

**Andrews University  
Undergraduate Council**

**OFFICERS**

Margarita Mattingly, Chair  
Tiffany Summerscales, Vice-chair  
Shanna Leak, Recorder

**SUPPORT STAFF**

Proposed Document Manager

**MEMBERS**

Niels-Erik Andreasen  
Michelle Bacchiocchi  
Verlyn Benson  
Lorena Bidwell\*  
Gary Burdick  
Carey Carscallen  
Erhard Gallos  
Emilio Garcia-Marenko  
Jim Jeffery  
Kris Knutson\*  
Gunnar Lovhoiden  
Andrea Luxton  
Ben Maguad  
Keith Mattingly  
Don May  
Lynn Merklin  
Diane Myers  
Najeeb Nakhle\*  
Lawrence Onsager\*  
Ray Ostrander  
Stephen Payne\*  
Monique Pittman  
Larry Schalk\*  
Dina Simmons  
Allen Stembridge  
Douglas Taylor  
Alayne Thorpe  
Carmelita Troy  
Kristen Von Maur  
Dominique Wakefield  
Gary Williams\*  
Jeannie Wolfer

\*Advisory

**SCHEDULED MEETINGS 3:30p NH143**

Monthly on 1<sup>st</sup> Mondays

Fall 2011: 3Oct – 7Nov – 5Dec

Spring 2012: 9Jan – 6Feb – 5Mar – 2Apr

Summer 2012: 7May – 4Jun

**STEERING COMMITTEE**

Margarita Mattingly - Chair  
Tiffany Summerscales - Vice-chair & PDRC  
Shanna Leak - Recorder & Admissions  
TBD - Academic Policies  
Don May - General Education  
Monique Pittman - Honors

**SCHEDULED MEETINGS 2:00pm BH106**

Monthly on 3<sup>rd</sup> Mondays

Fall 2011: 26Sep–24Oct –21Nov

Spring 2012: 19Dec -- 23Jan -- 20Feb--  
19Mar

Summer 2012: 23Apr – 21May

**WEBSITE**

<http://www.andrews.edu/go/ugcouncil>

**DOCUMENTS**

Y:\file4\Committees\Undergraduate Council

**AGENDA**

**5 December 2011 - 3:30p – Nethery Hall 143**

**1 DEVOTIONAL & PRAYER**

**2 MINUTES** for 7 November 2011 [Shanna Leak] {Page 4}

**3 COUNCIL RECORDER** Shanna Leak has agreed to serve the Council on a regular basis as recorder. She will make drafts of the UGC deliberations to record discussion and actions. Written motions or clarifications should be passed to her during our meeting or directly afterwards.

**4 STANDING COMMITTEE & SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITY**

- a. PDRC: *Process for Approval of New Programs* [Tiffany Summerscales] {Page 7}
- b. GE
- c. Academic Policies
- d. Admissions
- e. Honors

**5 SETTING MEMBERSHIP GUIDELINES** Our membership continues to grow. What do we see as the guiding principles for setting the membership of our council? How large is large enough? How much representation is enough? As the Working Policy and Terms of Reference are being reviewed, this is an opportune time to deliberate these questions in regards to our own committee. For example, the move of the Department of Engineering and Computer Science from COT to CAS displaces one of our members. COT is willing to reduce their representation. The Provost is considering a reduction in the number of nominees for small schools. What is our recommendation?

**6 UNDERGRADUATE FACULTY MEETING** It has been suggested by the Provost that in an age of email and other convenient means of communicating actions and disseminating information, it may be prudent to discontinue the expectation of an annual Undergraduate Faculty meeting as described in Working Policy. These meetings seem never to have been held in the past and there seems to be considerable resistance to adding more meetings into the campus calendar. The sentiment is that the Undergraduate Faculty, as the constituency of the Undergraduate Council, has ample opportunity to review minutes and information and make their objections known. Refraining from adding additional time commitments, particularly for such a large group, is a high priority. Discussion and a motion speaking to this issue is invited.

**7 BULLETIN COPY** The Office of Academic Records is to be commended for its deadline table {Page 15} and QuickGuide {Page 16}. It is however of some concern that the QuickGuide brings some items to a vote in UGC that in the past has been taken to the relevant school's curriculum and academic policies committee. One example is change of requirements, another is credit mounts for a major. Shall we accept or decline this assignment?

