



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

Effective Date: August 2020

Prior Dates Amended: March 1987; April 1989, May 2014

Responsible Office: Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy

Governing Board of Regents Policy RP5.201

Review Date: January 2025

I. Introduction

This Executive Policy directs implementation of Sections III. A, B, and E of the Board of Regents Policy RP 5.201. The following objectives, policies, and guidelines provide for the monitoring of academic program planning intentions, new academic program proposals, and the evaluation of provisional academic programs of the University of Hawai'i. Chancellors will develop procedures to implement this policy.

II. Objectives

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 provisions for meaningful assessment of student learning have been included in proposals for new academic programs, and reviews of provisional programs.

III. Definitions

A. New Program

1. For purposes of Board of Regents approval, a new academic program is any sequence of courses or instructional activities:
 - a. Culminating in a Board of Regents conferred degree or credential;
 - b. Requiring a major commitment of general-funded resources to a new instructional area. A new program shall be considered as requiring a major commitment if:
 - (1) it requires inclusion of a specific request in the Board of Regents' budget for a workload or program change appropriation, or
 - (2) it involves a reallocation of resources so extensive that it requires a Board of Regents' action to terminate the program or programs from which the resources are to be drawn.

B. Authorization to Plan (ATP)

1. 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.

C. Provisional Program



1. 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 200% for certificates and associate degrees. At the end of the cycle, provisional programs are eligible to become established.

D. Established Program

1. Are permanent programs that must undergo periodic comprehensive review.

E. Academic Subject Certificates

1. As defined in EP 5.205, an academic subject certificate is a supplemental credential for students in Associate, Bachelors, or graduate programs of 12 credit hours.

F. Academic Minors

1. As defined in EP 5.205, an academic minor is recognition of work completed in select credit courses within a specific academic major. Academic minors do not stand alone. Therefore, campuses may recognize academic minors only in Board-authorized baccalaureate degree programs.

G. Termination

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

H. 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.

IV. Executive Policy

A. The Board shall approve all new instructional programs granting academic credit leading to a degree or credential, upon recommendation by the President.

B. In addition, the Board shall approve all new certificates that are the sole credential of an instructional program or require significant resources except, for the following:

1. A Certificate of Achievement in which an associate degree in the program is already board-approved.
2. Certificates of completion and competence and campus based/subject certificates or minors that are components of a Board approved degree program.

C. Program Title

1. The title 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 title and CIP code for purposes of Board of Regents-conferred credentials and is used in University publications.
2. Program titles and CIP codes should align with titles and CIP codes for similar programs in the national database and should be consistent across campuses unless the program is unique to our system or there is a documented reason for the difference. The Office for the Vice President for Academic Programs and Policy (OVPAPP) must approve program titles 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, is maintained by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy.

3. Requests to change academic program titles 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. 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 name change must be aligned with the correct Classification of Instructional Property (CIP) code.
6. No program shall be given a name to honor a person without approval of the board.

D. 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 Planning and Policy 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.

E. 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 VPAPP.
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 Counsel 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) forwards it to the Board of Regents with a recommendation for approval.
- e. Once a proposal is approved as provisional by the Board of Regents, the program name and CIP code is approved by the OVPAPP.

F. 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 or tenure commitments 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 a baccalaureate and graduate degrees and 200% for certificates and associate degrees.
 - a. The review cycle schedule will be:
 - i. The review is due in 2 years for a 1-year certificate.
 - ii. The review is due in 4 years for a 2-year associates degree.
 - iii. The review is due in 6 years for a 4-year bachelor's degree.
 - iv. The review is due in 3 years for a 2-year master's degree.
 - v. The review period for a Ph.D. shall be 150% of the expected time to completion established on approval of provisional status.
5. Chancellors establish procedures for the preparation, review, and approval of provisional programs within their Units ensuring appropriate faculty and student input.

G. 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. Additional extensions may be requested.

5. The provisional to established proposal is brought to CCAO for comment and endorsement.

6. The Chancellor 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.

7. An established program which desires to change to a new type of degree (e.g. BA to BS, AS in xx to AS in zz) with minimal change to degree requirements may be approved by the President. However, if such a change requires significant resources or change in the CIP code, a full program proposal must be submitted.

H. Program Stop-Outs and Terminations.

1. A program may be stopped out by the Chancellor if it is:

a. Scheduled for termination and requires a period to teach out existing students in the program;

b. Temporarily stopped out while the curriculum is redesigned;

c. Appears on the small program list for five (5) years and after a program review.

2. A stopped out program is noted as stopped out but is not removed from the official list of degrees and certificates.

3. A program may be terminated by the President if:

a. Termination is recommended by the program or;

b. The program appears on the small program list and if termination is recommended as the result of a program review.

c. 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.

d. A terminated program is removed from the official list of degrees and certificates.

e. The Chancellor recommends such action to the President.

V. Delegation of Authority

VI. Contact Information



Office of the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy, 956-6897,
ovpapp@hawaii.edu

VII. 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 Planning and Policy (VPAPP) for review by the UH Officers. The VPAPP 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