCAA and the Office of the Provost shall receive a written proposal for program closure in an electronic file format, responsive to the criteria given in Section VI, containing all of the pertinent information to permit a substantive review of the program.

The proposal shall have been evaluated by the faculty and the head(s) of the academic unit(s) responsible for the operation of the program as well as the respective college/school curriculum committee(s) and academic dean(s),

3. The VPAA will render a final statement regarding the termination of a program only if both VPAA and the Faculty Senate concur that the program:

   • is considered not to be academically excellent or desirable, and/or

   • is inconsistent with the University's mission, and/or

   • is fiscally unsound

A written statement of the reasons for approval or disapproval of the program termination will be supplied jointly by the Faculty Senate, the SCAA, and the VPAA.

4. In the instance of program closure, the University will adhere to the provisions of Drexel University's personnel policies in assuring due process to any faculty members directly affected by closure.

5. If the proposal is rejected with the provision that changes to the program be made, further review will then be subject to the rules and regulations regarding program changes. However, if the changes are found unacceptable, the program will be terminated.

V. PROCESS FOR PROGRAM CHANGE

If the SCAA and/or the VPAA determine that any proposed program change(s) is (are) fundamental to the structure of a specific academic program, the following review procedures will be invoked. Minor changes as determined by the SCAA and VPAA may be approved without Faculty Senate approval; in such cases, the Faculty Senate will be notified of such action.

1. The Program Director and/or one or more faculty members of a program, or one or more academic administrators, may write/sponsor a proposal for change of an academic program. The change must be of a fundamental nature in curriculum, educational goal(s) and/or administrative reporting structure. This proposal shall be responsive to Section VI, and shall contain all of the pertinent information to permit a substantive review of a program.

2. The SCAA and the Office of the Provost shall receive the written proposal in an electronic file format.

The proposal shall have been evaluated by the faculty and the head(s) of the academic unit(s) responsible for the operation of the program as well as the respective college/school curriculum committee(s) and academic dean(s),

3. An academic program change will be implemented only if both the VPAA and the Faculty Senate concur that the program:

- is academically excellent and desirable
- is appropriate to the University's goals
- is fiscally sound

The VPAA will render a final decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of the proposed program only after a positive recommendation by the Faculty Senate.

Verification of acceptance or rejection of a proposal will be provided by the SCAA, Faculty Senate and VPAA via the online portal.

4. If the proposal for program change is disapproved the existing (unaltered) program will continue unless the proposal for change is the result of a recommendation from a continuation review.

VI. CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM INITIATION, TERMINATION, OR CHANGE

See Appendix I for a list of criteria to be considered for proposals for program initiation, termination and change.

VII. REVIEW STAGES

VII-A. THE PRELIMINARY REVIEW FOR PROGRAM INITIATION

A. The VPAA who will establish a specific period for preliminary review and notify the SCAA, faculty and academic administrators under whose purview the program exists as to the date of the end of the period.

1. Proposals may be submitted at any time. Implementation will occur according to the calendar in Section VII.
2. The period for preliminary review will be scheduled to be consistent with the calendar in Section VII.

B. The SCAA may also conduct a preliminary review of a proposal and then report on it to the Senate.

1. In support of the Senate's responsibility to advise and comment, the SCAA and its Academic Committees may, prior to submission of the proposal to the Senate, conduct inquiry among those faculty members and academic administrators associated with the program to:
   a. assure that all faculty members and academic administrators in the program are aware of the proposal;
   b. ascertain the degree of acceptance of the proposed program changes among faculty members and academic administrators.
2. The SCAA may refer a proposal to the appropriate Academic Committee which will conduct the preliminary review and report its findings in writing to the SCAA recommending either revision of the proposal or forwarding for formal review.
3. The SCAA will review a proposal in light of the recommendations of the Academic Committee, make further inquiries if it deems necessary, and produce a written review report to the Senate, recommending revision of the proposal or the SCAA will forward it for formal review.
4. If the report recommends formal review, it will state whether or not an external panel of reviewers should be appointed.

C. The Senate shall submit its advice and recommendations to the VPAA.

1. The Senate has the option to adopt the SCAA review report as its own. However, if deemed necessary, the Senate could undertake other means of review for the purpose of augmenting or supplanting the SCAA review.
2. The Senate may recommend formal review (including the necessary level of review), revision or rejection of the proposal at this point.

D. The VPAA will make a preliminary assessment of the merit of the proposal after receiving the Senate's preliminary review and after conducting any other preliminary inquiry that may be deemed appropriate.

E. If necessary the VPAA will return the proposal for revision based on the preliminary review and simultaneously notify the SCAA of the action by means of a copy of the preliminary review file.

1. The proposal may be rejected at this stage with the concurrence of both the VPAA and the SCAA acting on behalf of the Senate and in agreement with the Senate's Preliminary Review Report.

2. Approval of the proposal for formal review requires that either the VPAA or the SCAA approve it based on the following considerations:

    a. academic excellence and desirability;

    b. appropriateness to University's goals;

    c. fiscal soundness

3. The VPAA will include the reasons for the revision request in the review file.

4. Written statements of the reasons for approval for formal review or disapproval of the proposal will be made by the VPAA and the SCAA.

VII-B. THE FORMAL REVIEW

Upon completion of the Preliminary Review and notification of acceptability of a proposal by the VPAA, the unit administrator and the proposer or his/her representative, the appropriate academic deans and the VPAA will meet to determine the exact steps of the review process.