## STANDING COMMITTEES

### ACADEMIC POLICIES

David Nowack, Recorder & Acting Chair  
Lynn Bartlet  
Paula Dronen  
Emilio Garcia-Marenko  
Dwight Huslin  
Ante Jeronic  
Margarita Mattingly\*  
Don May  
Melchisedek Poniah  
Barbara Reid  
Leroy Ruhappatti  
Gary Williams

\*Guest Voting Member

### SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Monthly on 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursdays

Fall 2011: 13Oct – 12Nov -- 8Dec

Spring 2012: 12Jan -9Feb-8Mar-12Apr

Summer 2012: 10May

### ADMISSIONS

Shanna Leak, Chair  
Aaron Mouchon, Secretary  
Jeanette Bryson\*  
Carey Carscallen  
Randy Graves  
Duane Habenicht  
Kristine Knutson  
Stephen Payne  
Barbara Reid  
Charles Tidwell\*  
Carmelita Troy  
Lynelle Weldon  
Carletta Witzel  
Gary Wood\*

\*Advisory

### SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Bi-monthly on 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesdays

### General Education

Don May, Chair  
Cynthia Helms  
Monique Pittman  
Verlyn Benson  
Keith Mattingly  
Charles Tidwell  
Gordon Atkins  
Winston Craig  
Ivan Davis  
Carlos Flores  
Douglas Jones  
Oystein LaBianca  
Robert Moore  
Wayne Perry  
Glenn Russell  
David Steen  
Delyse Steyn  
Joseph Warren  
Armand Poblete  
Lee Davidson  
Katherine Koudele  
Lynn Merklin\*  
Gary Williams\*  
Jeannie Wolfer\*  
John Markovic  
Andrea Luxton  
Emilio Garcia-Marenko  
Allen Stenbridge

**8 UGC FILE MANAGEMENT** Dedicated space has been arranged with ITS for long term storage of UGC files: minutes, agendas and supporting documents, program reviews, manuals, handbooks, histories, terms of reference, standing committee materials, working papers, action trackers, correspondence, and any internal materials in play. It is proposed that only committee members currently listed in the Committee Database <http://commdb.andrews.edu> be able to map [\\file4\Committees\Undergraduate Council-\[ComID00413\]](\\file4\Committees\Undergraduate Council-[ComID00413]) onto their computers and have direct read access to these files. New members would automatically get this access, and outgoing members would lose that access at which time new members are entered into the database and old members are dropped. Committee officers and support staff of the UGC would have read/write/execute/modify permissions. Those permissions would also be automatically assigned according to the Committee Database officer entries. A new category of "support staff" would also be set up in the database to make it possible for administrative assistants or other support staff to manage the volume of documents that the UGC generates and must have readily available for reference. This model is being piloted by the UGC and is intended for broad use across campus for all committees. The executive assistant to the Provost, Mimi Weithers-Bruce, is responsible for maintaining the Committee Database. James Lim in ITS is responsible for maintaining permission structures and its connection with the Committee Database. Both Mimi and James have agreed to this structure.

Due to the UGC's unique responsibility to disseminate information, another dedicated space is also being developed at this time and should be ready in a week. This second space will be for long term storage of UGC files of a more public nature to make it available to the entire Undergraduate Faculty. Since Graduate Faculty are often interested and involved in UGC matters also, and since a great number of Graduate Faculty are also in the Undergraduate Faculty, it is proposed that all Andrews faculty and staff will have read access to this material through this fileserve (aka fileshare) which will be addressed as [\\file4\Committees\Undergraduate Council-\[ComID00413\]-PUBLIC](\\file4\Committees\Undergraduate Council-[ComID00413]-PUBLIC). A non-private web presence has still not been finalized for the UGC. And a link has not yet been made between the web and the PUBLIC fileshare.

It is appropriate at this time for us to decide who should have access to our information, what information should be available to them, what level of access they should have (ie whether they can see it, change it, delete it, etc). It is also appropriate at this time to approve the addition of another category of membership in order to make it possible for us to assign support staff to our committee to facilitate the management of our information. In particular, Rebecca Turk is nominated to be the first non-voting non-member support staff for the UGC, with proposed access to all our information for the purpose of maintaining and organizing it and disseminating it appropriately under the supervision of the UGC chair. She is temporarily working part time as an office assistant in the Department of Physics and is assigned to focus exclusively on UGC materials and assisting in their management. Does the Council approve her listing as Support Staff on the Committee Database? Her access would automatically cease at which time she no longer holds this status on the committee roll. Does the committee approve the permission and personnel structure and levels?

