

LAWRENCE T. POTTER, JR., Ph.D.
CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER

March 30, 2022

TO: Prof. Arlene King-Berry, Chair
University Faculty Senate

FROM: Chief Academic Officer

SUBJECT: Process for New and Revised Program Proposal Submissions to the Faculty Senate

The Office of the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) has responsibility for ensuring established administrative policies are maintained and followed in accordance with approved University and Board processes. **In addition, the Office of the CAO has the responsibility for the ongoing development of creating a more efficient approval process for new, revised, or modified programs (see attached memo dated June 26, 2017). Items approved by the Board of Trustees cannot be altered or changed without a “presentation to the Board of Trustees, through the Provost (Chief Academic Officer) and President, for consideration and action (ratification)” (see UDC Resolution No. 2012-8).**

It has been brought to my attention the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate were revised in January 2021 to include a “Branch Campus Committee,” which was not included in the Board-approved By-Laws adopted and ratified in 2012. According to the revised By-Laws, the Branch Campus Committee:

- *This committee shall: (1) develop, review, and recommend proposed policies and procedures for approval of degree programs and courses; (2) develop and recommend proposed procedures for approval of certificate and workforce programs; (3) review proposed certificate, workforce, and degree programs and courses to ensure currency, relevance, and coherence with other University offerings to advance the University’s academic mission; and review and recommend proposed certificate, workforce, and degree programs and course discontinuation.*
 - *Following consideration by the Branch Campus Committee, all proposed changes to Branch Campus Academic Programs will be forwarded to the ASPPC for consideration. All Proposed changes to Branch Campus admission, retention, and graduation will be forwarded to the ARC Committee.*

The university administration or the Board of Trustees have not approved the above committee. **More importantly, the stated function violates current academic policies governing new programs/program changes under Administrative Academic Procedures as stipulated in the University’s *Academic Policy Manual*, Section III (Channel for Reviews). The steps are outlined (see pg. 75 in the attached).**

Colleges and Schools recommend new programs/curricula through established Curriculum Committees at the College or School level. Curriculum Committees approve academic submissions, which are then sent to the Faculty Senate and the ASPCC before being routed to the Office of the CAO. The unapproved Branch Campus Committee will not be used as a substitute for the established Curriculum Committee. Furthermore, the proposed function of this committee will have no future action to review or approve non-academic certificates and/or workforce programs within the Division of Workforce Development and Lifelong Learning (WDLL). WDLL is a stand-alone division, separate from the Community College (Branch Campus), headed by a Dean reporting to the CAO. **The Community College (Branch Campus) Dean has been instructed to follow the outlined Channel for Reviews in the Administrative Academic Procedures section. Therefore, no new programs/program changes will be submitted to the "Branch Campus Committee." When proposals are not acted upon and moved forward promptly, the CAO will follow the established sixty-day process outlined in the June 26, 2017, memorandum as we have since my arrival.**


To ensure appropriate and adequate communication and adherence to this process, it is essential that the Academic Standards, Policy and Program Committee (ASPCC) and all Senate members are made aware of this process in an effort to maintain strides made in our shared governance efforts.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Office of the CAO if you have questions.

cc: Ronald Mason, Jr., J.D., President
Council of Deans
Council of Chairs

June 26, 2017

TO: Dr. Arlene King-Berry, Chair
University Faculty Senate

FROM: Ronald Mason, Jr., J.D., President 

SUBJECT: Process for New and Revised Program Proposal Submissions to the
Faculty Senate

The Office of the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) is working to develop a more efficient approval process for new, revised, or modified programs that involves Faculty Senate (FS) review and/or require approval from the President or Board of Trustees. After reviewing and discussing the current process, **the following changes will go into effect starting Academic Year 2017 – 2018:**

- Deans will be instructed to submit a copy of proposals for “New and/or Revised Programs” to the Office of the CAO at the same time they are submitted to the Faculty Senate.
- Proposals will be clocked (logged in) into the CAO’s Office when received, to identify dates of submission and to start the CAO-level review.
- The Faculty Senate will have two months to fulfill its review and approval obligations for proposal submissions.
- At the conclusion of Senate actions, recommendations will be forwarded to the CAO’s Office via a fully enacted transmittal form for additional approval(s)—e.g., transmission to the President and Board of Trustees approval when and if appropriate, followed by return to deans for implementation steps. The FS’ transmittal will be acknowledged by the CAO’s Office via e-mail.
- Proposals that have not completed Faculty Senate review within the two month period will be acted on by the CAO.

To ensure appropriate and adequate communication and adherence to this process, it is important that the Academic Policy and Procedure Committee (ASPPC) and all Senate members are made aware of this process, in an effort to maintain strides made in our shared governance efforts.

