

**UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES
COMMITTEE**

Members: Chair Carolyn Dwyer, Vice Chair Jodi Goldstein, Cynthia Barnhart, John Bartholomew, Otto Berkes, Frank Cioffi, Johannah Donovan, President Suresh Garimella, Curt McCormack, Carol Ode, Shap Smith, Berke Tinaz, and Samuel Young

Representatives: Faculty Representatives Evan Eyler, Laura Almstead, and Mary Cushman
Staff Representatives Amanda McIntire and Sarah Heath, Alumni Representative Susan Wertheimer, Foundation Representative Wolfgang Mieder, Student Representatives Finlay Buchanan-Jacobs and Sam Pasqualoni, and Graduate Student Representatives Rosie Chapina and Max Cordes Galbraith

Friday, February 5, 2021

10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.

**This meeting will be held remotely. If interested in listening in, please dial:
1-802-489-6040; Conference ID: 843 185 730#
For any technical issues or questions, please email edickinson@uvm.edu*

AGENDA

	Item	Enclosure	Discussion Leaders	Time
	Call to order			10:45 a.m.*
1.	Approval of September 25, 2020 meeting minutes	Attachment 1	Carolyn Dwyer	10:45-10:47
2.	Q&A on routine and annual reports <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provost's report• Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee chair's report	Attachment 2 Attachment 3	Patricia Prelock	10:47-11:02
3.	Action items: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Resolution approving the creation of an Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences in conjunction with the Graduate College• Resolution approving the creation of a Bachelor of Science in Community-Centered Design in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	Attachment 4	Carolyn Dwyer	11:02-11:10

*Times are approximate.

	Item	Enclosure	Discussion Leaders	Time
3.	Action items continued: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution approving the termination of the Master of Science in Bioengineering in the Graduate College 	Attachment 4	Carolyn Dwyer	
4.	Resolution reaffirming the Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action policy and the Equal Opportunity in Educational Programs and Activities and Non-Harassment policy	Attachment 4; Appendices A & B	Sharon Reich Paulsen	11:10-11:12
5.	Low enrollment/low completion program review	Attachments 5 & 6	Patricia Prelock J. Dickinson	11:12-11:42
6.	Other business**		Carolyn Dwyer	11:42-11:45
	Motion to adjourn			11:45 a.m.

**Executive session as needed.

**EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE**

A meeting of the Educational Policy and Institutional Resources (EPIR) Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College was held on Friday, September 25, 2020 at 10:05 a.m. The meeting was held via remote conferencing due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Carolyn Dwyer, Vice Chair Jodi Goldstein, President Suresh Garimella, Cynthia Barnhart, John Bartholomew, Otto Berkes, Frank Cioffi, Johannah Donovan, Carol Ode, Shap Smith, Berke Tinaz and Samuel Young

OTHER TRUSTEES PRESENT: Board of Trustees Chair Ron Lumbra, Briar Alpert, David Aronoff, Robert Brennan, Kevin Christie, John Dineen, David Gringeri, Don McCree¹ and Tristan Toleno²

MEMBERS ABSENT: Curt McCormack

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Faculty Representatives Laura Almstead³ and Chris Burns; Staff Representative Sarah Heath; Alumni Representative Susan Wertheimer; Foundation Representative Wolfgang Mieder, Student Representatives Finlay Buchanan-Jacobs and Sam Pasqualoni and Graduate Student Representatives Rosie Chapina and Max Cordes Galbraith

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT: Staff Representatives Amanda McIntire and Faculty Representative Mary Cushman

PERSONS ALSO PARTICIPATING: Provost and Senior Vice President Patricia Prelock, Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Wanda Heading-Grant, Vice Provost for Research Kirk Dombrowski, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Jennifer Dickinson, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Jim Vigoreaux, Chief Information Officer Simeon Ananou and Associate Chief Information Officer Julia Russell

¹ Joined the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

² Joined the meeting at 10:24 a.m.; departed at 10:49 a.m.

³ Joined the meeting at 10:42 a.m.

Chair Carolyn Dwyer called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. and welcomed new representatives Finlay Buchanan-Jacobs, Sam Pasqualoni, Rosie Chapman and Max Cordes Galbraith to the committee.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the May 15, 2020 meeting were presented for approval. A motion was made, seconded and voted to approve the minutes as presented.

Provost's remarks

Provost Patricia Prelock provided a number of updates on admissions, enrollment, retention, graduation rates and orientation in the context of the COVID pandemic impact. She noted some data was not available until last week and therefore not included in her written report. As is the case across the nation, the pandemic has had an overall impact in these areas. Provost Prelock reported that UVM was uniquely poised to meet the many challenges presented by the pandemic due in part to the physician experts in public health, epidemiology and infectious disease as well as the University's strong relationships with state public health officials and leaders. The Provost expressed her gratitude to the entire University of Vermont community for their tireless efforts in response to the pandemic.

