Procedures for Administrative Review of New Academic Programs and Remote Courses
September 12, 2018

The Graduate and Undergraduate Deans have developed the following procedures after discussions with the Executive Vice Chancellor – Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor – Health Sciences, Vice Chancellor – Marine Sciences, Chancellor, and the Academic Senate.

Currently, proposals for new academic programs are submitted to the appropriate Academic Senate committee (Graduate or Undergraduate Council and, for graduate programs, Planning and Budget); these committees are charged with evaluating the academic aspects of these programs, but often lack sufficient information to evaluate programs' resource requirements. For this reason, there seems to be a consensus that new program proposals could benefit from clarifying and formalizing the administrative review process to ensure programs are adequately resourced. In addition, the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) now requires that new programs (graduate programs and undergraduate majors) undergo a screening process to determine whether they involve a substantive change (in which case, they would require a WSCUC substantive change review).[1] The below administrative process has been implemented after Senate review, to facilitate WSCUC screening and to ensure that resource implications are documented consistently to inform Academic Senate review, and will be supported by formalized planning and routing procedures for new academic programs that are discussed below.

Contents of proposals to establish new undergraduate and graduate degree programs (including minors and specializations) and for the approval of new remote courses or degree programs:

In addition to the materials required for Academic Senate review, a proposal for a new program or to convert a course or program to a remote format should include an administrative cover package that will initiate WSCUC prescreening (if required), allow a financial analysis of the proposed program, and finalize commitments for any additional resources necessary to launch the program. Please note that curricular revisions do not require this additional administrative review process unless they require substantial additional resources (FTE/teaching materials) that the department/program is unable to self-fund.

Administrative cover package

1. A cover sheet with signatures documenting routing of the proposal and approvals, according to the appropriate routing order (see attached): from the Chair, to the Divisional/School Dean, to the Graduate or Undergraduate Dean and to the appropriate academic VCs (EVC-AA, VC-HS, and/or VC-MS, depending on program details). Online and/or hybrid courses and programs also require approval from the Center for Digital Learning, within the Teaching + Learning Commons

---

[1] All new degree programs require WSCUC screening to determine if a substantive change review is required. This screening is typically done in within 30 days. If a substantive change review is required, WSCUC recommends allowing at least six months. Some non-degree programs may require substantive change review, as may existing programs that change significantly. Factors that trigger a substantive change review include the use of modalities not already employed by other programs (e.g. distance or on-line, referred to here as 'remote'). Changing a single course to distance or on-line learning will not require screening, but significant changes in a program might.

(secured prior to routing to the Divisional/School Dean). Interdisciplinary programs should be reviewed by and signatures obtained from each Dean and Chair[2]. The Graduate or Undergraduate Dean will notify the Academic Senate when this administrative review process is started. Departments should plan on approximately one month for this review. Please note that additional time may be required if significant revisions are required.

2. A budget proposal prepared in collaboration with the Resource Administration Office(s) for the lead academic VC and in consultation with the Resource Administration Office(s) of other involved academic VCs. For self-supporting programs, see http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/sso/SAPD/Resources/FinancialModelTool

3. Letters documenting any additional resource commitments from the Divisional/School Dean and/or academic VC(s).

4. The following information, in succinct form (for WSCUC screening):

   a. Proposed program start date
   b. A short description of the program
   c. Modality of program (e.g. on-site, distance learning, on-line; if not on-site only, indicate the percentage of alternative modalities)
   d. Two most closely related programs at UC San Diego
   e. The number of new courses required for this program
   f. The number of new faculty required for the program
   g. Significant additional equipment or facilities needed for the program
   h. Significant additional financial resources needed for the program
   i. Significant additional library/learning resources needed

Academic Senate Review materials

Information to be included in proposals for new graduate programs can be found in the following Academic Senate document (sections B and C): https://senate.ucsd.edu/media/324445/graduate-council-new-degree-program-proposal-guidelines_updated-111815.pdf

Information to be included in proposals for new undergraduate programs can be found in the following Academic Senate document (section B): http://senate.ucsd.edu/media/180712/ugc-proposal-procedures-for-new-majors-and-minors.pdf

Additional information concerning the planning process and systemwide review can be found in the University of California Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units: https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/compendium_sept2014.pdf

---

[2] Interdisciplinary programs housed in Centers that do not report to one or more Divisional Deans should obtain the approval of the Center Director and the individual to whom the Center Director reports (as determined by the EVC/Chancellor).

Planning and routing process for graduate programs, specializations and remote courses

Planning process[3]:

1. A meeting to discuss proposal contents, format, and timeline with the Graduate Division and Academic Senate staff; for online or hybrid courses and programs, this meeting will include the Teaching + Learning Commons Center for Digital Learning to discuss platform, assessment, identity verification and best practices.

