

STOCKTON UNIVERSITY

PROCEDURE

Academic Program Proposal, Maintenance, and Closure
Procedure Administrator: Provost/Associate Provost Authority: Effective Date: Index Cross-References: Policy Procedure File Number: 2040 Approved By:

PURPOSE

This document describes the procedures authorized by the Stockton Board of Trustees (BOT) and the State of New Jersey for obtaining approval of new degree-granting programs (or academic offerings expanded from one type of program/offering to another: concentration-minor-certificate-major-baccalaureate-masters-doctoral), for communicating changes in curriculum and/or programs to the campus community and to the state, for managing programs during their life cycle, and for initiating/completing program closure.

All the options outlined throughout the life cycle of academic programs are subject to the terms and conditions of the Master Agreement between the Council of New Jersey State College Locals, AFT, AFL-CIO, and the State of New Jersey.

DEFINITIONS

Academic Issues Committee (AIC)

The AIC is the state committee that reviews all degree-granting programs and other academic offerings at colleges and universities in the state of New Jersey. This committee is a subcommittee of the New Jersey Presidents' Council (NJPC). The AIC sends recommendations for approval/non-approval of the new programs it reviews to the NJPC.

Academic Program

According to the Office of the (NJ) Secretary of Higher Education, a program is an academic curriculum that culminates in a degree (BA, BS, BFA, MA, MS, MBA, MFA, EdD, DPT, DNP, PhD, etc.). At Stockton, the Liberal Studies Bachelor of Arts ([LIBA](#)) is also considered a degree program.

Other Academic Offerings

1. In-Program Minor

An in-program minor consists of a minimum of five courses in a program. At Stockton, some programs specify courses for a minor whereas other programs allow students to choose their own five program courses to complete the minor. Stockton students declare in-program minors, and they appear on the student's official transcript; however, a student does not receive a degree for the minor; a student only receives a degree in a major program of study.

2. Interdisciplinary Minor

An interdisciplinary minor consists of a minimum of five General Studies courses or a minimum of five courses in more than a single program. Interdisciplinary minors do not usually have a corresponding degree-granting major. At Stockton, students declare interdisciplinary minors, and they appear on the student's official transcript; however, a student does not receive a degree for the minor; a student only receives a degree in a major program of study.

3. Concentration/Track/Area of Specialization

A concentration (or terminology such as track or area of specialization) constitutes a cluster of four or more courses within a program. At Stockton, a concentration and a track are the same type of academic offering. Concentrations and tracks do appear on a student's official transcript.

4. Area of Interest

An area of interest is used to prepare students for graduate study or for particular career. An area of interest consists of 2-4 courses in a major or minor focused on a field or discipline-specific topic. An area of interest does not appear on a student's official transcript and is not a graduation requirement.

5. Certificates

According to the Office of the (NJ) Secretary of Higher Education, an academic certificate that carries college credit is a curriculum, oftentimes vocationally focused or intended for personal enrichment, that culminates in an official award

or recognition from the University. Certificates appear on a student's official transcript.

6. P-12 Educational Endorsements

An endorsement is a group of courses in one or more majors and/or General Studies that meets the state Department of Education specifications for an official teaching endorsement. Endorsements do not appear on a student's official transcript.

7. Miscellaneous Academic Offerings

At Stockton, there are a number of offerings that do not fall into the categories above, but that are considered non-degree granting programs. Honors, First-Year Studies, First-Year Seminars, etc. constitute this type of offering. Some miscellaneous academic offerings appear on the student's official transcript (Honors), and others do not (First-Year Studies).

Advisory Body

The Deans Council and the Provost Council are advisory bodies to the Provost. As advisory bodies, both provide input that the Provost may consider in making recommendations regarding academic programs to the Board of Trustees.

Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies (LIBA)

The LIBA is a customizable degree program that permits students to create a fully individualized curriculum of study created from courses within an academic School or by expanding an interdisciplinary minor into a curriculum similar to a major. A prompt/pathway is not synonymous with a concentration. The LIBA degree will appear on a student's official transcript; however, the specific prompt/pathway will not appear on a student's official transcript.