On the positive side, Provost Prelock reported that UVM has more in-state students enrolled including 30 more first-time first-year Vermonters compared to last year. The University also saw an increase in the one-year retention rates for Vermonters. Two-year retention rates, the best indicator of those students who actually graduate from UVM, also increased. This suggests that if a student had a positive full year experience at UVM they are more likely to stay than someone who did not have that same experience.

On the negative side, out-of-state students were more likely to take a leave of absence or defer their acceptance either to the spring or fall. There is a slight decrease in graduation rates, an estimated 1% is likely related to students not being able to complete their practicum experience and the course work required before graduation, particularly in the professional schools when UVM had to go fully remote in March last spring.

The reputation of the University is changing as demonstrated in the eyes of academic peer assessments according to U.S. News and World Report, a publication parents and students look at. UVM is now ranked at 118 (was 121 last year) and our peer assessments score (which is how other university presidents, provosts, enrollment managers, and others perceive us) went from a 3.0 to a 3.1 tied with Iowa State and the University of South Carolina. This is the first time UVM has been able to raise the peer assessment in five years. Additional good news is that UVM is no longer considered a top party school, which was one of Provost Prelock's key goals.

Admit rates increased from 67 to 71%, with the greatest increase for Vermonters. The yield rate, meaning how many students who were offered admissions came to UVM, went down about a percent and a half from 20.4% to 18.8%. The target yield rate is 25 to 30%. The first-time first-year class was 2,487 representing almost a 5.7% decrease from last fall (2,636). Approximately 249 first-year students picked either the at home option or had a remote online instruction assignment. Of the students admitted, 270 requested to defer their admissions, about 75% deferred to fall 2021 and almost 78% requests were from out-of-state students. The University remains on a mission to bring back deferred students, and all academic units are working on aggressive strategies. Typically, the University has been successful in bringing about 50 to 58% of students who defer back and the goal is a minimum of 80%.

Provost Prelock shared enrollment data for this semester. Overall enrollment decreased by 1.9% from 13,548 to 13,292 (this number includes all students: undergraduate, graduate, continuing and distance education and medical students). Vermonters represent about 31.5% of enrollment this year. About 1,444 students chose the at-home option. This option was given to all students enabling them to choose to stay at home and have classes that were either online or remote.

The graduate population increased slightly, about 2.8% and is typical of what is occurring nationwide. The medical student population increased by 6 students.

Provost Prelock next commended the amazing student services and student affairs teams, academic units and admissions staff for a very successful virtual orientation that will be used in the future. There were four primary components: an academic overview session in June; advising and course registration in June and July; a faculty focused series in July and August; and five modules when students came on campus August 24 – 28. All included video series around academic success and preparation and are available on-line.

Provost Prelock next reported on mental health utilization acknowledging the increased level of stress and anxiety for students during the pandemic and the University's goal to make sure that students know, that whether virtual or in-person, that the University can support them. She cited telepractice as a great example of this success. Visits to the Counseling and Psychiatry Services (CAPS) are down the first five weeks, about 12%, likely due to the fact there are less students on campus, more students learning at home and the overall decrease in enrollment. The CAPS program had over 1,070 appointments and have served 550 students in the first few weeks. About 15% of students have a mental health diagnosis compared to 19% last fall. Following are examples of efforts made to support students in the virtual world: transitioned to phone or video through Microsoft Teams; offering virtual drop-in sessions with counselors, not only with CAPS but CAPS counselors are now working with our Mosaic Center for students of color, the Prism Center, and the Women and Gender Equity Center; and CAPS is prioritizing rapid access for students to triage appointments. Additionally, more staff time is devoted this semester to support case management which includes helping students access resources in Burlington or in their home communities. The top concerns that students have are relational concerns, adjustment, anxiety, moving away from home and coming to campus, and identity development. The top six reasons students seek assistance from CAPS are to manage stress, connect to resources, increase coping strategies, navigate a potential challenging situation, to increase their own understanding and self-awareness as a new college student, and to seek support on making healthier life style choices.

In closing, Provost Prelock recognized that she had shared a lot of data and that in the interest of time would proceed with the remaining agenda topics with perhaps an opportunity to continue discussions at a future meeting.

Faculty development and the four instructional modes/instructional technology

Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Jennifer Dickinson, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Jim Vigoreaux, Chief Information Officer Simeon Ananou, and Associate Chief Information Officer Julia Russell presented information on the four fall 2020 instructional modes: in-person, mixed, remote and online. The process for preparing faculty to provide the various modes of instruction included providing equipment and setting up the teaching space with the technology, assisting faculty in converting courses, and supporting faculty in the utilization of the technology. Presenters highlighted that the pandemic required UVM to be agile, innovative and adaptable and it's helped the University orchestrate and build an environment that will have a positive long-lasting impact on the institution and its future, and that the investment and hard work will pay off not just for this academic year but going forward.

Vice President for Research Fiscal Year 2020 report

Vice President for Research Kirk Dombrowski shared highlights from his office's annual written report by offering an overview of a few of complex networks required to support, regulate and advance the research enterprise.