1. Included in the process will be an internal formal review by the SCAA according to procedures established by SCAA.

2. The VPAA and the SCAA are jointly responsible to ensure that such steps will be consistent with the principles of sound academic peer review and will be carried out in a timely and thorough manner.

3. An external review may be requested if both the VPAA and the SCAA deem it necessary.

VIII. PROGRAM REVIEW

Periodic review of existing academic programs is conducted by the respective departments and schools under the direction of the Office of the Provost in collaboration with the Senate Committee on Academic Affairs. The Office of the Provost shall initiate this process by informing the academic unit(s) of which the program is a part of the intent to review. The academic unit(s) will then engage in a self-study in accordance with the components outlines in Section VI. The Office of Provost may also ask external evaluators to review the program. Reports of the external evaluators are submitted to the respective departments and schools and to the Office of the Provost. The academic program will write a response to the external evaluators' report and file the response with Office of the Provost. The Office of the Provost will give the Senate Committee on Academic Affairs regular updates about the process and provide it with findings and recommendations of the review of the program.

IX. ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF ACADEMIC UNITS

1. The organization of academic units –departments, colleges and schools – may significantly impact the academic curriculum. In accord with Articles 3.1 and 3.2 of the Charter, any significant change in the structure of departments, colleges or schools will be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Academic Affairs irrespective of the source of the proposed changes.

2. After review, the Senate Committee on Academic Affairs will forward its recommendations to the Faculty Senate for discussion.

3. Any significant change in the structure of programs, departments, colleges or schools can be implemented if and only if both the VPAA and the Faculty Senate concur that the change:

- is academically excellent and desirable
- is appropriate to the University's goals
- is fiscally sound

4. If the VPAA and Faculty Senate are unable to agree on a proposed change in organizational structure, a final decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of the proposed change will rest in the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, after both points of view have been presented to the Committee.

X. CALENDAR OF CRITICAL DEADLINES

A calendar will be established and posted in June of each year for the subsequent academic year for program submission to include:

- Initiation of Pre-proposals
- Submission of Proposals
- Approval of Proposals / Catalog Effective Dates

APPENDIX I. LIST OF CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM INITIATION, TERMINATION, OR CHANGE

A. Relevance to the University Mission

B. Appropriateness for a University

B.1 Maintains values of a University

B.2 Source of research sponsorship

B.3 Demands placed on faculty

B.4 Impact and relevance of co-operative education and major, if applicable

C. Relationship to Drexel University

C.1 Support of the Faculty

C.2 Leadership and Service Role

C.2.1 Internal

C.2.2 External

C.3 Complement other units or programs

D. Quality of Work

D.1 Faculty

D.1.1 Teaching

D.1.1.1 Undergraduate

D.1.1.2 Graduate

D.1.2 Individual Scholarly Activity

D.1.2.1 Research

D.1.2.2 Publication

D.1.2.3 etc. (e.g., juried shows)

D.1.3 Leadership and Service

D.1.3.1 To the Institution

D.1.3.2 To the Profession

D. 1.3.3 To the Community

D.2 Curriculum

D.2.1 Design

D.2.2 Delivery

D.2.3 Advising Mechanism

D.3 Courses taught by adjuncts: number and quality

D.4 Students

D.4.1 Entry Levels Indicators

D.4.2 Learning Outcomes Indicators

D.5 Management of Scholarly Activity (the unit(s) as a Whole)

D.5.1 Integration of faculty effort

D.5.2 Cooperation among faculty

D.5.3 Synergy of research programs, etc.

D.6 Actual or Potential Recognition Outside

D.6.l Regional Indicators

D.6.2 National Indicators

D.6.3 International Indicators

D.7 Response to needs of the Field and the Future

D.7.1 Preservation of value

D.7.2 Innovative Program

D.7.3 Innovative Delivery

E. Market Demand

E.1 Present Student Demand

E.1.1 e.g., Enrollment History, as applicable

E.2 Projected Student Demand

E.3 Present Placement of Graduates

E.4 Projected Placement of Graduates

F. Comparative & Competitive Advantage

G. Cost-Revenue Relationship

G.1 Costs

G.1.1 Personnel Costs

G.1.1.1 New Faculty

G.1.1.2 Administrative Support Staff

G.1.2 Cost of Academic Support

G.1.2.1 Labs

G.1.2.2 Space

G.1.2.3 Equipment

G.1.2.4 Computer Resources

G.1.2.5 Library Resources

G.1.2.6 Other support, as applicable

G.2 Revenue

G.2.1 Tuition

G.2.2 Funded Research

G.2.3 Industrial Support

G.2.4 Restricted Gifts

G.2.4.1 Alumni Support

G.2.4.2 "Angel"

H. Quality of Academic Support

H.1 Library holdings

H.2 Space

H.2.1 Offices

H.2.1.1 Faculty

H.2.1.2 Adjuncts

H.2.1.3 Graduate Students

H.2.2 Research laboratories

H.2.3 Special purpose teaching facilities

H.2.4 Technical and shop support

H.2.4.1 Machine

H.2.4.2 Electrical

H.2.4.3 Other

H.3 Computer resources

I. Accreditation

I.1 Regional Accreditor

I.2 State

I.3 Federal

I.4 Disciplinary Accreditor(s)

I.5 Other