## STANDING COMMITTEES, Cont.

### Honors

Monique Pittman, Chair  
Karl Bailey  
Lael Caesar  
Lilianne Doukhan  
Leonard Gashugi  
Annetta Gibson  
James Hayward  
Shandelle Henson  
Katherine Koudele  
John Markovic  
Beverly Matiko  
Lionel Matthews  
Ruben Perez-Schulz  
David Randall  
Tiffany Summerscales  
Robert Zdor

### PDRC

Tiffany Summerscales, Co-chair  
Eric Baumgarner, Co-chair\*  
Christon Arthur, Co-chair\*  
Barbara Huset, Secretary  
Sallie Alger  
Betty Gibson  
Martin Hanna  
R. Clifford Jones  
Keith Mattingly  
Lynn Merklin  
Alan Mitchell  
Darah Regal  
Larry Onsager  
Ray Ostrander  
Martin Smith  
Allen Stenbridge  
Delyse Steyn  
Carmelita Troy  
Roy Villafane

\*Graduate Council PDRC

**SCHEDULED MEETINGS 10:00am**  
**Monthly on 3<sup>rd</sup> Fridays**

## NEWS

- **STANDING COMMITTEE & SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES**  
submitted, entered into the record, and attached. Report discrepancies to the UGC Chair at [mattingl@andrews.edu](mailto:mattingl@andrews.edu) .
  - *PDRC Minutes of 21 October 2011 {Page 18}*

## PENDING

- \\file4\Committees\Undergraduate Council-[ComID00413]-PUBLIC
- *Updated UGS Website*
- *Format Standards For UGC Standing Committee Minutes*
- *Gap-in-Enrollment Student Policies*
- *UGC-GC Joint action on Credit Definition*
- *UGC-GC Joint action on Integrity Code*

## NEXT MEETING – 19 January 2012



**Minutes of the Undergraduate Council  
Andrews University  
November 7, 2011**

Margarita Mattingly, Shanna Leak, Tiffany Summerscales, Verlyn Benson, Gary Burdick, Carey Carscallen, Emilio Garcia-Marenko, Kris Knutson, Gunnar Lovhoiden, Ben Maguad, Keith Mattingly, Don May, Lynn Merklin, Ray Ostrander, Stephen Payne, Monique Pittman, Dina Simmons, Douglas Taylor

Members Present

Rhonda Root, Christon Arthur, Tom Goodwin

Guests

Keith Mattingly presented thoughts on Romans 13 and offered prayer.

Devotional & Prayer

UGC minutes dated November 7, 2011 were reviewed.

Review of Minutes

***VOTED to accept the UGC meeting minutes for November 7, 2011***

***UGC2011.11.07A***

The PDRC reported that it had been working on three new program proposals for Interior Design, Documentary Film and Construction Management. Also, the committee had been working on a policy for approving new programs when both undergraduate and graduate are involved.

Standing Committee &  
Subcommittee Activity

The General Education Committee reported that a group of professional program faculty have met to talk with about how their PDCs and the GE Committee should work together. Provost asked that learning outcomes drive GE. That model implies that GE will have the responsibility of determining the desired target outcomes, while the PDCs will have the responsibility of guiding programs and making the decisions that will result in achieving those targets. GE will be working on this for the next several meetings.

Clarification of GE  
responsibilities

The PDRC has defined undergraduate graduation rates as a comparison between the number of graduates for a program and the number of sophomores. Some UGC members expressed concern regarding the meaningfulness of graduation rates for undergraduate programs given that large numbers of students change majors or have double majors. Lynn Merklin stated that it is likely that federal regulations will soon be mandating the reporting of graduation rates for all programs. It is unclear if the federal rules will include procedures for calculating graduation rates.

Definition of graduation  
rates

The committee reviewed the Demonstration Case Study of the Proposed Andrews University Academic Integrity Policy in detail. The UGC had on March 7, 2011 voted to accept the concept of the University Integrity Code and voted to send to the Deans of the

Integrity Code

colleges this Integrity Code for discussion among their faculties in order to increase buy-in.

Issues raised included the observation that the Integrity Code does not seem to involve the Provost, that holds would be redundant with the XF grade on the transcript that's not going to be seen, and that a student changing schools/colleges has complexities which have not been adequately resolved. Tom Goodwin helped bring some clarity, observing that in his opinion the code does include the Provost in the process. Further discussion ensued with regards to advisors not seeing the XF and how that might hamper their roles, and how unofficial transcripts might be affected by XFs. Ivue was brought up as a portal that could be used by Deans to access full integrity information. Advisors, on the other hand, would get notification but not detail, just as they get notification that a student will not be attending class when social or attendance issues are involved. There was also discussion with respect to the accountability of faculty.