In the last year, Research Administration supported the development and submission of 1,300 proposals, 680 external awards were accepted representing over \$181 million in funding, and over \$143 million was billed and collected in sponsored projects.

The Office of Animal Care Management promoted the well-being of animals used in research and teaching and facilitated high-quality research by providing animal husbandry and veterinary services for laboratory animals and program care support for an average daily census of 8,000 animals a day. These include primarily mice and rats, and occasional guinea pigs, rabbits, and pigs, used in approximately 200 active research and teaching protocols.

Instrumentation and Technical Services (TPS) provided equipment preventative maintenance and repair services to 74 UVM departments, and completed 3,608 work events for those departments. In total, TSP supports an active inventory of 4,508 devices on the University campus including incubators, centrifuges, biological safety cabinets, anesthesia systems and a variety of other complex instrumentation.

Vice President Dombrowski concluded by noting that the Office of Vice President for Research has faced unprecedented challenges in areas like animal care and protecting critical research assets. He commended the research team for successfully bringing the entire research capacity back online in a matter of a couple of months with individual safety plans that were guided and meticulously reviewed by their safety professionals for every single lab and have met every protection and compliance deadline.

Annual diversity report

Referring to her written report, Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Wanda Heading-Grant offered highlights of summer and fall diversity, equity and inclusion activities including the teach-in and webinars offered to bring the community together and have conversations to inform and move to action together. All of the videos of the teach-ins and webinars have been recorded and are available on-line.

Vice President Heading-Grant expressed her appreciation to Provost Prelock and Vice Provost for Student Affairs Annie Stevens for their support in the relocation of the Prism Center to the Living and Learning C Building. She reported that she is working with President Garimella on his initiative to dedicate a prominent area in the Davis Center to honor and celebrate the University's common commitment to unity, respect, diversity, inclusion, equity, and belonging. In addition, the University is initiating a focused fundraising campaign to establish the President's Common Ground Scholarship program for students from historically underrepresented groups to attend UVM.

Vice President Heading-Grant concluded her report by acknowledging a formal commemoration of the Black Lives Matter flag to be permanently and prominently displayed in the University's Mosaic Center for Students of Color.

Action items

Chair Dwyer presented the following resolution:

Resolution approving the creation of a Micro-Certificate of Graduate Study in the Graduate College

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the creation of a Micro-Certificate of Graduate Study in the Graduate College as approved and advanced by the Provost and President on September 21, 2020.

An opportunity for discussion was offered. There being none, a motion was made, seconded and it was unanimously voted to approve the resolution as presented.

Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Dwyer, Chair



Office of the Provost
and Senior Vice President

Provost's Report
February 5, 2021

Board of Trustees
Educational Policy and Institutional Resources Committee

Prepared by
Provost and Senior Vice President Patricia A. Prelock

I'm incredibly proud of the university's successful fall 2020 COVID-19 response. As a result of the ingenuity and dedication of our faculty, staff, and students we did something many thought impossible – we delivered an excellent educational experience while maintaining the health and safety of our campus. As noteworthy as that accomplishment was, and despite the fact that the spring semester will look much like the fall, this report will provide only a brief COVID update, and will instead focus on the important work of the university that has continued without fanfare, but with a steadfast focus on our long term goals. Throughout this report, I will note the connection between these activities and the [Academic Success Goals](#) (ASG) that were adopted in May 2020.

COVID Preparations

Our fall 2020 COVID-19 protocols remain in place and many have been enhanced based on what we learned last semester. We continue to issue comprehensive communications to the campus community through Teams live events for faculty, students and families, and weekly newsletters and digests. Our students will participate in pre-arrival testing, will quarantine, will test upon arrival, and will test weekly throughout the semester. Testing is voluntary for faculty and staff but we are placing greater emphasis on its value for these groups this semester. It is likely that our positivity rates will be higher this semester than last, but we are ready to deploy the excellent response and containment plans we have in place. Our students who do not feel comfortable returning to campus this spring again have the option to study at home. Our spring schedule of courses includes a good balance of offerings with some in-person component and those delivered remotely through synchronous and asynchronous methods; 21% of our courses are in-person, 30% are “mixed” including both in-person and online components, 39% are “remote” delivered through synchronous online instruction, and 10% are traditional asynchronous online offerings. We have created spaces across campus for students to study and gather in safe, socially distanced ways. As you'll read below, we have expanded the professional development opportunities available to our faculty and they have developed new skills and abilities the usefulness of which will last well beyond the pandemic.

General Education (ASG 1.1)

During the fall semester, the Faculty Senate passed the proposed approval criteria for courses in the new Catamount Core General Education categories, including Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Data Literacy, Oral Communication, Writing and Information Literacy Tier 2, and Global Citizenship. It is worth noting that these new requirements also expand curricular components that support progress in areas such as those under Academic Success Goal 3.3: Prepare Students to be Engaged Citizens. Our faculty fellow for the Catamount Core, Professor Pablo Bose, will

be leading the new joint committee that will be responsible for approving new courses in the curriculum. The launch of this committee in spring 2021 is a fundamental step towards achieving full implementation of this new curriculum as a requirement for all UVM undergraduates starting in fall 2023.