Board of Trustees (BOT)

Stockton University is governed by its Board of Trustees, which currently consists of twelve members: nine New Jersey citizens, all voting members appointed by the Governor of New Jersey; the President of the University, a non-voting member; and two student representatives elected by the student body, one of whom serves as the voting student representative and the other as the student alternate, a non-voting member. The BOT reviews and approves new programs before they are presented to the state AIC committee.

Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Planning Committee (BOTAAP)

The Academic Affairs and Planning Committee ensures the consistency and alignment of Stockton's academic programs with the University's mission and strategic planning priorities.

Classification of Instructional Programs Codes (CIP)

CIP codes are a system for cataloguing instructional programs with the purpose to facilitate the organization, collection, and reporting of fields of study and program completions. Most of the CIP titles correspond to academic and occupational instructional programs offered for credit at a college or university. The CIP code is the accepted federal government statistical standard on instructional program classifications and is used in a variety of education information surveys and databases.

External Governance

External governance refers specifically to the AIC and the NJPC.

For Your Information (FYI) Items

FYI items are academic offerings other than degree-granting programs that must progress through internal and external review processes; however, they progress through review processes for information purposes only.

Internal Governance

Internal governance refers to Stockton's shared governance structure. Most major changes and initiatives move through shared governance for input and to achieve the broadest communication and outreach. At Stockton, shared governance includes the Deans Council, the Provost Council, Faculty Senate, and the BOT. Depending on the type of project, those seeking input and communication might present the change and initiative to program, School-based, Divisional, or University-wide committees or task forces.

New Jersey Presidents' Council (NJPC)

The NJPC represents New Jersey's public, private, and community colleges and universities. The NJPC is made up of the presidents of the state's public and independent institutions of higher education that receive state aid. The presidents of the proprietary schools and the presidents of the two largest religious institutions also serve to represent the interest of all such schools. The Council's charge is to make recommendations on new programs, regional alliances, budget and student aid levels, licensure, and the statewide higher education master plan.

Program Change/Consolidation

Refers to actions such as revising a program at one degree level for another degree level (i e., a BS for an MS), usually done in response to accreditation standards, or combining two distinct programs into a single program.

Program Closure

Dissolving the program, usually after a period of program suspension or in the case of financial exigency.

Program Suspension

The program will stop accepting new students.

Recommending Body

The Academic Programs and Planning Committee of the Faculty is a recommending body to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate is a recommending body to the Provost. The Provost recommends to the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Planning Committee. The Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Planning Committee recommends to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees writes a resolution, indicating its support for the BOTAAP's recommendation. The Office of the Provost staff includes the BOT resolution in the packet that is sent to the AIC committee. The AIC committee reviews the proposal and makes its recommendation to the NJPC. The NJPC approves or does not approve the program/offering. If the NJPC approves the program/offering, it writes a resolution indicating its approval. If the NJPC does not approve a program/offering, it writes a note to the institution explaining the NJPC's decision. A recommending body offers formal support or objection to moving a proposal to the next level of internal or external governance. Formal support can include a resolution, a memo, a scheduled meeting with notes, etc.

NEW PROGRAM/OFFERING GENERATION: PROGRAM PROPOSAL

New degree-granting programs generally emanate from faculty members. However, new programs may also evolve from demonstrated need identified by the University administration, Admissions, and Continuing Studies, as well as marketing or research officials at the University. Changes in specialized fields, for instance, may necessitate a change from an interdisciplinary minor to a specialized/focused program. Accreditors, too, can request curriculum/program changes that result in a new degree-granting program requiring review and approval.

Review and Approval Processes

The review and approval processes have three aims:

1. To communicate the new program/offering to the University community through the internal governance structures on campus.
2. To provide helpful comments to the faculty members involved in the development of the new degree-granting program.
3. For the Provost to recommend and the New Jersey Presidents' Council (NJPC) to approve the new degree-granting program.

The final approval process has one internal steps of shared governance and two external steps:

1. First, recommendation by the Provost, which means that the proposal moves forward to the Stockton University Board of Trustees (BOT).
2. Second, after approval by the BOT, the proposal moves to the Academic Issues Committee (AIC) of the New Jersey Presidents' Council (NJPC).
3. Third, upon recommendation from the AIC, the proposal moves to the NJPC for its approval.