***VOTED to accept the original Integrity Code as an imperfect Integrity Code document and to appoint the Faculty Integrity Committee to refine the document in consideration of concerns expressed. (15 yes, 1 no)***

**UGC2011.11.07B**

Christon Arthur shared that the Graduate Council discussed the Integrity Code about three months ago but had taken no action. He also shared that at its last meeting, the Graduate Council voted to give the chairs of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils authority to appoint zero to two members from each council to meet with them to address the differences between any actions taken by the two councils and to produce a joint action that could be approved by each council and in view of future actions concerning both councils to recommend that the Undergraduate Council vote likewise. This action was taken in the contrast and opposition to a proposal for establishing a large, representative joint committee.

Joint Committee  
Alternative

***VOTED to support the recommendation of the Graduate Council that the chairs of the Undergraduate and Graduate Council appoint zero to two members from each council to meet with them to address differences between actions taken by the two councils on any given matter and to produce mutually acceptable language for a joint action that could be approved by each council.***

**UGC2011.11.07C**

The Graduate Council chose at its last meeting not to take action on the credit definition that the UGC had passed. It also chose not to take action on a modified definition brought to the Council by Emilio Garcia-Marenko, rewritten to match the Federal definition and without knowledge of the UGC's action in support of the Deans Council definition.

Credit Hour Definition

***VOTED to use the new process by which the Graduate and Undergraduate Council will resolve differences between their committees' actions by authorizing the two chairs to collaborate and forge a mutually acceptable document in the matter of Credit Hour Definition.***

**UGC2011.11.07D**

There was considerable discussion on the process by which new programs go before the Board of Trustees and why it gave its approval before the matter came before the UGC. The Deans shared that the Provost had encouraged these programs coming before the Board because of critical timing issues. They also noted that the Board's vote was just a pre-approval, contingent on UGC approval, at which point concerns subsided with one exception. This exception was the concern that there was no evidence that these new programs, before approval by the Board and before coming before the UGC, had been analyzed with regards to possible negative impacts on general education's capacity and resources, much less non-academic pressures on the capacity and resources of the University. Informal reassurances that this matter would be brought to bear in subsequent PDRC deliberations were sufficient to proceed with a vote on the new programs.

New Programs  
Presentations for  
Approval

***VOTED to stay 15minutes beyond the scheduled adjournment at 5 o'clock to hear the program presentations and possibly vote approval in order to avoid unnecessary delays in advertising these programs for the coming year.***

Rhonda Root presented the essentials of the proposed Documentary Film degree in the College of Technology (COT) as described in the proposal document.

Carey Carscallen presented the essentials of the proposed Interior Design and the proposed Construction Management programs in the School of Architecture (ARCH) as described in the proposal documents.

***VOTED to bring the matter of new programs in Documentary Film, Interior Design, and Construction Management programs to a vote at this meeting.***

***VOTED to approve the three new programs proposed: Documentary Film (COT), Interior Design (ARCH), and Construction Management (ARCH). (11 yes)***

**UGC2011.11.07E**

---

Margarita Mattingly, Chair

---

Shanna Leak, Recorder

## **PROCESS FOR APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAMS**

### **October 21, 2011**

**Directions.** Proposals for new programs, on campus or via distance education, must follow these procedures. Proposal originators must provide thorough information on all aspects of the proposed program and address issues raised during the review process of new programs. The guidelines contain information on proposal preparation, the approvals needed to initiate a new program, and time lines for the approval process.

In preparing the proposal, the writer should follow the guidelines' numbered sections in sequence, so that the proposal presents all relevant information in the order suggested. If some subsections do not apply to a specific proposal, the writer should state this. Or, the writer may wish to combine two or more subsections into one paragraph; in that case, the numbering of the paragraph should indicate that subsections have been combined (e.g., 3.3.1 - 3.3.3). Typically, proposals are twelve to fifteen pages long; special materials may be placed in appendices.

### **I. PROPOSAL SECTIONS**

#### **1.0 Introduction: Identify the Program**

- Name of the program
- Title of the major
- Title of the degree
- Unit that will offer the program
- School/college in which the program will be housed
- A brief abstract or executive summary of the proposal

#### **2.0 Needs Assessment**

- 2.1 Specify the needs to be met by the program, using documentation from appropriate national, state, local, professional, and disciplinary resources.
- 2.2 Show how the proposed program will compete for students on a national or regional level.
- 2.3 Describe any overlaps with other programs at Andrews University and justify any duplication of programs. If overlap exists with another unit, that unit should be invited to prepare a commentary on the proposal for the new program. Describe any cooperative relationships, if appropriate.
- 2.4 Discuss indicators of student demand for the program, including appropriate marketing research.
- 2.5 Explain how the program will meet the needs described above.