We are also pleased to announce that The Davis Educational Foundation has awarded UVM a two-year, \$217,000 grant to support faculty development for General Education (ASG 1.4), as well as helping us launch an assessment program for our new Catamount Core (“Gen Ed Assess”). The grant will focus on faculty development for courses in our new Oral Communication, Writing and Information Literacy Tier 2, and Global Citizenship areas. It will also support the establishment of a new position in the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment that will be responsible for the assessment of student learning in our Catamount Core.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes (ASG 1.1)

In addition to the new support for General Ed Assess, we also have a new Faculty Fellow for Assessment and Academic Program Review, Emily Manetta. Professor Manetta has been working closely with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to develop new guidance for departments on best practices for assessing student learning outcomes. On February 1, all programs that are not externally accredited will be submitting their first annual summary of outcomes assessment activity and findings. These reports will be reviewed at the college or school level as well as provided to the Provost’s Office, and are an important next step in maintaining cycles of learning outcomes assessment over time. Through regular assessment, programs can identify challenges to student retention and progression, as well as patterns of student learning, and use this information to respond to student needs with the goal of increasing retention and timely graduation rates (ASG 1.2).

Low Enrollment/Low Completion Program Reviews (ASG 1.1)

In its long history, the university has created many new and important academic programs, but has terminated very few, including those that have consistently sustained low enrollments. The regular and systematic review of low enrollment/low completion programs is essential to aligning our resources with our priorities and supporting the institution’s long-term financial sustainability. An equally important reason for curating our degree offerings is to ensure that we are providing our students with an array of properly resourced programs that can maintain strong enrollments, fostering the vitality necessary to achieve a high-quality academic experience.

For these reasons, I have asked the deans of our schools and colleges to conduct a review of low enrollment and low completion programs within their purview to determine whether any of these programs should be considered for consolidation, deactivation, or termination. The College of Arts and Sciences has recently completed a similar exercise and has begun taking action on its findings. This is an important process in which all colleges and schools should engage regularly, not only in response to our current fiscal challenges, but also as part of on-going quality assurance efforts ensuring the maintenance of our most important programs. We will discuss this in more detail at our meeting.

Study Abroad/Anchor Sites (ASG 1.1)

To supplement our existing study abroad offerings, we are developing a series of “anchor sites” at four international locations. Anchor sites are partnerships between UVM and international universities where the University of Vermont, rather than the student or an external organization, coordinates many of the academic, administrative, and financial components of the study abroad experience. The specific benefits of this approach for participating students include the ability to maintain both their federal and

UVM financial aid eligibility; a curated curriculum supporting an enriched study abroad experience and ease of transfer credit upon return; study abroad with a group (a “cohort experience”) which may appeal to students with limited travel experience and/or students who want to study abroad with UVM colleagues; participation in a unifying 3-credit online UVM course; and simplified administrative demands for the student.

Our first two anchor sites have been established with the National University of Ireland Galway and the University of Auckland in New Zealand. We look forward to sending the inaugural cohort of students when conditions allow. We will identify and begin the development of the remaining two anchor sites this semester.

Learning Communities (ASG 1.2)

We continue to refine the structure and approach of our Residential Learning Communities (RLCs), with Learning Communities providing a key intersection between academics and student community where we can help build an early sense of academic and social belonging. This year, we know that Learning Communities provided important opportunities for our first time first year students to meet others and connect with the interests reflected in learning community themes like Arts and Creativity and Outdoor Experience. A committee is working on a new structure for our Learning Community experience that will further strengthen academic links with these themes while continuing to provide the sense of community and belonging that Learning Communities offer to new students.

Career Outcomes (ASG 1.3)

Over our extended winter break, the Career Center collaborated with the Alumni Association to offer its Career Readiness Series. Over 250 students signed up for the series of workshops focused on the skills and knowledge essential to our students’ career success. This collaboration also offered an opportunity to expand student awareness of UVMConnect, a powerful platform that brings together alumni and current students and “activates” our strong UVM alumni network to help students prepare for career success after they graduate.

Faculty Professional Development Activities (ASG 1.4)

Our faculty professional development activities have increased in number, scope, and significance over the last year. The sudden switch to online instruction in spring 2020 necessitated intense efforts to assist faculty in the development of technological skills through workshops and increasing helpline and personal consultation capacity. While this effort continued through the summer and into fall 2020, the emphasis gradually shifted to workshops that focused on the student experience, cultivating community and connections in pandemic classrooms, and teaching during difficult times. Faculty panels on topics such as *Teaching in Tumultuous Times* and *Sharing Stories: Faculty Reflections on Teaching in Fall 2020* were among the most popular. Altogether, nearly 110 workshops offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning, Writing in the Disciplines Program and other collaborating units drew over 1,600 registrants. The popular online teaching bootcamp offered by Continuing and Distant Education drew 240 participants over the same period. In January, in preparation for spring 2021, we offered two weeks of programming on a variety of subjects from course design topics (e.g., *Active Learning in Remote Classes*, *Decolonize Your Syllabus*) and newer instructional technologies (e.g., Yellowdig), to research grant proposal planning, preparation and submission, as well as wellness events.

