UC Merced Policy and Procedure Manual
Campus Organization and Management
Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs
Approved: May 31, 2011 (hyperlinks updated January 6, 2020)
Supersedes: none

Source Document: "*Systemwide Review Process of Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units"* (see https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/compendium_sept2014.pdf) and "*Procedural Manual for the Review of Proposals for Academic Programs and Units (May, 2003)*"

Exhibit B, Flow Chart -- Approval Process for Academic Degree Programs

I. Purpose

This section describes the formal steps to be taken in preparation, transmittal, review, and implementation of proposals for the establishment, transfer, or discontinuation of an academic degree program at UCM.

II. Policy

A. For the purpose of this policy, an academic degree program is considered any regularized sequence of courses leading to a degree, including those programs sponsored by groups of faculty from different academic units. Proposals to offer new degree titles are also covered by this procedure.

B. The process for the creation or discontinuation of academic degree programs shall be in accordance with the University's system of shared governance and shall be consistent with the relevant University-wide policy statements cited in this section.

With the exception of undergraduate degree programs involving a title unique to the Division (e.g., MFA, MBA, etc.), all actions involving undergraduate degree programs are carried out at the campus level and there is no systemwide review (*Compendium*, section II.A.). Proposals for all new graduate degree programs, including self-supporting degree programs, multi-campus degree programs, and degree programs jointly sponsored by UC campus(es) and other higher education institutions (e.g., CSU), are reviewed systemwide (*Compendium*, II.B.1).

C. Generally, campuses are expected to include anticipated actions such as the establishment of new academic programs in the campus Five-Year Perspective at least one year prior to the proposal being reviewed on campus (two years for proposed new schools and colleges).

D. Each party in the process is expected to expedite consideration of pending proposals. Answers to questions that arise in the review process shall be sought from earlier reviewers and incorporated into recommendations as needed. Revisions to proposals may be approved without re-review by advisory parties but require approval by parties with authority to approve or reject a proposal.

III. Development of Proposal

A. New program or degree title

A summary of the requirements and guidelines for approval of a new program or degree title is given in the *Compendium*, Section II.C.

B. Discontinuation of program or degree title

1. Justification of the proposed action including analysis of costs and benefits to the campus and expected budgetary impact; a statement about the expected impact to enrollment, changes in staffing and space requirements.
2. A phase-out plan that includes an explicit description of the accommodations to students, faculty, staff, and non-academic appointees.
3. A complete statement of all steps required for adoption and implementation of the proposal and the timetable of target dates for completion of each step.
4. Explanation of the method of consultation that was employed in the review process with students and faculty members from potentially affected programs and with appropriate college or Academic Senate committees.
5. Description of the relationship of the proposal to the campus and unit's academic plan.
6. Appended comments of students, faculty, academic non-Senate appointees, and committees.

C. Graduate Degree program

Proposals for new graduate degree program should follow the format described in the UC Academic Senate *Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Handbook* (Appendix B) and current guidelines of the Graduate and Research Council (GRC) and the Committee on Academic Planning and Resources (CAPRA).

For name changes to graduate degree programs, the decision making process may occur on campus if the proposed name change is not associated with a fundamental change in the nature of the graduate degree program or a need for substantial new resources. There is no systemwide review, but the action must be reported systemwide to the CCGA chair and analyst, Council Chair, and Coordinator - Program Review and certain supporting materials must be provided. Campus decision-making must involve approval by the Graduate and Research Council and favorable review by the campus administration. If such a "simple" name change is contemplated, the faculty member responsible for the degree program is encouraged to consult with the Graduate and Research Council Chair, CCGA Chair, and Coordinator - Program Reviews to determine whether systemwide review is required (*Compendium*, II.B.2).

D. Undergraduate Degree program

Proposals for a new degree program should follow the general format described in policies and guidelines provided by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and CAPRA.

IV. Procedures for Review and Approval

For a flow chart of these procedures, see Exhibit B.

A. The proposal is initiated by the interested group (academic unit, graduate group, group of faculty). The initiator shall consult with review committees (Undergraduate Council or Graduate and Research Council, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education or Dean or Graduate Studies, School or College Executive Committee), and with the dean(s) of affected schools or colleges for input and assistance in proposal preparation and requirements.

B. The WASC substantive change specialist should be consulted to determine whether the proposed change requires external review by WASC after the proposal is approved on-campus. If WASC review is required, the responsible faculty must prepare the required substantive change documentation for WASC

review, in consultation with the campus WASC Academic Liaison Officer and WASC Substantive Change Specialist.

C. The affected unit(s) (any units within a college or school affected by the action) shall review and approve the proposal. The recommendation shall be reported as a vote of the Academic Senate members of the affected unit(s). If the proposed program is associated with faculty in more than one school or college, affected units in each school or college shall review and approve the proposal.

