



Executive Policy EP 5.201, Approval of New Academic Programs and Review of Provisional Academic Programs

Effective Date: June 2022

Prior Dates Amended: March 1987, April 1989, May 2014, June 2020

Responsible Office: Office of the Vice President for Academic Strategy

Governing Board of Regents Policy RP 5.201

Review Date: January 2025

I. Purpose

The following guidelines outline the academic program approval and termination process from authorization to plan through established status. Chancellors/Provost will develop procedures to implement this policy as required for their campus.

The objectives of the executive policy are:

- A. To establish guidelines and procedures for the preparation and processing of authorizations to plan, proposals for new academic programs, and reviews of provisional programs.
- B. To assure the administration and Board of Regents of the academic and fiscal soundness of proposed and provisional programs and their appropriateness to both University-wide and campus missions.
- C. To assure the administration and the Board of Regents that provisions for adequate physical facilities for the programs have been included in campus long-range development plans.
- D. To assure the administration and the Board of Regents that program offerings are aligned across the system, duplication is strategic and intentional, and curricular pathways exist.
- E. To assure the administration and the Board of Regents that provisions for meaningful assessment of student learning have been included in proposals for new academic programs and reviews of provisional programs.

II. Definitions

- A. Definitions of all degrees and certificates offered by the University of Hawai'i System are provided in EP 5.205.
- B. Program
For purposes of Board of Regents approval, an academic program is any sequence of courses or instructional activities required to complete a specific degree, inclusive of required coursework within the major, concentration/specialization, and minor.
- C. Authorization to Plan (ATP)
An authorization to plan is a request to authorize planning for a new academic program made to the UH Officers at the beginning of the formal program planning process before resources are committed.
- D. Provisional Program



New programs shall be considered provisional during the period of their first full cycle. A cycle is 150% of the proposed length for baccalaureate and graduate degrees and up to 300% for certificates and associate degrees. At the end of the cycle, provisional programs are eligible to become established.

E. Established Program

Are permanent programs that must undergo periodic comprehensive review.

F. Termination

Programs that are terminated are removed from the official list of degrees and certificates.

G. Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP)

1. The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) provides a taxonomic scheme that supports the accurate tracking and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. CIP was originally developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1980, with revisions occurring regularly.

2. Each program CIP code is aligned to the NCES CIP title (when possible) and definition and is used for reporting of programs to the NCES.

3. A CIP code and title generally apply to all levels of certificates and degrees.

H. Official Program Name

The name of the program, including parenthetical information, is approved by the Board of Regents at the time of program establishment. It is the official name for purposes of Board of Regents-conferred credentials and is used in University publications.

I. Significant Change

A major modification or expansion of the nature of an academic program, including content, objective, or goals.

J. Significant Resources

As defined in RP 5.201, significant resources includes one or more of the following: new faculty or staff positions, new facilities including lab or office space, and/or new operating costs that must be requested through a new budget request to the board and/or Legislature. This would not include situations in which resources can be internally reallocated from other units in the college, department, division, or school in the context of reprioritizing programs and services.

III. Executive Policy

A. As described in RP 5.201, the Board approval is required for all new instructional programs granting academic credit leading to a degree or credential, upon recommendation by the President with the exception of those in B, C and D below. The President can then delegate approval as outlined in B, C and D.

B. Credentials listed below can be approved by the President or designee if the program does not require significant resources:

An established program which desires to change to or add a new type of degree (e.g. BA to BS, AS in xx to AS in zz) with minimal change to degree requirements.