Working Group on Shared Diversity Experiences and a Diversity Co-Curriculum (ASG 1.5)

As we continue to further demonstrate our commitment to diversity and inclusive excellence, it has become clear that there is a need for more intentional and impactful engagement of our undergraduate and graduate students in co-curricular diversity experiences and activities. I have charged a Diversity and Inclusive Excellence Co-Curricular Working Group with conducting an inventory of existing co-curricular diversity experiences occurring across campus (including activities noted in units' Inclusive Excellence Plans); analyzing the efficiency, effectiveness, and spectrum of the current array of these experiences and activities, and, proposing an undergraduate diversity co-curriculum consisting of a menu of both mandatory and optional activities –which may be new, existing, or reflect the expansion or re-design of current programs. I expect the group's report later this semester with the goal of implementing some recommendations as early as fall 2021.

University Academic Reorganization (ASG 1.1, 2.1, 2.2)

Higher education is facing rapid change that has only accelerated with COVID-19. We must not only respond to our shifting landscape, but we must also be proactive, thinking ahead rather than reacting to changes as they unfold. This will place UVM in a position to thrive in the decades ahead. Recognizing this need, a Working Group comprised of faculty, staff and administrators has been meeting for the last several months to review past recommendations for reorganization along with organizational change at other universities. As a first step, the working group proposed a conceptual model that builds on areas of strength and goals articulated in [Amplifying Our Impact](#). Our deans have contributed further to the model and in November we began discussions with faculty, staff and students to envision how we can best position UVM for future success. Through a collaboration with the Faculty Senate we have identified a structure to advance this effort. Faculty, staff and student membership on the Working Group has been expanded and three Subgroups have been created to examine the various facets of academic reorganization: an External Benchmarking Subgroup, an Internal Alignment Subgroup, and a University Resources Subgroup. This work will unfold in phases over the next calendar year, and all campus constituencies, including students, staff, and faculty, will have multiple opportunities to provide input.

Leadership Transitions

We will reluctantly bid farewell to several university leaders this semester. **Vice Provost for Student Affairs Annie Stevens** has retired after 23 years. We are tremendously grateful for all Annie has contributed to UVM, most recently the leadership role she played in UVM's response to the pandemic. Her warmth and positive approach are ever present, even in the most challenging of situations. A celebration will be held in Annie's honor when we can all gather again in person. **Vice President Wanda Heading-Grant** has accepted the position of Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer at Carnegie Mellon University. Words cannot adequately convey my gratitude for all that Wanda has done for our university community. This is a natural next step for a skilled leader whose accomplishments have received national recognition.

I'm delighted to welcome a slate of talented new leaders to my team. **Dr. Jay Jacobs is our new Vice Provost for Enrollment Management**. He comes to us from the University of Miami in Coral Gables and has worked in enrollment management at the University of Chicago, Colgate University, and the College of New Jersey. **Dr. Noma Anderson has been appointed dean of the College of Nursing and Health Sciences**. Most recently, Dr. Anderson was the special assistant to University of Tennessee System president on diversity and inclusion. Before that she served as dean of the College of Health Professions at the University of Tennessee Health Science Center for six years. **Erica Caloiero has been appointed Interim Vice Provost for Student Affairs**. Erica has served as the Assistant Dean for

Student Affairs in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences. Having worked in a key academic position at UVM for over a decade, she has deep knowledge of both the academic and student affairs components of student development and the student experience.

While 2021 may not be off to an auspicious start, I am hopeful for its promise and potential. I hope you had a peaceful holiday and that your new year is beginning with good and sustaining health. I look forward to seeing you soon.

Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

Report of the Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

February 5, 2021

**Board of Trustees
Educational Policy and Institutional Resources**

**Prepared By
Laura Almstead, Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee**

Reviews of Proposals to Initiate, Alter or Terminate an Academic Program

Completed Reviews (three):

- › **Approval of a proposal from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences in Conjunction with the Graduate College for a new Entry-Level Doctorate of Occupational Therapy**

The Curricular Affairs Committee approved a proposal for a new entry-level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (OTD) from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS) Department of Rehabilitation and Movement Science in conjunction with the Graduate College. The program is in line for accreditation by the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE[®]), and is a reinvestment of the energy and resources intended for the Post-Professional Doctorate of Occupational Therapy approved in January 2020. A proposal to deactivate the Post-Professional OTD was submitted in parallel with the proposal for the new entry-level OTD. The proposal for a new entry-level OTD and the request to deactivate the Post-Professional OTD were both approved by the Faculty Senate at the December 14, 2020 meeting. (Note that deactivations do not require Board of Trustees approval.) If approved by the Board of Trustees, the new entry-level OTD will be offered beginning fall 2022.