- 2.6 Describe how the program will further the University's mission and initiatives in the Strategic Plan, as well as the more specific plans of the unit(s) involved.
- 2.7 Projected Enrollment. Indicate the projected enrollment in the program, the probable source of students, and the projected number of graduates.
- 2.8 Advisory Resources. Discuss the sources and extent of advice and consultation that have been used in formulating the new program (e.g., industry, professional, or business advisory groups).

### **3.0 Program Description**

- 3.1 **Mission, Goals, & Outcomes:** Provide the mission/purpose of the program. List the broad goals and specific, measurable student learning outcomes. (What will graduates of the program know and be able to do?)
- 3.2 Describe the uniqueness or distinctiveness of the program.
- 3.3 Admission Requirements. The University provides minimum criteria for admission, acceptable academic standing and progress toward the degree, and graduation. Many programs, however, have standards which exceed these basic minimums, and, in some cases, standards are imposed by national accreditation organizations. This section of the proposal should describe the exact criteria the new program will use. If the University admission requirements will be used, that policy should be clearly stated.
  - 3.3.1 Identify any required background experience or credentials, such as course work in specific disciplines; any required degree, certificate, or licensing; any professional or field experience required.
  - 3.3.2 Describe any other specific admission requirements, such as letters of recommendation, statement of objectives, personal interview, or special exams (such as the GRE or GMAT).
  - 3.3.3 For Graduate Certificates, indicate whether students may be admitted while concurrently enrolled in a graduate degree program or not. Indicate whether a separate departmental admission application is required (in addition to the Graduate Admission Application).
- 3.4 Curriculum.
  - 3.4.1 Describe the curriculum, identifying major and minor options,



concentrations or tracks, and any other specific requirements, such as research, field work, internship, etc.; include discussion of any experimental or unique components. Indicate that the number of upper division or advanced courses is adequate to the level of the program.

Note: Graduate School minimums for advanced courses are:

For master's degrees, 75% of the course work the program must be 500-level or higher.

For doctoral programs, 100% of the course work must be 500-level or higher.

- 3.4.2 List the required or core courses, cognates and electives for the program, indicating the course number and title, the number of credits, the frequency of the course offerings and a brief description of each course.
- 3.4.3 On the list of courses, differentiate between existing courses and new courses to be developed. Submit New Course Proposal forms along with the proposal.
- 3.4.4 Provide a typical plan of work for students in the program. Differences in concentrations, thesis or project requirements, or full-time/part-time study may have serious impact on the plan of work; include separate plans of work where such differences occur.
- 3.4.5 Document adherence to best pedagogical practice in the discipline.
- 3.4.6 If any required courses will be provided by another department, provide a memorandum of collaboration from the cooperating department(s).
- 3.4.7 Interdisciplinary programs should include a capstone seminar or course that integrates the materials from the various disciplines; the proposal should make clear the interdisciplinary nature of the program and how the interdisciplinary perspective will be achieved.
- 3.4.8 Major Assessments: Provide an initial draft of what methods will be used to measure the outcomes listed in 3.1 above (comprehensive exam, final project, etc). Include a curriculum map showing where these outcomes will be addressed in the sequence of courses.

### 3.5 Graduation Requirements.

- 3.5.1 *Number of Credits.* Indicate the total number of credits required for the degree as well as their distribution among core / required courses, concentrations / tracks, cognates / minors, and any special requirements

such as research, field work, internship, etc. (The specific courses for the program are to be listed in Section 2.4.1.) For master's programs, indicate whether thesis / project options will be available and describe the requirements for each.

3.5.2 *Grade Point Average.* Describe the standard of performance expected, and any limitations on C grades that the program will impose.

3.5.3 *Progress toward Degree.* Explain whether full-time and/or part-time enrollment is expected of students. For Graduate Certificates, indicate whether the completion of a master's degree or a specific number of credits toward the master's degree is required before the Certificate is awarded. State the time limitation for earning the degree.

### 3.6 Mentoring and Advising of Students.

3.6.1 Discuss the advisory system to be implemented for mentoring and counseling the students in their progress toward degrees.