-
- C. Approval of credentials listed below may be delegated to the Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) or Vice President for Academic Strategy (VPAS) if the program does not require significant resources:
 - 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.
 - D. Credentials listed below may be delegated to the Chancellor or Provost if the program does not require significant resources:
 - 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.
 - E. Program Name
 - 1. The name of the program, including parenthetical information, and the Classification of Instructional Property (CIP) code approved by the Board of Regents at the time of program establishment becomes the Official Program Name and CIP code for purposes of Board of Regents-conferred credentials and is used in University publications.
 - 2. Program names and CIP codes should align with titles, descriptions and CIP codes for similar programs in the national database and should be consistent across campuses unless the program name is unique to our system or there is a documented reason for the difference. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Strategy (OVPAS) must approve program names and CIP codes not aligned with the national standard or across the institution. A Master List of Board of Regents-authorized degree and certificate programs, and programs approved by the President or Chancellor/Provost, is maintained by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Strategy.
 - 3. Requests to change the Official Program Name in order to maintain currency in terminology and which involve no substantive change in the program are made to the President. Upon approval, such changes are reported to the Board of Regents as an information item.
 - 4. Official Program Name changes that reflect a substantive program change are handled according to the requirements for new program authorizations as outlined in this policy.
 - 5. Any program name change must be aligned with the correct Classification of Instructional Property (CIP) code and title.
 - 6. No program shall be given a name to honor a person without approval of the Board.
 - F. Authorization To Plan (ATP)
 - 1. The purposes of the ATP are to:
 - a. Coordinate academic program planning actions.
 - b. Request approval from administrators to proceed with planning.
 - c. Inform the administration of long-term academic program planning intentions; the long-term physical facilities requirements of planned programs; and provide opportunities for appropriate feedback.



2. Guidelines for the ATP process are developed by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Strategy in consultation with the Council of Chief Academic Officers (CCAO). Guidelines for the ATP can be found in Appendix A.
 3. ATPs are evaluated by the Officers as to fit with the mission of the unit, relationship to existing programs on each campus and in the UH system, and reasonableness of the proposed plan. Approval of the proposal authorizes a campus to proceed with planning and developing a formal proposal for the program.
 4. After the Officers approve, ATPs are reviewed by CCAO who provide feedback to the proposing campus.
 5. Faculty senates will be informed of approved ATPs.
- G. Proposal for New Academic Programs
1. A program proposal sets forth the description of, and justification for, new academic programs sought by the campuses.
 2. The proposal must contain sufficient information to permit assessment of the academic integrity and quality of the program, to determine its fiscal soundness and efficiency relative to other University activities, and to determine its appropriateness to the mission of the University and the campus. See Appendix B for guidelines for preparing the proposal.
 3. The proposal must have an appropriate CIP code approved by the OVPAS.
 4. Procedures and Processing
 - a. Each unit establishes internal procedures for the preparation and processing of new program proposals, ensuring appropriate faculty (including faculty senate review where required by internal procedures) and student input and attention to the questions outlined in Appendix B.
 - b. Program proposals are reviewed by the Council of Chief Academic Officers (CCAO) for feedback on the content and scope of the proposal, academic integrity, and relationship with programs on each campus and offered by other campuses to ensure program differentiation.
 - c. Proposals endorsed by CCAO as ready to move forward for approval are submitted to the President by the campus.
 - d. The Office of the President reviews the proposal and (if approved), the program name and CIP code are approved by the OVPAS.
 - e. The proposal is then sent to the Board of Regents with a recommendation for approval as provisional.
- H. Provisional Programs
1. All programs approved by the Board of Regents are placed on provisional status during their first cycle of operation.
 2. No tenure appointments shall be made in new programs until the Board of Regents has reviewed the provisional cycle and elected to continue the program. Resources for newly approved academic programs are sought in accordance with standard budgetary policies and procedures.



3. Each provisional program shall undergo a comprehensive review at the end of its first full cycle. The review shall examine the program's actual achievement of its proposed enrollment, completion, resource use, impact, and role in the curriculum.
4. A review cycle is 150% of the proposed length of the degree for baccalaureate and graduate degrees and up to 300% for certificates and associate degrees and master's degrees.