Program Description

The proposed entry-level OTD is designed to train students interested in becoming practicing, licensed occupational therapists. It takes an innovative approach, incorporating hybrid courses, interprofessional learning, and experiential learning opportunities with the goal of producing occupational therapists who are rooted in science, creative thinkers, leaders, and scholars. The inclusion of some online components also provides more flexibility than fully in-person programs. An EAB market analysis indicated incorporating online components into the curriculum is desirable for adult learners, as flexibility is a consistent variable considered when deciding on a graduate program. All faculty teaching in the proposed program will be

required to complete the Teaching Effectively Online course offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning so they are prepared to deliver the hybrid curriculum. Students who successfully complete the proposed entry-level OTD will be eligible to sit for the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy (NBCOT) exam.

As noted previously, the proposed program will be accredited, and thus the curriculum was designed to meet the standards of the accreditation body, ACOTE. To demonstrate competencies, students will successfully complete all coursework and all fieldwork experiences, and successfully prepare and present a scholarly capstone project (see Curriculum section for details). Graduates of ACOTE-accredited doctoral-level occupational therapy programs must:

- Have acquired, as a foundation for professional study, a breadth and depth of knowledge in the liberal arts and sciences and an understanding of issues related to diversity.
- Be educated as a generalist with a broad exposure to the delivery models and systems used in settings where occupational therapy is currently practiced and where it is emerging as a service.
- Have achieved entry-level competence through a combination of didactic, fieldwork, and capstone education.
- Be prepared to evaluate and choose appropriate theory to inform practice.
- Be prepared to articulate and apply occupational therapy theory through evidence-based evaluations and interventions to achieve expected outcomes as related to occupation.
- Be prepared to articulate and apply therapeutic use of occupations with persons, groups, and populations for the purpose of facilitating performance and participation in activities, occupations, and roles and situations in home, school, workplace, community, and other settings, as informed by the Occupational Therapy Practice Framework.
- Be able to plan and apply evidence-based occupational therapy interventions to address the physical, cognitive, functional cognitive, psychosocial, sensory, and other aspects of performance in a variety of contexts and environments to support engagement in everyday life activities that affect health, well-being, and quality of life, as informed by the Occupational Therapy Practice Framework.
- Be prepared to be a lifelong learner to keep current with evidence-based professional practice.
- Uphold the ethical standards, values, and attitudes of the occupational therapy profession.
- Understand the distinct roles and responsibilities of the occupational therapist and the occupational therapy assistant in the supervisory process for service delivery.
- Be prepared to effectively collaborate with and supervise occupational therapy assistants in service delivery.
- Be prepared to effectively communicate and work interprofessionally with all who provide services and program persons, groups, and populations.

- Be prepared to advocate as a professional for access to occupational therapy services offered and for the recipients of those services.
- Be prepared to be an effective consumer of the latest research and knowledge bases that support occupational therapy practice and contribute to the growth and dissemination of research and knowledge.
- Demonstrate in-depth knowledge of delivery models, policies, and systems related to practice in settings where occupational therapy is currently practiced and settings where it is emerging.
- Demonstrate active involvement in professional development, leadership, and advocacy.
- Demonstrate the ability to synthesize in-depth knowledge in a practice area through the development and completion of a doctoral capstone in one or more of the following areas: clinical practice skills, research skills, administration, leadership, program and policy development, advocacy, education, and theory development.

In addition to the ACOTE standards, the proposal included three curricular goals with specific outcomes, which are listed below. Development of these goals was guided by The American Occupational Therapy Association's 2025 Vision statement and the mission of CNHS. Specific curricular threads were identified for each goal, and are addressed in multiple courses each semester.

- *Curricular Goal 1: Develop innovative and effective, occupation-based and evidence-based practitioners*

Demonstrate the ability to critique, synthesize, and integrate science and technology into the art and practice of occupational therapy to enhance occupational performance for all clients.

- Basic science – Students will demonstrate the ability to link basic science concepts throughout a variety of clinical scenarios to justify various treatment approaches.
- Evidence-based practice – Students will develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills as they explore translating knowledge into evidence-based practice and occupation-based, client-centered care.
- Innovation – Students will learn to explore client solutions by incorporating innovative, creative thinking principles to real-world issues that limit desired participation, whether it is due to physical, cultural, cognitive, or societal barriers.

- *Curricular Goal 2: Develop leaders and advocates*

Articulate the complexities of issues affecting health, wellness, and quality of life, and lead and advocate for the benefits of occupational satisfaction for individuals, communities, and society.

- Leadership: Students will recognize their leadership strengths and challenges, and learn how to maximize their skills to advocate for all clients and for the profession.

- *Curricular Goal 3: Develop compassionate, inclusive, and collaborative practitioners*
Recognize therapeutic use of self, and capitalize on strengths while embracing challenges to become a compassionate practitioner who is collaborative with professionals and clients across all sectors of healthcare and society, recognizing accessibility, equity and diversity needs.
- Compassion: Students will explore their own therapeutic use of self in various settings as they recognize how their own strengths and challenges can be used when working with clients to achieve maximum therapeutic potential.
- Interprofessional: Students will collaborate with professionals across all sectors of healthcare and society to design, deliver, and advocate for humanistic, high quality occupation-based care to enhance participation in desired activities.