2. A meeting with the Resource Administration Office(s) of the appropriate academic VC(s) to finalize the budget details and discuss additional resource commitments (as needed).

3. A review of the draft proposal by the Graduate Division before routing.

4. The Divisional/School Dean approves the draft proposal, resource requirements, and, if needed, additional Divisional/School resource commitments before routing.

5. If necessary, the appropriate academic VC(s) make additional resource commitments before routing.

Proposed administrative routing:

1. The Department Chair submits the draft proposal to the Divisional/School and Graduate Deans, the academic VC(s) Resource Administration Office(s) for resource analysis, and, for online or hybrid courses and programs, the Teaching + Learning Commons Center for Digital Learning.

2. The Divisional/School Dean confirms resource requirements (e.g. space, faculty, administrative support, etc.); any additional commitments from the Divisional/School Dean are documented with a formal letter, which is included in the proposal and communicated to the appropriate academic VC(s).

3. Any additional resource commitments from the academic VC(s) are documented with a formal letter, which is included in the proposal and communicated to the Divisional/School Dean.

4. The final proposal is approved by the Divisional/School Dean.

5. The Department Chair submits the final proposal to the Graduate Dean, the Dean of Undergraduate Education, and the Academic Senate.

   Programs should allow one month for the above steps; additional time may be required if revision is required.

6. The Dean of Undergraduate Education initiates the WSCUC substantive change screening.

---

[3] Note that this describes the current planning process for graduate programs.

7. The Academic Senate commences review according to its established procedures, and communicates with the Department Chair regarding proposal approval, questions, etc.

8. If approved by the Academic Senate Committee(s), the proposal is forwarded for consideration at a Representative Assembly meeting*[4]*.

9. If approved by the Divisional Senate, the proposal is forwarded to the Chancellor for endorsement and submission to the system-wide Academic Senate and the UC Office of the President, Academic Affairs*[5]*.

10. The systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) reviews the proposal; if the proposal represents a new degree title, it requires approval by the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

11. Simultaneously, the Provost & Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs reviews the proposal.

12. If approved by the systemwide Senate and Provost & Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs, the Provost forwards the proposal to the University President (or their designee in compliance with established policies) for final approval.[6]

13. If the WSCUC screening determines that a substantive change review is required, the Dean of Undergraduate Education oversees the review application.

Planning and routing process for undergraduate programs and remote courses

Planning process:

1. For online or hybrid courses and programs, a meeting with the Teaching + Learning Commons Center for Digital Learning to discuss platform, assessment, identity verification and best practices

2. A meeting with Divisional/School Dean (or College Provost) to discuss the draft proposal, resource requirements and, if needed, additional Divisional/School (or College) resource commitments

3. A meeting with the Resource Administration Office(s) of the appropriate academic VC(s) to finalize budget details and discuss additional resource commitments (as needed) before routing

4. A review of the draft proposal by the Dean of Undergraduate Education before routing

---

[4] Note that steps 7-12 describe the current Academic Senate and UCOP review process for graduate programs.
[5] Note that steps 9-13 are descripted in the Compendium https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/compendium_sept2014.pdf
[6] Final approval depends on the successful completion of a WSCUC substantive change review, if such a review is required.

Proposed routing:

1. The Department Chair submits the draft proposal to Divisional/School Dean (or College Provost), the Dean of Undergraduate Education, the academic VC(s) Resource Administration Office(s) for resource analysis, and, for online or hybrid courses and programs, the Teaching + Learning Commons Center for Digital Learning.

2. The Divisional/School Dean (or College Provost) confirms resource requirements (e.g. space, faculty, administrative support, etc.); any additional commitments are documented with a formal letter, which is included in the proposal and communicated to the appropriate academic VC(s).

3. Any additional resource commitments from the academic VC(s) are documented with a formal letter, which is included in the proposal and communicated to the Divisional/School Dean (or College Provost).

4. The final proposal is approved by the Divisional/School Dean (or College Provost).

5. The Department Chair submits the final proposal to the Dean of Undergraduate Education and the Undergraduate Council.

Programs should allow one month for the above steps; additional time may be required if revision is required.

6. The Dean of Undergraduate Education initiates WSCUC substantive change screening.

7. The Undergraduate Council communicates with the Department Chair regarding proposal approval, questions, etc.

8. If approved by the Undergraduate Council, the program is approved.[7]

9. If the WSCUC screening determines that a substantive change review is required, the Dean of Undergraduate Education oversees the review application.

---

[7] See footnote 6