The review cycle schedule will be:

- a. The review is due in 3 years for a 1-year certificate.
 - b. The review is due in 6 years for a 2-year associate's degree.
 - c. The review is due in 6 years for a 4-year bachelor's degree.
 - d. The review is due in 6 years for a 2-year master's degree.
 - e. The review period for a Ph.D. shall be 150% of the expected time to completion established on approval of provisional status.
5. Chancellors/Provost establish procedures for the preparation, review, and approval of provisional programs within their units ensuring appropriate faculty and student input.
- I. Proposal to Establish a Program
1. A proposal to the Board for "established" status of a provisional program shall be submitted in the academic year following the end of the program's first full cycle. The first year of a program is considered the academic year in which students first declare a major in the degree or certificate.
 2. The provisional to established proposal is outlined in Appendix C. The proposal to established status should summarize and reflect on the program review, the self-study of the provisional program, and the quantitative indicators included in Appendix C.
 3. The proposal shall be based upon and summarize the comprehensive review of the program.
 4. Campuses may request, and the President or designee may grant, an extension for one year for provisional programs.
 5. The provisional to established proposal is brought to CCAO for comment and endorsement.
 6. The Chancellor/Provost then transmits the proposal for established status to the President for approval by the Board via an action memo that summarizes:
 - a. A statement of program objectives. Differences between the final program objectives and those found in the program proposal should be explained.
 - b. An assessment of whether or not the program is meeting its objectives and a summary of the evidence used to reach this conclusion.
 - c. A discussion of any substantial changes made in the program since its approval and any substantial discrepancies in program indicators or activities from those identified in the program proposal.
 - d. A projection of resource needs for the next five years.
- J. Program Stop-Outs and Terminations



1. Degree programs may be stopped out by the Chancellor/Provost based on the criteria in item IV.J.4. Degree programs may be terminated by the President based on criteria in item IV.J.5. Termination of all certificates and stand-alone minors may be approved by the Chancellor/Provost.
2. A program stop-out indicates the program is no longer accepting new students. A stopped out program is noted as stopped out, but it is not removed from the UH System official list of degrees and certificates offered.
3. A terminated program is no longer accepting new students, and it is removed from the official list of degrees and certificates. A program scheduled for termination should generally be preceded by a stop-out period that provides time for students currently in the program to graduate.
4. A degree program may be stopped out by the Chancellor/Provost if one of the following criteria applies:
 - a. It is scheduled for termination and requires a period to teach out existing students in the program;
 - b. It is undergoing curriculum redesign with the intention to continue the program after a temporary stop-out;
 - c. It is listed on the Programs with a Small Number of Graduates report for 5 years and stop-out is recommended as a result of a comprehensive program review.
 - d. It is determined to be under performing after an external review, and stop-out is recommended by either the department, the Dean, or the campus Chief Academic Officer.
5. A degree program may be terminated by the President if it meets one of the following criteria:
 - a. The program or Dean recommends termination;
 - b. It is listed on the Programs with a Small Number of Graduates report and termination is recommended as the result of a comprehensive program review;
 - c. Recommended for termination by the Chancellor/Provost to the President;
 - d. It is determined to be under performing after an external review and termination is recommended.

IV. Delegation of Authority

The President delegates approval of all certificates and minors described above where a previously Board-approved degree program exists to the Chancellor/Provost.

The President delegates the approval of all stand-alone certificates of competence at the community colleges to the Vice President for Community Colleges and at the 4-year campuses to the Vice President for Academic Strategy.

V. Contact Information

Office of the Vice President for Academic Strategy, 956-6897, ovpas@hawaii.edu



VI. References

Approved:

<signature>

<Date>

David Lassner
President

APPENDIX A AUTHORIZATION TO PLAN

Authorization to Plan (ATP) Guidelines (3-page limit, excluding signature page)

The ATP is a request to plan a new BOR-approved academic program before resources are committed to program planning. The ATP is submitted by the campus Chancellor to the system Vice President for Academic Strategy (VPAS) for review by the UH Officers. The VPAS will notify the campus of the results of the review. If positive, the ATP will be reviewed for comment and approval by the Council of Chief Academic Officers (CCAO).