Rationale and Justification

The field of occupational therapy has entered a transitional phase of restructuring with current emphasis on producing evidence-based and client-centered leaders that deliver effective outcomes. In 2017, ACOTE put forth a mandate stating that all OT programs should move to a doctoral level. This mandate raised concern in the field and was rescinded in July 2019. Regardless, many OT programs are moving to an entry-level doctorate degree, rather than the current master's level degree. Market analysis indicated that in the spring of 2019, there were 30 entry-level OTD programs. A second market analysis in October 2019, identified 81 new programs seeking initial accreditation for an entry-level OTD. At the time the proposal was submitted, there were more than one hundred programs seeking initial accreditation for an entry-level OTD (<https://www.aota.org/Education-Careers/Find-School/Applicant/OTD-Applicant.aspx>).

Vermont is the only state that does not offer any educational programs in Occupational Therapy. UVM's College of Nursing and Health Sciences is well positioned to fill this gap. The proposed entry-level OTD also aligns with UVM's Academic Excellence Goals to expand programmatic offerings to include distance and hybrid modes of instructional delivery, and to increase enrollments in graduate and professional programs.

Evidence for Demand and Anticipated Enrollment

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the OT profession remains one of the fastest growing health care professions in the US (<https://www.bls.gov/ooh/healthcare/occupational-therapists.htm>), and is projected to remain strong with the current health care market trends and the country's aging population. A data report issued by the American Occupational Association in 2018 indicated a 58% increase in the number of students enrolled in an entry-level OTD over the last ten years. The EAB market analysis stated that regional employer demand for doctoral-level occupational therapists increased 84% from September 2016 to January 2019, which is in line with the 86% increase in regional demand for all doctoral-level

professionals. The market analysis also noted that the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Emsi Analyst™ project growth in national and regional employment of doctoral-level occupational therapists to outpace the average growth in employment across all occupations over the next ten years.

The proposal indicated an anticipated enrollment of 20 students in the first year, 32 students in the second year, and 40 students per year once the program enters the third year. Thus, once the program is fully established, it is expected that there will be a total of 120 students in the program.

Relationship to Existing Programs and Anticipated Impact on Existing Programs

There are currently three doctoral-level programs in CNHS, including the Post-Professional OTD that will be deactivated. The other two are the Interprofessional Health Sciences PhD and the direct-entry Doctorate of Nursing Practice. Letters of support were provided by both the Dean of CNHS and the Chair of the Department of Movement and Rehabilitation Sciences. To align with the interprofessional nature of CNHS, interprofessional modules will be incorporated into classes allowing occupational therapy, physical therapy, and speech and language pathology students the opportunity to learn together and from each other.

Two of the courses for the proposed entry-level OTD are currently used by other programs – NH 399 Fundamentals of Critical Inquiry and NSCI 302 Neuroscience. A letter from the NH 399 course director indicated the course has the capacity to accommodate more students. Vice Chair of Education in the Department of Neurological Sciences, Margaret Vizzard, expressed some concerns regarding NSCI 302. Addition of the OTD students will double the current enrollments. There is capacity for this increase in the lecture component of the course, but limited ability to accommodate additional students in the laboratory component due to space limitations. Dr. Vizzard's letter also indicated some concerns regarding use of the anatomy laboratory for the new Functional Anatomy course. The suggestions provided in the letter were for the OTD courses to consider weekday after hours and/or weekends.

As noted previously, there are no other occupational therapy programs offered in Vermont. In New England, most of the regional OT programs are master's degrees. This works to UVM's advantage as UVM can be one of the first entry-level OTD programs in the area. Currently there are three ACOTE entry-level doctorate programs in New England – Boston University, MGH Institute of Health Professions, and Western New England University. Boston University's program is hybrid program, while the other two are traditional (i.e. in-person) programs. Other entry-level OT programs in New England are transitioning from an MS degree to a doctorate degree, and are in various steps of the three-step ACOTE accreditation process. These include Quinnipiac University, Tufts University, University of New Hampshire, and Johnson & Wales University-Providence.

The proposers expect that by 2025, these four schools will be fully accredited at the doctorate level with traditional programs. Therefore, the proposed entry-level OTD at UVM would be only the second program in the region to offer a more flexible hybrid approach.

Curriculum

The proposed entry-level OTD is a three-year program, and the curriculum was designed to meet the standards set by the accreditation body, ACOTE. In total, 98 credits are required; see table below for details. All courses with the OT prefix are new. Course descriptions and syllabi were submitted with the proposal, and all are moving through the course approval process. A student must successfully complete all courses in one semester before they can progress to the next semester. If unforeseen, extenuating circumstances arise that preclude a student from completing a semester of coursework, a progression plan will be formulated on an as needed basis taking into account student needs, program needs, and ACOTE accreditation standards.