D. Undergraduate Programs

1. The recommendation of the affected unit(s) is forwarded to the Executive Committee of the affected school(s) or college(s) in which the degree is to be offered, and to the dean of the school(s) or college(s).
2. The Executive Committee of the school(s) or college(s) approves or rejects the proposal following the procedures specified in the bylaws of the school or college.
3. The dean(s) of the school, college, or division provides an independent recommendation regarding resource support for the program, including faculty supporting the program, student enrollment, staff support, and space. The recommendation should also address resource impacts on other academic programs.
4. Approval from the school or college Executive Committee and the recommendation of the dean is forwarded to the Divisional Council office for transmittal to the Undergraduate Council, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, and any other standing Senate committees as appropriate. Copies of these approvals and recommendations are also sent to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and to the chairs of the Executive Committees of the undergraduate schools/colleges to comment on potential effects to programs within their schools/colleges.
5. The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation submits its evaluation of resources to the Undergraduate Council and the Divisional Council.
6. The Undergraduate Council reviews the proposal, taking account of recommendations from the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, and the advice of the academic dean(s) and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education regarding availability of support for the program. The Undergraduate Council approves or rejects the proposal on behalf of the Divisional Academic Senate.
7. Undergraduate Council approval, CAPRA evaluation, and comments from any other standing committees are forwarded to the Divisional Council for comment, synthesis, and transmittal to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, who transmits to the Executive Vice Chancellor.
8. The Executive Vice Chancellor reviews the proposal and consults with appropriate members of the administration to determine if the action will be supported by the campus, including providing appropriate resources, and advises the Chancellor.
9. If approved by the Chancellor and required under WASC substantive change policy, the Chancellor's Office notifies the WASC Academic Liaison Officer and WASC Substantive Change Specialist, who prepares and transmits documentation for WASC review. Until such time as WASC has completed the substantive change review process and approval has been received, all public publications or announcements regarding new or modified degree programs should contain an asterisk or footnote indicating that the program is “pending the review of our accreditation agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)."
10. The Chancellor transmits campus approval to the Chair of the Divisional Council, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Dean of Graduate Studies, deans of schools or colleges, Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs, and Offices of Accounting & Financial Services, Admissions, University Communications, Registrar, and Planning and Resource Management.

E. Graduate Programs

1. The lead dean of the graduate program provides an independent recommendation regarding support for the program, including faculty supporting the program, student enrollment, staff support, and space. The recommendation should also address resource impacts on other academic programs.
2. The program proposal and the recommendation of the lead dean are submitted to the Divisional Council office for transmittal to the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Graduate and Research Council, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, and any other standing Senate committees as appropriate.
3. The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation submits its evaluation of resources to the Graduate and Research Council and to the Divisional Council.
4. The Graduate and Research Council reviews the proposal, taking account of recommendations from the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, and the advice of the lead academic dean and Dean of Graduate Studies regarding availability of support for the program. The Graduate and Research Council approves or rejects the proposal on behalf of the Divisional Academic Senate.
5. Graduate and Research Council approval, CAPRA evaluation, and comments from any other standing committees are forwarded to the Divisional Council for comment, synthesis, and transmittal to the Dean of Graduate Studies, who transmits to the Executive Vice Chancellor. The Divisional Council also transmits these documents to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs for Academic Senate approval.
6. The Executive Vice Chancellor reviews the proposal and consults with appropriate members of the administration to determine if the degree program will be supported by the campus, including providing appropriate resources, and advises the Chancellor.
7. If approved by the Chancellor and required under WASC substantive change policy, the Chancellor's Office notifies the WASC Academic Liaison Officer and WASC Substantive Change Specialist, who prepares and transmits documentation for WASC review. Until such time as WASC has completed the substantive change review process and approval has been received, all public publications or announcements regarding new or modified degree programs should contain an asterisk or footnote indicating that the program is “pending the review of our accreditation agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)."
8. The Chancellor transmits the proposal, campus approval and recommendation to the Office of the President for systemwide approval. Copies are sent to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Chair of the Divisional Senate, and the Chair of the Graduate and Research Council.
9. When approved by the Office of the President and systemwide Academic Senate, the Chancellor and/or Chair of the Divisional Academic Senate notify the Chair of the Graduate Council and the Dean of Graduate Studies who notifies the graduate program, and Offices of Accounting & Financial Services, Admissions, University Communications, Registrar, and Planning and Resource Management.

V. References and Related Policies

UC Academic Senate Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Handbook (revised 2008).
UC Merced, Undergraduate Council, Policy and Procedure for Review and Approval of Undergraduate Degree Programs (revised Oct., 2007).
UC Merced, Graduate and Research Council, Procedures for Review of New Graduate Emphasis Areas and Graduate Groups (revised Sept., 2007).
Systemwide Review Process of Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (see https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/compendium_sept2014.pdf).

Procedural Manual for the Review of Proposals for Academic Programs and Units (May, 2003).

Approval Process for Academic Degree Programs

Formation
Consolidation
Reconstitution
Disestablishment
Transfer