Prior to initiating the ATP, consultation with the campus Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) must be completed.

The following items are to be addressed in the ATP:

1. Campus, school/college and department/division proposing the new program.
2. Degree proposed and program objectives and potential for articulation across the UH campuses.
3. **Statement of alignment** with the campus and UH system mission, strategic plan and the Integrated Academic and Facilities Plan (IAFP) (https://www.hawaii.edu/offices/aa/IAFP_BOR_Approved_April17.pdf). Provide evidence that demonstrates how the proposed program is consistent with the mission, strategic plan, and IAFP.
4. **Preliminary indicators of need** that include:
 - a. A clear rationale for the new program with as much direct evidence as possible.
 - b. In the case of workforce demand, data and evidence of employment or industry need in the state or local/regional service area of the institution (e.g., occupation projections, current jobs available, critical shortage areas).
 - c. If justification is not tied to employment or industry need, the rationale should include evidence that the proposed program is linked with high priority initiatives of the campus or system.
5. **Preliminary indicators of demand for the program:** Provide evidence of sufficient unmet demand in one or more of the following areas: student demand, demand for services unique to the program, and/or employer demand.
 - a. Provide evidence demonstrating student demand for the program and the extent to which the demand is not being adequately met by existing programs.
 - b. Provide evidence demonstrating demand for services unique to the program

- (e.g., contracts, consulting, grants, or community service that will be provided).
- c. Provide evidence demonstrating employer demand including any documentation from employers of the need for graduates with specific skills the new program can provide.
6. **Non-duplication of programs** is addressed by listing all programs with the same, or similar, degree level offered at other UH institutions and providing an explanation that differentiates the programs. Provide an analysis that includes:
 - a. Number of degrees conferred over the last three years;
 - b. Why existing programs are not sufficient to address demand;
 - c. If similar programs exist, describe what the proposing institution has done to explore partnerships with the existing program and why an additional program is necessary.
 - d. When a similar program exists, the VCAs of the UH campus(es) with relevant program(s) should be consulted, as should any colleagues in related disciplines from the impacted campus. The ATP should identify who (campus, name and title) has been consulted and the date(s) of consultation.
 7. **List potential risks** (e.g., insurance, vendor contracts, off-site management) associated with the new program. These potential risks will be fully assessed in the new program proposal.
 8. **Resources: Indicate what resources are needed and where it is anticipated these resources can be acquired.** If new resources will be necessary, please identify where those resources will come from. Indicate how existing resources will be allocated.
 9. Impact on accreditation, where relevant (program and regional)
 10. Proposed timeline for submission of new program proposal to:
 - a. Council of Chief Academic Officers (CCAO)
 - b. BOR Committee on Academic and Student Affairs
 - c. Board of Regents

APPENDIX B
GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS FOR NEW ACADEMIC
PROGRAMS

The **action memo** from the Chancellor should make the campus case to the System/Board for approving this program as provisional by commenting on the following:

- Summarize the program and its role
- Why is this a priority for the campus/college
- Why should this program be established here?
- What need does it fill?
- How does it fit the campus mission as outlined in the IAFP?
- Summarize succinctly enrollment projections/achievements and planned/realized resource requirements and sources

The **program proposal** should include the following:

1. Executive Summary of the program.
2. Why is the program a priority for the unit; what needs/goals does it meet?
3. What are the expected enrollments in the program? From what sources?
4. What operating and instructional resources will the program need and where will they come from? What are the program's facilities needs?
5. What impact will developing this program have on resource (re)allocation in the unit?
6. Has there been consultation at the program level between campuses and within the originating campus? Please provide documentation about who was consulted, in what capacity, and when did it happen? What is the summary of the results of this consultation?
7. What risks are associated with the program?
8. Program details (curriculum, staffing, assessment, accreditation, etc.)
9. New Program Resource Template (spreadsheet).

