What are the differences between the ABPPP and what is done now? (See highlighted areas of new diagram.)

1. Several new documents are added at various stages. I suggest that all of them are required as part of the original proposal. Most of them are already part of new academic program proposals, but may not be in the desired format. SAC will want all of this information to make its decisions I expect.

2. The ABPPP seems to indicate that ANY academic-related budget request would go through SAC, not just new program requests. Is that desirable? It could reduce the MAU role in deciding what to put forward for example. It would add months to the budget preparation process.

3. A review by the President is inserted after the SAC review, before Academic Affairs.

4. A SOR that passes all levels of review is automatically in the budget request. This means that a SOR put forward with a new program request could automatically trump any other budget requests of a MAU. Or the implication may be (as I mention in 2.) that all academic-related requests would go through SAC. Would they be ranked? Would we have an upper $ limit per year? Would research, student affairs be included?

Questions about the Kit Duke Version of the “Program Modeling” diagram:

1. What is a Mission Expansion? Is this based on the institution’s Mission Statement? For example, UAF’s includes “advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research and public service with an emphasis on Alaska, the circumpolar North and their diverse peoples”. Not many new programs or capital projects would expand this mission...it encompasses a lot, already. Or, does mission expansion mean “Any new program or significant capital expenditure”? Or does it mean “Any new program or significant capital expenditure that will require new resources from the Legislature.”

There are quite a few changes that formally require Board of Regents approval, but do not require significant new resources of any sort. For example, UAF will soon propose an AAS in Paramedicine. This program has been offered as an option within Emergency Services for many years. Making it a separate AAS will cost no more than continuing to offer it as an option. However there will be two real benefits: People majoring in Fire Science can also earn a Paramedicine AAS, which is not possible now. Also, marketing of the Paramedicine program will be easier. To make this change are all the steps necessary? Can we have an approach where small changes like this have a much simpler process, medium-sized changes like addition of a Certificate or AAS program without facilities or external funding requests are a fairly simple process, and the full process is reserved for programs requiring new resources from the State?

2. Many documents or forms are mentioned on the diagram, and some of these are at least partly duplicative. For example, a new Academic Program Proposal submitted to SAC already has within it what I would consider a SON and SOR, and probably a MAA as well. The PAR form (replacing the HEX form) summarizes information (mainly financial) that is included in the
Academic Program Proposal, and would include most of the information in a SOR. Would these documents suffice for a PAA, or would there need to be a separate, condensed version of some or all of the preceding documents.

I would like to avoid duplication and having to repeat the same information in many different documents and forms. I would be willing to ask the Faculty Senate to modify their Academic Program Proposal format to include specific MAA, SON, and SOR sections that have the content that the President wants and that are clearly labeled within the document. I believe these elements are already present, but may need reformatting, additional information or other changes.

3. On this form there is no route for some things. For example, what if a new academic program (like the Paramedic Program mentioned above) does not expand the MAU mission? What if a proposed project is an expansion of mission, but is not Academic in nature, and not DM or small R&R. For example, what path would public-private partnerships to construct greatly expanded campus residential facilities follow?

4. What is the value added of each step and document? Are the steps/documents in the right order? In order to think about this, we can consider what purposes we want the revised procedures to serve, for example:

- Clear communication between academic and other program development, capital planning, and operating and capital budget development. (For this purpose, program additions and changes that did not require new operating funds or facilities would not need such an extensive process.)
- Minimizing effort devoted to planning new programs that will not be approved. (The PAA occurs rather late in the process, after what will have been many months to years of effort on a campus. Should there be a pre-PAA? Should there be simplified processes for some kinds of proposals?
- Ensuring that all of the important information about a new program is readily available to the Provosts, Chancellors, VPAA, President, and BoR. To my mind that means that the original Academic Program Proposal should simply be modified and reorganized to clearly provide all of the desired elements of the MAA, SON, SOR, and PAA (and that perhaps the PAR form should be modified again as well). I believe what is needed is a clear and precise statement of the required information for each document.
New Program Proposal (reformatted to include elements of MAA, PAA, SON, Business Plan as required), supporting data from IR, and PAR Form.

SOR is prepared and added to the Proposal, with all necessary MAU approvals.

SOR is incorporated into operating and capital requests, and into capital LRP if needed.
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