

EP 5.201 Approval of academic programs consultation comments						
Campus	Office	Section	Page	Proposed Revision	Comment/Rationale	Response
System	ACCFSC				Can approval of academic subject certificates (ASCs) and certificates of competence (COs) remain at the campus/chancellor level?	In 2013, a revision in the UHCCP 5.203 policy led to a conflict of approving authority with RP5.201 and EP5.2.05. Proposed revisions to EP5.201 are intended to clarify the approving authority. COs that are created as part of a BOR approved degree or CA will still be approved at the chancellor level. The issue of standalone COs has become problematic as they will require additional campus resources and may lead to duplication of programs between community colleges. For these COs, having the approving authority at the system level ensures resources are used most effectively to meet community needs. Additionally, the UHCCs are a system of 7 community colleges that together provide transfer and workforce development training for the state of Hawaii. In that role and given the current fiscal realities, the UHCCs need to work more collaboratively to offer programs and reduce duplication of effort. Having the VPCC as the approving authority adds a layer of review that is currently missing from the approval process. [Debbie/Tammi] In regards to the ASC, I think Tammi and I feel the ASC is not well-defined. If the ASC was truly a transfer certificate (like a concentration), then chancellor approval could be maintained. The problem is campuses are using the ASC as a Liberal Arts CO. It's essentially a standalone ASC, so I'm not sure how to address the concern. Could the UHCCP better define ASC? Or should we push on this at the RP/EP level as it might be easier to get it through?
System	ACCFSC				Can approval of whatever counts in the future as a microcredential also remain at the campus level?	I think this would make sense except we don't have a policy yet. Can we say "Once a UH system policy/procedure for microcredentials is developed, the approving authority will be delegated to the chancellors."
System	ACCFSC				If the real concern is about badges (and about how badges might "stack"), could ASCs and COs be set aside from that discussion?	The concern is not about stacking as COs that are part of a BOR approved degree or CA are approved by the chancellor. The concern is focused on standalone certificates that use campus resources without a BOR approved program and may duplicate an existing program at another CC.
System	ACCFSC				Is it reasonable to say that smaller certificates earned through coursework (ASCs and COs) are on one side of a divide between traditional and alternative credentialing, where badges, digital certificates, and other MOOC-like things are on the other side? If so, why not leave ASCs and COs a little more loosely managed, as they are now? It's not that we're anticipating some sort of chaotic future in which some sort of random assortment of badges turn into an academic subject certificate, right? Or are we?	Under current policy, the idea of a chaotic future is here. There is already a random assortment of badges and certificates. As the community relies on the UHCCs for workforce development, it has become clear that we are often offering certificates with the same title and different outcomes as well as different titles and similar outcomes. It is also apparent that there is a lack of coordination between the CCs which is most noticeable on Oahu. The UHCCs should be providing a comprehensive set of degrees and certificates that meet statewide needs in a cohesive and coordinated manner. The best way to implement that vision is through a centralized office that reviews and approves new certificate requests.
System	ACCFSC				Or (if a future in which a million microcredentials are flying around willy-nilly isn't the concern), is the proposed tightening of management of COs and ASCs coming from concerns about unnecessary or unintended/incidental competition between campuses? If so, could we shift to a perspective that it might be competition between the UH system and, say, Coursera? Would the argument that some amount of overlap in small (sometimes very small) programs might be capacity building instead of unnecessarily (internally) competitive be reason enough for the system/BOR to reconsider?	The goal of the policy revisions is to ensure a coordinated approach for all UH offered degrees and certificates. Capacity building is currently available through BOR approved programs and non-credit offerings. New programs that require additional resources are required to follow a process that ensures transparency in how new resources are allocated. UH is not revising policy to address the concern of competition with Coursera.
UH Hilo	Registration	III.B.1	1		Should this line also include general education?	no... general education is part of the degree (so defined in EP 5.205) but is not considered part of the academic program. For example, you need to do GenEd to graduate with a BA in political science, but the political science program is the specialized courses in that area of study.
UH Hilo	Registration	III.E.1	2		We do have a BOR established GR certificate (KITE). Not sure if this should get identified in this document or not.	We have removed the definition of certificates from this policy and moved them to EP 5.205.
UH Hilo	Registration	III.I.4	6		Is there a limit to how many extensions they can have? This statement should be consistent with the statement in RP5.201. RP5.201: Campuses may request and the president or designee may grant an extension for up to 2 years one year for provisional programs. After the 2 year extension, the program should be approved for established status or terminated.	Thanks for catching that -- text has been changed to align with RP.