Internal Review

Step 1: Deans Council Review

Because the creation of new degree-granting programs can affect faculty and programs/offering in other Schools, faculty proposing a new degree-granting program should first present the proposal to the Deans Council. The Deans Council is an advisory body. The Deans will provide feedback to the faculty member proposing the new degree-granting program regarding duplication, competition, potential stress on faculty and programs, limits to increasing enrollment in courses/programs, etc. This step is to provide background, support, and create awareness of potential issues before the proposal moves forward to the Academic Programs and Planning (APP) Committee of the Faculty Senate. If the Deans would benefit from additional documentation, they may request it at this time.

All new programs and offerings should have the appropriate School Dean's support, as well as letters of support from all Deans, and program faculty, affected by the new program (i.e., Dean of the School housing the program, Deans of Schools with programs impacted by the new program, and the faculty members of impacted programs). If a new degree-granting program requires new faculty lines, the letter from the Dean housing the program should include a statement from the Dean that indicates their willingness or unwillingness to seek a faculty line for the new program. Deans' letters should be included in the new degree-granting program proposal as it moves through internal and external governance.

Step 2: Academic Programs and Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate (APP) Review

The APP committee is a recommending body of the Faculty Senate. Its role is to assist faculty in developing new degree-granting programs.

All faculty proposing new degree-granting programs will submit a proposal to the APP Committee of the Faculty Senate. APP Committee members review the proposal and provide written feedback to the Faculty Senate.

The Committee completes two readings of each proposal over a minimum period of two months, so the faculty presenting the proposal have an opportunity to revise the proposal after the first reading and in preparation for the second reading, before the proposal moves to the full Faculty Senate for review.

After the second reading, the APP Committee will include a review of the status of the proposal, and strengths and weaknesses, for any new degree-granting programs the APP Committee has twice reviewed in its monthly report to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Step 3: Faculty Senate Review and Provost Council Review

Faculty Senate Review

The Faculty Senate is a recommending body. Its role is to assist faculty in new program development by reviewing new program proposals and offering helpful guidance about next steps in the internal shared governance process and the state approval process, and suggestions for revisions to proposal content and formatting.

After APP review, the Chair of the APP Committee will include a review of the status, and strengths and weaknesses, of any new degree-granting programs the APP Committee has twice reviewed in its monthly report to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee reviews the proposal and any comments forwarded from the Chair of the APP Committee and decides whether to put review of the proposal on the agenda of an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. Forwarding the proposal does not mean that the APP necessarily endorses the program. If the Faculty Senate Executive Committee decides not to put the proposal on the Faculty Senate agenda, the committee will send the proposal back to the APP committee for further review.

In cases where the Executive Committee moves the proposal forward for a full Faculty Senate review, the Faculty Senate will typically conduct two readings. After the second reading, the Faculty Senate will vote to recommend or not to recommend the new degree-granting proposal and forward its recommendation to the Provost. The Faculty

Senate's recommendation to the Provost will include the following information: strengths of the new degree-granting program, weaknesses of the new degree-granting program, concerns, and challenges.

Reviews from the APP Committee and from the Faculty Senate will move the proposal onto the Provost. The Provost will review all recommendations from the Faculty Senate, the APP Committee (see Step 2), and Provost Council.

Faculty Senate review and Provost Council review can occur concurrently.

Provost Council Review

The Provost Council is an advisory body. It consists of School Deans, Directors of Centers and Institutes, Directors of instructional sites, Directors of offices in Academic Affairs, Office of the Provost managers, and Union and Faculty Senate representatives. One of its roles is to assist the Provost in new program development by reviewing new program proposals and offering helpful suggestions for revisions to proposal content and formatting.

A faculty member and Dean, or another administrator, work together to present the new degree-granting program to the Provost Council. Provost Council review of a proposal for new program/offering can occur in the same timeframe as Faculty Senate review of the proposal. The Provost Council members offer comments and suggestions during the presentation of the new degree-granting program. This feedback is forwarded to the Provost, and the Provost follows up, as necessary, with other relevant bodies.