3.6.2 For programs requiring research degree, describe the process by which students will identify appropriate research advisers and indicate the point in the program at which the adviser and committee (if indicated) should be identified. Describe also the expected frequency of meetings between the student and the research adviser and full advisory committee.

3.7 Bulletin Copy. Prepare the program description for the Bulletin; insert it into an appendix.

## 4.0 Program Standards

4.1 Accreditation. If the program is in an area in which professional or specialized accreditation is available, indicate the basic achievements necessary to meet such requirements. If there are plans to seek such accreditation, indicate the timetable and the resource commitments needed to achieve accreditation. If there are no plans to seek accreditation when it is available, explain why not.

4.2 Program Evaluation. Andrews University expects a process of Program Review. Explain plans to evaluate the new program at the end of the first graduating class year.

## 5.0 Program Administration

5.1 Administrative Structure. Describe the administrative structure for oversight of the program, i.e., whether by the department as a whole, or by a special

advisory committee, or by a director.

- 5.2 **Specific Responsibilities.** Describe the structure responsible for recruitment, admissions, student advising and progress, curriculum development, and program evaluation, i.e., whether there will be separate committees / individuals responsible for each area or committees/individuals with several responsibilities.
- 5.3 **Selection Process.** Describe the selection process for the above committees / individuals and any special qualifications required. For interdisciplinary programs describe mechanisms to assure representation of all participating units.

## **6.0 Program Resources**

This is one of the most important sections of the proposal. The Undergraduate and Graduate Council will approve only those programs that have a secure intellectual and financial base.

- 6.1 **Faculty Resources.** List all faculty (regular and adjunct) participating in the new program. Indicate their current teaching and advising loads. Describe plans to fit new program responsibilities within these loads. Document how this new program will affect faculty workloads.
- 6.2 **Faculty Qualifications.** Assess the ability of the unit to conduct the program, and describe the number and qualifications of the faculty, as well as access to resources outside the unit. Describe the qualifications of any Graduate faculty in sufficient detail to allow Graduate Council to evaluate their ability to sustain the program. If commitments for new faculty have been approved by the Vice President for Academic Administration those should be described in the proposal, along with an assessment of the availability of individuals to fill them.
- 6.3 **Physical Facilities.** Describe the physical facilities and equipment available to support the new program. Particular attention should be given to facilities for graduate student research or professional training. If new educational equipment or training aids will be required, identify the source(s) of funding and provide letters of commitment to provide the required funding.
- 6.5 **Library Support.** Describe the library support that is available to meet the needs of the new program, indicating what new acquisitions will be required. Attach as an appendix a completed library evaluation following the guidelines found in the "Evaluation of Needed Library Support for New Academic Programs" available from the James White Library.

- 6.6 Interdisciplinary Programs. In the case of interdisciplinary programs, each department that will provide instruction should be asked to furnish a letter of support, which details the availability of resources it will contribute, as described in the proposal (faculty, course scheduling, student enrollment, etc.), and assures that its courses used in the program will continue to be available.

## **7.0 Program Costs**

The resources described in Section 6 will require a variety of costs including time, money, and effort. In this section, those costs should be described as completely as possible. Although the Councils do not make budgetary decisions, the Councils require an understanding of how the costs of this program will be met.

- 7.1 Expenditures. Project the estimated expenditures of the next two-three years for the proposed program in terms of faculty and staff FTE.'s, library costs, supplies, and equipment for both classroom and research activity. If faculty and staff who are currently performing duties in one program will also be responsible for the new program, then discuss their ability to adequately support the new program.
- 7.2 Revenue. Identify sources of revenue to support the program. Describe any special grants which may be sought to support the new program and the impact of these expenditures on any existing programs.
- 7.3 Student Financial Aid. If financial aid to students is necessary to maintain enrollment in the program, indicate how this issue will be addressed.

## **II. Approval Process for New Programs**

A proposal for a new program requires several levels of review and approval. The various levels are listed below in order.

### **A. Department and School/College Approval**

Approval of the departmental faculty, the school/college faculty governing body, and the dean should be indicated via a memo or approval page with signatures of the department chair, chair of the faculty governing body, and dean.

### **B. Online Program Approval**

If the new program or an existing program is to be delivered online, or through other creative use of technology, all courses must be approved through the online course

approval process, reviewed by the Compliance Officer, and then approved by the Distance Learning Technology Committee.

### **C. Off-Campus Program Approval**

Off-campus face-to-face programs (extensions, affiliations) must be reviewed by the Compliance Officer and the Director of Off-Campus Programs and then be approved by the Off-Campus Programs Committee.