UH Hilo	Registration	III.J.2	6		Not removed from where? Catalog, website, majors a student can elect to change their major to?	We are referencing the UH System list of degrees offered: https://www.hawaii.edu/degrees-and-programs . Have added language to clarify.

System	Financial Aid				Questions and concerns about campus process for new program consideration and financial aid review for FA eligibility - does this new process replace campus process and does it bypass FA review? The current process that includes an approval form is not mentioned in this revision.	This process is only for system-level review and BOR approval. It does not replace campus level processes.
Winward CC	Faculty Senate	II.D	1	Stet. Or: "To assure the administration and the Board of Regents that program offerings are aligned across the system and that curricular pathways are maintained."	Limiting duplication is not desirable as a blanket goal for all programs, especially when it comes to small or very small programs. The proliferation within board-approved programs of small certificates—academic subject certificates and certificates of competence for example—is already explicitly sanctioned by this policy. Microcredentials, the certifications most likely to be duplicated going forward, are more often than not offered in non-credit/extension contexts and are not appropriate for, or best-deployed via, system-level management.	Thanks for your comment. The intent isn't to eliminate all duplication but to make sure that factors such as the ones listed in this section are considered.
Winward CC	Faculty Senate	IV.C	3	C. Credentials listed below may be delegated to the Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) or Vice President for Academic Strategy (VPAS): 1. All new stand-alone certificates of competence or academic subject certificates. 2. A stand-alone certificate where the existing Board-approved associate degree or certificate of achievement is being terminated.	Comment on proposed revisions in rows 2 & 3: As they stand, microcredentials or alternative digital credentials seem to have messiness as a feature rather than a bug (so to speak). They seem to be progressing on multiple tracks/somewhat chaotically at "leading" institutions that offer them. For example, UC Irvine is currently offering digital credentials through Credly at the same time that it has partnered with the MIT-led Digital Credentials Consortium, whose goal is obviously to take over from (or compete directly with) Credly or whatever commercial badge vendor might eventually take its place. Hanging back and coordinating up-front seems like a losing strategy here. Having a messy, diverse/wide-flung-net approach to microcredentials will make us more robust in the end.	Much of what will happen in the microcredential space will not be governed by policy. However, we need some common definitions and starting points so that we can avoid too much chaos. Robustness yes, chaos not so good.
Winward CC	Faculty Senate	IV.D	3	D. Credentials listed below may be delegated to the Chancellor or Provost: 1. New minors, concentrations or certificates consisting of courses within or among existing Board-approved instructional programs. 2. A stand-alone minor where the existing Board-approved major is being terminated. 3. Microcredentials	Comment on proposed revisions in rows 2 & 3: As they stand, microcredentials or alternative digital credentials seem to have messiness as a feature rather than a bug (so to speak). They seem to be progressing on multiple tracks/somewhat chaotically at "leading" institutions that offer them. For example, UC Irvine is currently offering digital credentials through Credly at the same time that it has partnered with the MIT-led Digital Credentials Consortium, whose goal is obviously to take over from (or compete directly with) Credly or whatever commercial badge vendor might eventually take its place. Hanging back and coordinating up-front seems like a losing strategy here. Having a messy, diverse/wide-flung-net approach to microcredentials will make us more robust in the end.	
System	Student Affairs	I	1		An AP or maybe include in this policy that "program" approvals and/or stop-out/terminations cannot be done mid-year. Should be est. by the academic year Fall/Spring/Summer. Mid-year changes wreak havoc on other processes and should be approved by AY not term.	Thanks for your comment. We are attempting to manage this via the calendar and an AP may be another idea for how to proceed.
System	Student Affairs	III.J	2	Substantive change	Titling this as a "Substantive" change would be more appropriate to show that this is really a major modification to the current program. Using this terminology will also align with what is already noted in the body of the policy sec. IV E.3. and E.4.	I believe we changed to significant over substantive to avoid confusion with accreditation language around substantive change.
System	Student Affairs	IV.C	3		Need definition for micro-credentialing. How will this be recorded? Where will this be recorded? How will it show up on the transcript, be articulated, etc.?	See EP 5.205 where we begin to define these. Other questions are beyond the scope of this policy.