Step 4: Provost's Review

The Provost Council review provides the Provost with information that, in conjunction with the Faculty Senate review, helps the Provost make the decision to recommend/not recommend the new degree-granting program to the Board of Trustees. The Provost will make the decision to recommend/not recommend subsequent to receiving feedback from both the Provost Council and the Faculty Senate. The Provost shall not submit a recommendation with one or more pending reviews from Provost Council or Faculty Senate.

If the Provost recommends the new degree-granting program, the staff in the Office of the Provost prepare a resolution and executive summary for an upcoming Board of Trustees meeting.

The Provost can also not recommend the new degree-granting program. In that case, the faculty proposing the new program can continue to work on the proposal and

resubmit at a step in the process indicated by the Provost or can choose to discard the proposal. At any point in time, a faculty member may resurrect the proposal, revise it, and submit it through internal governance beginning at Step I.

The Provost may also recommend that Hanover conduct a study of labor market and regional demand for the program.

Step 5: Board of Trustees Review

The Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Planning (BOTAPP) Committee reviews an executive summary and resolution from the Provost's Office at one of its regularly scheduled meetings. If a BOT resolution is necessary, the BOT signs it, and the resolution appears in the BOT materials. That signed resolution should be added to the proposal packet that the staff in the Office of the Provost sends to the Academic Issues Committee (AIC) of the New Jersey Presidents' Council (NJPC).

Step 6: External Approval

Once the BOT meets and gives its support to the new degree-granting program, the faculty members proposing a new degree-granting program work with the staff in the Office of the Provost to prepare a proposal packet for distribution to NJPC. The presidents have a month to write letters of support or letters of objection to the new program proposal. The letters become part of the new program proposal packet. Following the month-long review by the presidents, the AIC reviews the proposal and forwards its recommendation to the NJPC for its approval.

New degree-granting programs receive full vetting by the AIC; however, academic offerings that do not culminate in a degree (e.g., minors) appear on the AIC agenda as For Your Information (FYI) items. FYI items do not require the same proposal packet as required for new degree-granting programs. The staff in the Office of the Provost submits FYI items to the AIC.

Proposal packets going to the state for review and approval should conform to the guidelines and format in the current *Academic Issues Committee Manual*.

For Your Information (FYI) Items

Academic offerings other than degree-granting programs must progress through internal and external review processes; however, they progress through review processes for information purposes only. FYI items include the following types of offerings:

1. In-program minors
2. Interdisciplinary minors

3. Concentrations/tracks/areas of interest/areas of specialization
4. Certificates
5. Educational endorsements.

The faculty proposing the new offering should present it to the Deans Council, APP Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the Provost Council for communication purposes. Each entity requires only a single reading, as the presentation is for information only. The new offering is also presented to the BOTAPP Committee as an FYI item. As well, the proposal is sent to the AIC committee of the NJPC as an FYI item. Faculty members proposing academic offerings other than degree-granting programs should consult the staff in the Office of the Provost to clarify the requirements for the presentation of non-degree-granting programs to internal and external governance.

MANAGING PROGRAMS DURING THEIR LIFE CYCLE: PROGRAM MAINTENANCE

Program Maintenance

Annual Program Reports: Each spring, the Office of Institutional Research prepares data workbooks for each degree-granting and non-degree-granting academic program, to be used in annual program reports. Completion of these annual reports is required and is specified in a locally-negotiated agreement.

Five-Year Program Review: Similarly, on a five-year calendar maintained by the Office of the Provost, approximately 20 percent of all programs (including disciplinary majors, interdisciplinary minors, the LIBA degree, and miscellaneous academic offerings) will undertake a five-year program review each year. The Office of Institutional Research prepares data workbooks for each degree-granting and non-degree-granting academic program according to the five-year calendar. These reports are required and are specified in a locally-negotiated agreement.

The LIBA five-year review will contain an analysis of the numbers of students over time creating customized curriculums. The five-year review will also include recommendations, if appropriate, for any LIBA prompt/pathway or concentration to develop into a stand-alone major. The faculty interested in exploring the development of the stand-alone major can request a feasibility study or a market scan from an external research consultant by contacting the staff in the Office of the Provost.