Expected length is approximately 15 pages of text (not including appendix or figures).

APPENDIX C
REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PROVISIONAL PROGRAMS

A. Guidelines for **Provisional to Established Programs**

Maximum length is 15-pages (not including appendix or figures).

1. Executive Summary

2. Alignment of program with mission and strategic planning of the Campus and University System

(Relationship to University mission and development plans, evidence of continuing need for the program, projections of employment opportunities for graduates, etc.)

3. Program enrollment and graduation of students using anticipated and actual enrollment figures. In other words, did the program meet its proposed targets?

(Analysis of numbers of majors, graduates, service to non-majors, employment of graduates, enrollment in graduate programs, etc.)

4. The instructional resources required for the program and how they were utilized compared with anticipated resources.

(Analysis of number and distribution of faculty, faculty areas of expertise, budget and sources of funds, and facilities and equipment.)

5. How the program is organized to meet its outcomes

(Identify any differences in the program from what was approved by the Board of Regents including any changes in curriculum requirements from what was proposed. An assessment of productivity and cost/benefit considerations within the overall context of campus and University "mission" and planning priorities. Include quantitative measures comparing, for example, SSH/faculty, average class size, cost per SSH, cost per major with other programs in the college, on the campus and, as appropriate, similar programs on other UH campuses.)

6. Evidence of student learning and student and program success.

(Summarize the assessment of whether or not students meet the program outcomes and the evidence used to reach this conclusion. Data on time to degree trends, retention and actions to increase retention and on time graduation. Indicators of program quality, e.g. accreditation or other external evaluation, student performance on external exams, student employer satisfaction, alignment with Hawai'i economic

demand, employment/graduate school trends of graduates, awards to faculty and students, etc.)

B. Quantitative Indicators for Provisional and Established Programs

The following data for the period of review specified in 5.201 are used in the program review process for both provisional and established programs. The data are provided by the campus administration to the program. Wherever possible, data are broken down by the level of instruction (e.g., lower division, upper division, certificates, minors, graduate or C.O., C.A., A.S.) and disaggregated in meaningful ways. Campus may add additional data points to this list.

Where possible, data from the program review should be integrated into the narrative of your proposal. Your proposal for established status should summarize and reflect on the review and self-study of the provisional program.

1. Number of majors
2. Student semester hours (SSH) taught, by major demographic groups.
3. FTE course enrollment (SSH divided by 15 for undergraduate-level and by 12 for graduate-level courses)
4. Percent SSH/FTE of own majors, of majors within college and all others
5. Number of classes (sections) offered,
6. Average class size (total student registrations divided by number of classes offered) and average fill rates (student registrations divided by course max) for all courses, including face-to-face courses and distance delivered courses
7. FTE faculty (SH taught/12) by tenure/tenure track and other faculty (temporary, 12s and lecturers)
8. Student-faculty ratio (FTE course enrollment divided by FTE faculty) for tenure/tenure track and other faculty
9. Number of degrees earned by majors (annual)
10. Retention rates
11. Graduation rate (100 and 150%)
12. Time to degree
13. Average credits earned at graduation by major
14. Budget allocation
15. Review to assure program continues to align with Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code.
16. Cost per SSH

C. Action memo for Provisional to Established (From the Chancellor/Provost):

- Summarize the program's role and its evolution since inception
- Why will this continue as a priority for the campus/college?
- Will it continue to meet needs and generate demand?

- Does the program integrate well with programs on this and other campuses? How will developments at other campuses affect this program in the future?
- Assess how well the program met proposed enrollments, completions operating and instructional resource and facility needs?
- What unexpected developments enhanced or challenged the program in its evolution?
- Defend the recommendation to make the program permanent

Adopted by CCAO 4/29/2020