### **D. Undergraduate/Graduate Council Approval**

1. The Chair of the Program Development and Review Committee reviews the proposal for adherence to the Process for Approval of New Programs and may request additional documentation from the proposal originators before submitting it to the committee for evaluation.
2. The Program Development and Review Committee will review the proposal and may ask for or send it back for further information. Proposal originators should be present at the PDRC to give a brief presentation and answer any questions. When the PDRC is satisfied that all concerns have been addressed, the proposal is sent to the Undergraduate/Graduate Council for approval.
4. At the Council, the originators of the proposal make an oral presentation and answer questions that may arise. At the meeting, the Council votes on approval of the proposal, and, if approved, forwards the proposal to the Office of the Provost / Vice President for Academic Administration.

### **E. Academic Administration and Board of Trustees Approval**

1. The Provost reviews the proposal in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer. They may request additional clarification.
2. The Board of Trustees reviews the proposal and makes the final evaluation and authorization.
3. NCA-HLC Approval. As of July 2010, the Higher Learning Commission has instituted new procedures for the approval of new programs. Please see <http://ncahlc.org>, and click on Maintaining Accreditation on the side bar, then choose Institutional Change. If Commission approval is required, the average timeframe is three months, depending on the completeness of the application.
4. Once the program has been approved, it may be publicized. Admission, program, and course codes will be established for the program.



### **III. Time lines for the Approval Process**

Generally, a minimum of twelve months is required for the approval of new programs.

- Program Development and Review Committee and the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils meet monthly during the academic year. The review by the PDRC requires at least one meeting, and may require more, depending on the complexity of issues to be resolved. The Undergraduate and Graduate Councils' review generally takes one meeting.
- The Off-Campus Programs Committee meets monthly. Approval of online courses and programs, however, is an extensive process and will likely require significantly more time.
- The Provost will need at least one month to fully review the proposal in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer.
- The Board of Trustees considers new program proposals at its regular meetings, and such proposals should receive Board approval at least six months prior to the proposed startup date of the program.
- Programs to be initiated in a Fall Term should receive full approval during the preceding fall in order to be included in the bulletin.

#### **4. Note to Proposal Writers on Format and Contact Information**

To facilitate the review process proposals should have appropriate page numbering and footers indicating the name of the program proposal similar to this document. The date of any draft submitted should be clearly indicated at the end of the document. Please also provide a name and phone number on a page separate from the proposal document of the person to be contacted should the review committees have any questions.



# Andrews University

Office of Academic Records

---

October 12, 2011

Re: Deadlines for the 2012–2013 Academic Bulletin

To the Deans and Department Chairs of All Schools:

This letter contains deadlines and pertinent information regarding the Bulletin submissions process for this year.

A reference guide has been included with the intention of clarifying and improving the submissions process. Bulletin submissions will be evaluated and compared to committee minutes for the type of curricula and course changes made, for instance, editorial changes, or those requiring votes, such as adding a degree in order to ensure the accuracy of the Bulletin. Committee minutes should accurately reflect the changes voted, and minutes from the courses and curricula committees and Undergraduate and Graduate Councils should be filed with Aimee Regoso.

This year a new email address, [bulletin@andrews.edu](mailto:bulletin@andrews.edu), has been created specifically for digital Bulletin submissions including notifications about errors or updates. This email address will be overseen by the Office of Academic Records. **Please note that handwritten copy or scans of handwritten copy will not be accepted.** This contributes to errors and delays.

Below you will find deadlines for original submissions and revisions:

Date	Action	Office of Origin
Tuesday, November 15, 2011	Original submissions due to <a href="mailto:bulletin@andrews.edu">bulletin@andrews.edu</a>	Deans & others
Tuesday, January 17, 2012	First draft of bulletin with updated calendar sent to deans and departments	Mimi Weithers-Bruce
Tuesday, January 31, 2012	Bulletin corrections due to <a href="mailto:bulletin@andrews.edu">bulletin@andrews.edu</a>	Deans & Departments
Tuesday, February 14, 2012	Second draft of bulletin to deans & departments	Mimi Weithers-Bruce
Tuesday, February 28, 2012	Deans sign off on bulletin copy	Deans
Friday, March 26, 2012	Approval of bulletin proof	Provost and Academic Records
Tuesday, April 10, 2012	Published bulletin released	Printer

We are aware that this is a new process and with that in mind, please feel free to send questions and feedback to [bulletin@andrews.edu](mailto:bulletin@andrews.edu).