External Accreditation: A locally-negotiated agreement contains provisions for programs responsible for maintaining external accreditation. Faculty representatives from the program should consult that agreement for the most current guidelines.

Some of the following actions require review or approval by internal and external governance or FYI communication to internal and external governance.

Identifying and Changing Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code

All degree granting programs and credit-bearing certificate programs have an assigned/selected six-digit Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code. The code functions as an identifier and is used for tracking and reporting data such as program completions.

New program proposals identify the CIP code before submitting a proposal to the Dean's Council. That CIP code appears on the New Jersey State Program Inventory after the program is approved by NJCP.

When a program changes its CIP code, that information needs to be communicated through Stockton internal governance as outlined above in Step 6 and to the state of New Jersey via a For Your Information (FYI) item to the Academic Issues Committee (AIC) of the New Jersey Presidents' Council (NJPC).

Deans and program faculty should contact the Office of the Provost regarding the processes for identifying an initial CIP code or reporting a CIP code change to the AIC.

Program Revision

Program revision can include updating or redesigning curriculum. Some program revisions occur at the program level and do not necessitate internal or external governance; other revisions are subject to review and approval through the procedures outlined above for FYI items. For instance, a curriculum revision that does not result in a new degree-granting program and that does not impact enrollments or scheduling in other programs will not require review by internal governance bodies. However, a revision that results in substantial curriculum changes and that may result in a new degree-granting program or impact enrollments or scheduling in other programs should pass through internal governance. Revisions that result in a new degree-granting program or an FYI Item must pass through internal governance and must also be presented to the AIC and the NJPC.

Changes Requiring Review	Changes Not Requiring Review
Revision that results in substantial curriculum changes	Curriculum revision that does not result in a new degree-granting program
Revision that results in a new degree-granting program	Curriculum revision that does not impact enrollments or scheduling in other programs
Revision that impacts enrollments or scheduling in other programs (internal review only)	
FYI Items or changes to CIP codes	

Timeframe: The process for revision, updating, and redesign is ongoing and a regular part of faculty responsibility.

Initiation: Faculty members or the School Dean may initiate a meeting with all relevant stakeholders to discuss the program revision.

Vote: Faculty who teach courses in the program vote by simple majority to recommend revision, updating, and redesign, unless program bylaws specify other procedures for voting on curriculum changes. If a majority of faculty members vote for revision, updating, and redesign, this procedure advances to the Dean. If the vote impacts other programs, notice of the vote and its results must be submitted to the appropriate Dean(s) and Dean’s Council. If a majority of faculty do not vote for revision, updating, and redesign, faculty meet with the Dean to consider other options.

Acceptance or Rejection: The School Dean may reject or accept a faculty vote to revise, update, and redesign a program. If the Dean and the faculty disagree, the Dean meets with faculty to consider other options.

Implementation: Faculty work with the School Dean and other administrative units to implement the best program revision options. Options might include: creating a new delivery method, revising the curriculum, developing new agreements with county colleges or high schools, revamping the focus of the program/offering, or following

other recommendations made in the context of a five-year review. The Dean will provide assistance to the faculty in accordance with the Master Agreement and all local agreements in place during the period of program revision, updating, and redesign.

Workload: Faculty continue to teach and precept, as they have in the past, during the period of revision, updating, and redesign. If appropriate, the School Dean can make in-load assignments, within the parameters of existing agreements, to facilitate the revision, updating, and redesign.

Monitoring: During the revision, updating, and redesign period, the faculty and Dean will meet at least once to monitor the impact of the revision, updating, and redesign efforts on other programs and additional administrative units and notify any affected units, including the Center for Learning Design , Financial Aid, Academic Advising, etc.

Enrollment: During the revision, updating, and redesign period, the program faculty and Dean will meet at least once to develop enrollment strategies in line with the University's mission statement.

PROGRAM SUSPENSION, CHANGE/CONSOLIDATION, OR CLOSURE: **PROGRAM CLOSURE**

During periods of stagnation, decline, or other appropriate reason such as discipline or pedagogical shifts, program faculty or faculty teaching courses in the academic program consult with their School Dean to evaluate the necessity of pursuing any of the following options: suspension, change/consolidation, or closure. Faculty members and their School Dean might also consider these options when a field of study has experienced significant change.