Kauai CC	Faculty Senate	II.D	1	Change "duplication is limited" to some variant of: "duplication happens intentionally and strategically" or "offerings are duplicated when appropriate" or similar.	A broad statement of intent to limit duplication would apply to all programs, even ones that make sense to offer individually at each college. This could be too restrictive to best serve our students.	Thanks. Added "strategic and intentional" to duplication language.
Kauai CC	Faculty Senate	IV.J.4.c & IV.J.5.b	6 & 7	"comprehensive program review" needs clarification -- What are the procedures for doing the review? Who is involved? Who decides the result of the review?	Without clarification on the program review process, programs are left in uncertainty about how their status will be determined.	Such a level of specificity should be decided by the campus. There is existing policy on program review EP 5.202 that may be useful.
Kauai CC	Faculty Senate	IV.J.4.c & IV.J.5.b	6 & 7	Both of these should read the same: "Listed on the Programs with a Small Number of Graduates Report for 5 consecutive years and termination is recommended as the result of a comprehensive program review." (although the program review needs clarification as stated)	The standards for termination should be consistent in both termination by Chancellor/Provost and by President. It is important that IV.J.4.c include "termination is recommended...." by the program review. Otherwise the program review could recommend something else but the program could still be terminated by the Chancellor/Provost.	The stop out and termination language has been aligned. See above for program review answer.

Kauai CC	Faculty Senate	III.G	2	It would be wise to insert more language to cover a situation where a CIP code does not yet exist for a proposed program/certificate.	We know that new professions are being created at a rapid pace and CCs are able to react quickly to offer certificates - usually at a faster pace than the Fed Govt can create CIP codes. There should be provisions in the policy for situations where programs/certificates are proposed in areas where CIP codes do not yet exist.	We are developing an AP to address CIP issues.
FOLLOW-UP REVIEW COMMENTS						
UHM	Registrar	IV.C.2.	3	Microcredentials: Differ from a degree, minor, or certificate, in that it allows earners to show case skills, competencies, or achievements gained from a variety of learning experiences.	Microcredentials is mentioned, but not defined.	Was defined in 5.205 -- please review definition there to make sure it is acceptable.
UHM	Registrar	IV.C.2.	3		How will microcredentials be awarded? Most are microcredentials are digital badges that contain metadata describing the credential. Earners can then share it on social media, with their employer, etc.	I believe we will need to work on an AP or some procedures for this.
UHM	Registrar	IV.C.2.	3		How is a microcredential proposed/established?	
UHM	Registrar	III.I.	2	Substantive change: As defined by WSCUC Policy, a substantive change at an accredited or candidate institution is defined as a change to an institution's mission, educational programs, scope, control, or organizational structure that needs to be reported to and approved by WSCUC in advance of implementation.	Use 'Substantive Change' instead of Significant Change'. This will keep terminology consistent with accreditation bodies such as WSCUC.	We opted to use significant change so we <i>wouldn't confuse</i> what we are saying with WSCUC -- it is not necessarily the case that we are using the words in the same way.
UHM	Faculty Senate	III.2.J	2	"Use of resources" instead of "significant resources."	What is intended by the term "significant resources"? Would a better term be "use of existing resources" or "use of resources"? In fact, many new programs do not require "significant resources" because they use resources already in place for other programs.	We have defined significant resources in the RP -- this is the threshold at which there will need to be BOR oversight. So if there are resources being used that are NOT significant, the goal is to allow the programmatic decision to be made at the System or campus level.
UHM	Faculty Senate	IV.J.1	6	"Programs without enrollments" instead of "underperforming".	What is meant by "underperforming"? Without operationalization, this could be interpreted in myriad ways and could harm other programs inappropriately. Some programs serve a small number of majors, but contribute to the overall attractiveness of the university and its mission. What are the data, sources of data, and criteria that would be used to determine whether a program is "underperforming", and what is the process? "Underperforming" with regards to what? Who decides? Also, include how the program change would improve things for students, in context. Please share your definition of "streamlining."	* The sentence using "underperforming" has been removed. To address the questions regarding how it would be operationalized, the following new criteria for stop out or termination has been added: "A degree program may be stopped out by the Chancellor/Provost if one of the following criteria applies:..... It is determined to be underperforming after an external review and stop out is recommended." **The comment about how the program change would improve things for students, in context, isn't clear as to what it is reference. *** There does not appear to be the word streamlining in EP 5.201.