Please contact the Office of the CAO if you have questions or concerns.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

UDC Resolution No. 2012-28

SUBJECT: Ratification of Faculty Senate Charter Amendment

WHEREAS, pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 38-1202.06(3), the Board of Trustees is authorized to establish or approve policies and procedures governing admissions, curricula, programs, graduation, the awarding of degrees, and general policy for the components of the University; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees considers an effective academic governing body to be a critical component of the University; and

WHEREAS, the Charter and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate were approved by the Board of Trustees on December 8, 2010 (Resolution No. 2010-33) after being developed over an extended period (Spring 2009 to Fall 2010) during which the Interim Academic Senate sought and received input from UDC students, faculty, the administration, the Board of Trustees, and several outside entities with specialization in academic governance; and

WHEREAS, the recommended amendments to the Charter and Bylaws provide for the student representative from the UDC Community College to be selected in the same way and to have the same status as the student representatives of the UDC Student Government Association and the UDC Graduate Student Government Association.

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Charter and Bylaws, Amendments to the Charter and Bylaws must be approved by two-thirds of the eligible voting members of the Faculty Senate and shall be presented to the Board of Trustees, through the Provost and President, for consideration and action, and have done so through a February 27, 2012, letter to the Provost;



NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees hereby approves and ratifies the attached Charter and Bylaw amendments to govern the Faculty Senate; and

Submitted by the Academic Affairs Committee

April 11, 2012

Approved by the Board of Trustees

June 13, 2012


 Elaine Crider
Chairperson of the Board

ADMINISTRATIVE ACADEMIC PROCEDURES

Academic Proposal Guidelines

New Courses

New Courses initiated by a department with approval of the program director must be submitted through the proposal approval process. To facilitate the process, proposals for the new course(s) should be submitted to the respective Office of the Dean after they have cleared the College's/School's internal process and have the recommended approval of the Curriculum Committee. All requests for new courses must include the following:

1. A completed Course Inventory File form with the course description typed on the reverse side of the form (*see attached form*),
2. A justification for the course, and
3. The names of regular full-time faculty available to teach the course.

New Programs/Program Changes

New academic programs, and major program changes, including termination, must be reviewed and endorsed by the Academic Senate. In the case of undergraduate programs, the Academic Standards, Policies and Program Committee (ASPPC) has purview. In the case of graduate programs, the Graduate Council has purview. In the procedures described below, graduate proposals will be considered by the Graduate Council through the Graduate Dean and brought to the Academic Senate.

The following procedure shall be used when any academic policy or program is to be initiated or modified and submitted to the ASPPC of the Academic Senate. It includes review by appropriate committees and academic administrators in a time frame that will allow expeditious dispatch as indicated in the "Channel For Reviews." The major characteristic of this procedure is that it establishes primary review and approval just above the level of initiation supplemented by a university-wide review system to ensure congruence with university objectives, resources, and desired academic standards.

I. PREPARING THE PROPOSAL

The initiator (individual or academic unit) shall provide the following information:

- A. The type of review requested
 1. Review of existing program
 2. Course change(s)
 3. New course(s)
 4. Program deletion
 5. New program(s)
 6. Non-degree certificate programs
 7. Other (specify, e.g., interdisciplinary)

- B. Description of program, course, change, course requirements, prerequisites, and syllabi as applicable.
- C. In reviewing a proposal for a new course or program, the Academic Standards, Policy and Program Committee (ASPPC) of the Academic Senate will examine its feasibility in terms of the factors listed below and shall include relevant commentary.
 - 1. Demonstration of need (including internal and external supporting data)
 - 2. Congruence with academic unit objectives and university mission (relationship to other existing program and courses)
 - 3. Avoidance of duplication or overlap with existing courses or programs
 - 4. Relationship with other programs/departments/schools/colleges with written response from those concerned
 - 5. Standards of relevant accrediting agencies and/or professional societies
 - 6. Number of students immediately affected, if relevant
 - 7. Projected enrollment, if relevant
 - 8. Effect on student development, employment or program effectiveness, if relevant
 - 9. Adequacy and appropriate qualification of current faculty and support staff (Identify additional needs if any.)
 - 10. Adequacy of current facilities (offices, classrooms, labs, etc.)
 - 11. Adequacy of supplies and equipment (Identify additional needs, if any.)
 - 12. Estimated costs, available funds and probable funding sources
 - 13. Adequacy of supportive library and technical resources in consultation with LRD.
- D. If the proposal is for program, course change(s) or course deletion(s), the following information should be provided in addition to relevant items required in item C above.
 - 1. The number of students served during the past 4 academic years, itemized by semester (Include graduates, majors, non-majors in courses, etc.)
 - 2. Rationale for proposal
 - 3. Probable impact on unit
 - 4. Faculty and staff affected
- E. Proposed Date of Implementation

II. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS AND COMMENTS TO APC

- A. Fifteen (15) copies of the proposal shall be submitted by the initiator to the ASPPC or Graduate Council with the Transmittal Form with appropriate signatures on the cover sheet. Fifteen (15) copies of the comments from appropriate levels shall also be submitted to the ASPPC.
- B. One (1) copy of the proposal shall be submitted directly to the Chair of the ASPPC as soon as it is approved at the departmental level, allowing the ASPPC to determine workload and calendar.
- C. If timely action cannot be met at any level, the authority at that level must promptly inform all involved parties, including the ASPPC Chair. The ASPPC shall monitor such delays and make determinations on disposition of the proposal.

- D. For implementation during a given academic year, the proposal shall be cleared through the department for submission to the next academic level.

III. CHANNEL FOR REVIEWS

- Step 1: Initiator (originator)
- Step 2: Program (if applicable)
- Step 3: Department Curriculum Committee
Department Faculty
Chairperson
- Step 4: Next academic administrative level (School, College, Division)
Dean/Director
Curriculum Committee
Faculty (for entire academic administrative issues only)

NOTE: When proposals are initiated above the department level, they shall be returned to the appropriate department and forwarded through channels for Senate review and recommendation. Faculty and departments should be contacted regarding issues which transcend programs/departments.

- Step 5: Academic Standards, Policies and Program Committee of the Academic Senate or Graduate Council through the Graduate Dean
- Step 6: Academic Senate
- Step 7: Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Step 8: President (if required)
- Step 9: Board of Trustees (if required)

PROCEDURAL STEPS IN SUMMARY

1. Fifteen (15) copies of the proposal and comments shall be submitted to the ASPPC as outlined above.
2. Channels for review process shall be followed.
3. Reviewing panels shall make relevant comments on the merits of the proposal.
4. All levels should sign off on the cover sheet and add relevant summary recommendations. If the proposal is not approved at any level, it must be returned with appropriate comment to the previous level and to the originator. A courtesy copy should be forwarded to the ASPPC Chair. If differences cannot be reconciled, the proposal, with all comments, should be forwarded to the ASPPC for adjudication.
5. Proposals approved by the ASPPC shall be submitted to the Academic Senate.
6. Proposals approved by the Academic Senate shall be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for consideration and forwarding as warranted. The Senate and the originator shall be apprised of the action.

NOTE: If timely action is not taken at any level and no written explanation is received, the proposal will be transmitted to the next level for action. The initiator is responsible for monitoring the progress of the proposal.

Recommendations for changes in courses, programs and academic requirements must be approved by the VPAA. New degree programs must be submitted to the President for consideration and transmittal to the Board of Trustees. Certificate programs do not need Board approval.

CALENDAR DEADLINES

1. Proposals for new programs must be submitted to the ASPPC by the end of the Fall semester in the year preceding proposed implementation.
2. All other proposals must be submitted by the end of January in order to be considered for the next Fall implementation. Proposals will be considered in order of submission, and action will be taken as time permits.

Course Inventory File

The Course Inventory File (CIF) is the official list of courses offered by the University. It contains courses currently offered in all academic departments. No course may be offered if it is not listed in the CIF.

To list a new *undergraduate* course in the CIF, the academic department must complete the Course Inventory File form with the appropriate signatures and submit it to the Office of Academic Affairs. Departments may add, discontinue, or amend undergraduate courses listed in the CIF. This is done by completing the Course Inventory File (CIF). All forms must bear the signature of the Department Chairperson, signature of the Curriculum Committee Chair, and the Dean.

To list a new *graduate course* in the CIF, the graduate program must complete the Course Inventory File form with the appropriate signatures and submit it to the Office of Graduate Studies for approval, before it is transmitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.

Graduate courses to be offered off campus or on an atypical schedule must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies. All such course offerings must receive the approval of the department and the school or college dean before being submitted to the graduate dean.

Graduate programs may add, discontinue, or amend, courses listed in the CIF. This is done by completing the Course Inventory File (CIF). All forms must bear the signature of the Graduate Program Director, the Department Chairperson, the Curriculum Committee Chair, and the graduate dean.

Course Offering Cycle

To facilitate students' timely progress to degree completion, academic units will publish and adhere to a schedule of offering required courses that are not offered every term. Such courses must be offered at least one of the three semesters during an academic year. Major courses cannot be offered only in the summer term. Standard electives will be offered on a published schedule, not less often than once in two years. Such electives may not be offered only in the summer term. Required lower-division courses must be offered at least two of the three semesters each year.