Suspension

Suspension means that the program will stop accepting new students so that the School Dean and program faculty can consider options.

Timeframe: The process for suspension takes four semesters.

Initiation: Faculty members or the School Dean may initiate a meeting with all relevant stakeholders to discuss program suspension. A representative from the program faculty notifies the APP Committee of the Faculty Senate about this meeting for informational purposes. The Dean notifies the Provost and Provost Council of this meeting for informational purposes.

Vote: Faculty who teach courses in the program vote by simple majority to recommend suspension, unless the program bylaws specify other procedures for voting on curriculum changes. If a majority of faculty members vote for suspension, this procedure advances to the Dean. If a majority of faculty do not vote for suspension, the program faculty meet with the Dean to consider other options. The Dean or representative from the program faculty notifies the APP Committee of the Faculty Senate about the outcome of the vote for informational purposes. The Dean notifies the Provost and Provost Council of the outcome of the vote for informational purposes.

Acceptance or Rejection: The School Dean may reject or accept a faculty vote to suspend a program. If the Dean and the faculty disagree, the Dean meets with faculty to consider other options. The Dean also notifies the Provost and the Provost Council of the outcome of the meeting for informational purposes.

The Provost may accept or reject the School Dean's recommendation for suspension. If the Provost rejects the recommendation, the Dean and the faculty meet with the Provost to consider other options.

Implementation: If the faculty, the School Dean, and the Provost agree to suspend the program, the Dean notifies Admissions to cease recruiting new students for the program. The suspension process takes four semesters, during which time the Provost assesses the merits of suspension and decides either to maintain the program or to initiate a path to consolidation or closure. The Dean will provide assistance to the faculty in accordance with the Master Agreement and all local agreements in place during the period of program suspension.

Workload: Faculty continue to teach and precept, as they have in the past, during the four-semester period of suspension. If appropriate, the School Dean can make in-load assignments, within the parameters of existing agreements, to facilitate progress toward goals set for the suspension period. During the four-semester period of suspension, faculty members meet with the Dean and Admissions to reach a decision about maintaining the program or initiating pathways to consolidation or closure.

Change or Consolidation

Programs that experience a serious reduction in enrollment over an extended period of time or a dramatic shift in the discipline/field may consider change or consolidation, if suspension of the program is not an option. Student demand or trends in the field

may also lead to change or consolidation. Among the possible types of change or consolidation are:

1. Merging of programs/offerings
2. Recasting a minor to a concentration within an undergraduate major
3. Recasting an undergraduate major to a minor
4. Discontinuing an undergraduate major when a MA/MS becomes the required degree in the field
5. Discontinuing a MA/MS when a doctoral degree becomes the required degree in the field
6. Recasting a very specific MA/MS program to a concentration within a more general MA/MS program

Timeframe: There is no specific timeframe for change or consolidation.

Initiation: Faculty members or the School Dean may initiate a meeting with all relevant stakeholders to discuss program change or consolidation. A representative from the program faculty notifies the APP Committee of the Faculty Senate about this meeting for informational purposes. The Dean notifies the Provost and Provost Council of this meeting for informational purposes.

Multi-Program Meeting: When change or consolidation involves decision-making by more than one program, faculty members of the affected programs meet to discuss possible types of change or paths to consolidation.

Vote: Faculty who teach courses in the program vote by simple majority to recommend change or consolidation, unless the program bylaws specify other procedures for voting on change or consolidation. If a majority of faculty members vote for change or consolidation, this procedure advances to the Dean. If a majority of faculty do not vote for change or consolidation, the faculty meet with the Dean to consider other options. The Dean or representative from the program faculty notifies the APP Committee of the Faculty Senate about the outcome of the vote for informational purposes. The Dean notifies the Provost and Provost Council of the outcome of the vote for informational purposes.

Acceptance or Rejection: The Dean may reject or accept a faculty vote to change or consolidate a program. If the Dean and the faculty disagree, the Dean meets with faculty to consider other options. The Dean also notifies the Provost and the Provost Council of the outcome for informational purposes.