Sincerely,

Kari Friestad  
Publications & Communications Specialist  
Office of Academic Records  
269-471-3233  
[bulletin@andrews.edu](mailto:bulletin@andrews.edu)

## Curriculum and Course Action Quick-Reference Guide

Types of Changes	Departmental Approval	Requires votes by courses & curricula committee	Requires votes by Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council
Grammatical or editorial changes or updates	✓		
Bulletin Course Description	✓	✓	
New Course	✓	✓	
Course Acronym	✓	✓	
Course Content	✓	✓	
Course Delivery	✓	✓	
Course Level	✓	✓	
Course Name	✓	✓	
Prerequisites/ Co-requisites	✓	✓	
Repeat Limits	✓	✓	
Scheduling	✓	✓	
Credit Amount	✓	✓	
Grading Method	✓	✓	
Degree Name	✓	✓	✓
New Degree	✓	✓	✓
Credit Amount for a Major	✓	✓	✓
Changes to the name of a major or concentration	✓	✓	
Change in Major Requirements	✓	✓	✓
New Major or Minor	✓	✓	✓
New Program	✓	✓	✓



**Andrews University**  
**Graduate & Undergraduate Councils**  
**Program Development & Review Committee**  
*Minutes held Friday, October 21, 2011*  
*Administration Building Room 306*

Christon Arthur, Betty Gibson, Barbara Huset (recording secretary), James Jeffery, Clifford Jones, Lauren Matacio, Keith Mattingly, Lynn Merklin, Alan Mitchell, Larry Onsager, Martin Smith, Tiffany Summerscales, Alayne Thorpe, Carmelita Troy

**Members Present**

Carey Carscallen, Paula Dronen, Rhonda Root

**Guests**

Faith-Ann McGarrell, Delyse Steyn

**Regrets**

Martin Hanna, Ray Ostrander, Darah Regal, Allen Stembridge

**Members Absent**

Prayer was offered by Betty Gibson.

**Prayer**

The minutes for the previous meeting were reviewed, and it was **VOTED** to approve the minutes for the meeting held on September 16, 2011.

**Minutes**

Lauren Matacio was welcomed as a member of the PDRC. Lauren is replacing Sallie Alger.

**Welcome**

Rhonda Root reviewed the "BFA Documentary Film Degree Proposal" document. The following points were noted:

**BFA Documentary Film Degree Proposal**

- Mission
- Department Goal
- BFA in Documentary Film Degree Goal
- Outcomes/Objectives
- Measures & Findings
  - BFA Review: A critique of students' portfolios by Art faculty.
  - Senior Exhibition (Exhibition of students' work at the end of the senior year.)
- This program is distinctly different from other programs.
- Different equipment
- An internship will be a future requirement.
- Library support was discussed.
- This proposal has been approved by College of Technology.
- This proposal has also been approved by the Curriculum Committee.
- This proposal was initiated by the Provost.
- Courses already exist in Banner.

It was **VOTED** to approve and to send this proposal to Undergraduate Council along with attached COT acceptance and library resources.

**Interior Design  
Proposal and  
Construction  
Management  
Proposal**

Paula Dronen brought us a report on the Interior Design proposal and the Construction Management proposal within the School of Architecture. The following points were noted:

- An associate degree in construction is offered by Southern Adventist University.
- The first two-year curriculum is the same for Interior Design, Construction Management, and M.Arch. It is the third year that starts different courses for the three different programs.
- Travel abroad is required.
- On-site work experience is encouraged.
- An Interior Design program did exist at Andrews some years ago.
- The faculty does support the Interior Design and Construction Management proposals.
- Construction Management professionals need to have some knowledge of Architecture.
- These two proposed programs will be housed in the School of Architecture.
- The GPA requirement for the first year is 2.50. After the first year the GPA requirement is 2.75.
- Classroom space is available at the present time; however, a need for additional space could develop in the future.
- Professional programs are a good area for future growth (Provost).
- PDRC's primary responsibility is to look at curriculum not finances.

It was **VOTED** to send these two proposals to Undergraduate Council.

Christon Arthur, Lynn Merklin, and Tiffany Summerscales worked on the "Proposed Process for Approval of New Programs" document. It was decided that PDRC members would review this document for a week then send feedback to their fellow members.

**Proposed  
Process for Ap-  
proval of New  
Programs**

Next Meeting: Friday, November 18, 2011

---

Tiffany Summerscales, co-Chair

---

Christon Arthur, co-Chair

---

Barbara Huset, Recording Secretary