The Provost may accept or reject the Dean's recommendation for change or consolidation. If the Provost rejects the recommendation, the Dean and the faculty meet with the Provost to consider other options.

Implementation: Faculty work with the Dean and other administrative units to implement the best program change or consolidation options. The Dean will provide assistance to the faculty in accordance with the Master Agreement and all local agreements in place during the period of program change or consolidation.

Notification: If all parties agree to the change or consolidation, the Dean notifies Admissions, Academic Advising, the Office of the Registrar, Academic Affairs, and the Office of Institutional Research of the expected timeline for the change or consolidation and any other relevant details.

Workload: Faculty continue to teach and precept, as they have in the past, while the change or consolidation is in progress. During that time, faculty and the Dean notify students of the change or consolidation and of their options for matriculating in the changed or consolidated program.

Closure

Programs may consider closure, dissolving the program, as a final resort, if suspension of the program or change/consolidation are not viable options.

Timeframe: There is no specific timeframe for closure.

Initiation: Faculty members or the Dean may initiate a meeting to discuss program closure. For informational purposes, a representative from the program faculty notifies the APP Committee of the Faculty Senate of this meeting while the Dean notifies the Provost and Provost Council of this meeting.

Vote: Faculty who teach courses in the program vote by simple majority to recommend closure, unless the program bylaws specify other procedures for voting on curriculum changes. If a majority of faculty members vote for closure, this procedure advances to the Dean. If a majority of faculty do not vote for closure, the faculty meet with the Dean to consider other options. The Dean or representative from the program faculty notifies the APP Committee of the Faculty Senate about the outcome of the vote for informational purposes. The Dean notifies the Provost and Provost Council of the outcome of the vote for informational purposes.

Given that program closure is a serious decision, it requires steps that overlap and allow for reconsideration:

Acceptance or Rejection: The Dean may reject or accept a faculty vote to close a program. If the Dean and the faculty disagree, the Dean meets with faculty to consider other options. The Dean also notifies the Provost and the Provost Council of the outcome of this meeting.

Faculty Senate Level: The Provost formally notifies the Faculty Senate President of the results of the vote and the Faculty Senate President formally refers the closure proposal to the APP Committee for review. The APP Committee carries out two readings of the closure proposal, usually over the course of two months, and makes a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate completes two readings of the closure proposal, usually over the course of two months. After the second reading, the Faculty Senate votes on a recommendation regarding closure.

The President of the Faculty Senate notifies the APP Committee and the Dean of its recommendation. The Dean communicates the Faculty Senate's recommendations to the Provost. The Dean also notifies the Provost Council of the Faculty Senate's recommendation for informational purposes.

Provost Level: The Provost may accept or reject a recommendation for closure of a program.

President Level: The President maintains final authority regarding closure of a program and may accept or reject a recommendation from the Provost for closure of a program.

Detailed Plan: If a program closes, the faculty and Dean draft a detailed plan for future roles of all faculty or staff currently considered to be part of that program. In addition, the program notifies faculty and staff of the plan for closure. All parties recognize the critical importance of the closure plan for affected faculty and staff and the significance of ensuring them the opportunity to continue employment with Stockton University. Each affected faculty and staff member, in accordance with Master and local agreements, has the opportunity to move to a similar position in another program or academic unit.

Notification: When the Provost receives the plan for closure, the Provost notifies all appropriate administrative offices, including the Office of the President, the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Planning Committee, Admissions, the Center for

Academic Advising, Financial Aid, Human Resources, as well as the Deans and faculty of affected academic programs, the Office of the Registrar, and the Office of Institutional Research.

Board of Trustees Decision: The Board of Trustees has the opportunity to review the plan for closure and decide to accept/not accept the plan. After the Board of Trustees makes its decision, the Provost notifies the Academic Issues Committee of the New Jersey President's Council of the Board of Trustees decision and forwards the Board of Trustees' signed resolution regarding closure.

Workload: Faculty continue to teach and precept, as they have in the past, while the discussion about closure and the closure plan is in progress. Faculty and the Dean notify students of the plan for closure and of their options for continuing their undergraduate or graduate education.

Approval History	Date
Deans Council	
Provost Council	
Faculty Senate	
Provost	
President	