FIRST YEAR	
Fall	Credits (17 total)
OT 410: Foundations for OT practice	2
OT 411: Functional anatomy	4
OT 412: Movement and occupational performance	4
OT 413: Development of occupational beings	2
OT 414: Psych & MH infl on occ	3
OT 418: Activity analysis	2
Spring	Credits (18 total)
OT 425: Older adults as occupational beings	6
OT 420: Therapeutic interventions	3
NSCI 302: Neuroscience	3
OT 424: Visual, cog, percept	3
NH 399: Fundamentals of critical inquiry	3
Summer	Credits (8 total)
Fieldwork – Level I	2
OT 435: Cultural immersion	2
OT 465: Capstone I	1
OT 437: Research I	3

SECOND YEAR	
Fall	Credits (16 total)
OT 445: Young adults as occupational beings	6
OT 448: Designing creative therapeutic interventions	2
OT 440: Teaching and advocacy	2
OT 447: Research II	2
OT 449: OT practice management	3
OT 466: Capstone II	1
Spring	Credits (15 total)
OT 455: Children as occupational beings	6
OT 459: Becoming a life-long practitioner and learner	3
OT 456: Living life to the fullest	3
OT 457: Research III	2
OT 462: Capstone III	1
Summer	Credits
Fieldwork – Level II	8

THIRD YEAR	
Fall	Credits
Fieldwork – Level II	8
Spring	Credits
OT 463: Capstone IV	8

The proposed curriculum includes three unique characteristics: hybrid courses, interprofessional learning, and experiential learning opportunities. Five of the courses are fully on-line or hybrid. Two courses, OT 420 and OT 459, are designed to be interprofessional experiences and will be co-taught with occupational therapy and physical therapy faculty with students from both disciplines participating in the classes. Additional courses lend themselves to interprofessional teaching with the Department of Communication and Science Disorders, thus interprofessional modules within other courses are likely once the program is established. The interprofessional nature of these courses gives students the opportunity to understand how professionals from different disciplines work collaboratively to enhance client participation in desired activities. Six of the courses are designed to involve experiential learning (OT 425, 435, 445, 455, 456, and 424), and the curriculum includes three fieldwork experiences. This means that roughly one-quarter of a student's learning occurs outside of the classroom setting, in real-life learning settings including skilled nursing facilities, community centers, pediatric facilities, mental health facilities, and rehabilitation facilities. Field placements will require establishment of formal relationships or MOUs with these facilities; preliminary conversations have begun and will continue following approval of the program.

The proposal indicated two additional unique characteristics will be explored once the program is established – dual entry and digital badges. Approval of the proposed entry-level OTD does not include approval of either of these; any additional programs/components will require approval through the appropriate review processes.

Admission Requirements and Advising

To be considered for admission to the proposed entry-level OTD, a student must have a bachelors or master's degree and meet the prerequisites and additional requirements indicated below. Students will apply through the OTCAS system. An admissions committee consisting of three faculty members will review all admission applications.

Pre-Requisites

- General Psychology, 3 credits
- Abnormal Psychology, 3 credits
- Human Development, 3 credits
- Statistics, 3 credits
- Biology (in addition to A&P), 3 credits
- Human Anatomy, 3+ credits
- Human Physiology, 3+ credits
- Social Sciences (Anthropology, Humanities, Philosophy, Sociology), 6 credits
- Physics or Kinesiology, 3 credits

Additional Requirements

- Minimum cumulative GPA 3.0/4.0
- Minimum prerequisite GPA 3.2/4.0
- 40 observation hours
- English proficiency exam and TOEFL, if applicable
- Personal statement
- Three letters of recommendation
- Transcripts
- Phone or face-to-face interview

Assessment Plan

The proposed entry-level OTD will be evaluated internally every year; specific parameters for evaluation are listed below. These parameters follow the ACOTE standards for program assessment. A detailed assessment plan and assessment timeline was also included in the proposal. The program will also be assessed via the standard Academic Program Review process.

- Faculty effectiveness in their assigned teaching responsibilities
- Students' progression through the program
- Student retention rates

- Fieldwork performance evaluation
- Student evaluation of fieldwork experience
- Student satisfaction with the program
- Graduates' performance on the NBCOT certification exam
- Graduates' job placement and performance as determined by employer satisfaction
- Community satisfaction
- Graduates' continued contribution to scholarship
- Student diversity

Staffing Plan, Resource Requirements, and Budget

Seven full-time faculty will be hired to support the proposed entry-level OTD. These positions will be filled systematically as budgetary resources allow while remaining compliant with ACOTE accreditation standards. In addition, an Academic Fieldwork Coordinator (AFWC) will be hired in FY20-21 to meet the ACOTE requirement that the AFWC be hired six months prior to the candidacy application date of April 15, 2021.

To address library support, the proposers met with the Interim Director of the Dana Medical Library, Gary Atwood. An evaluation of the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy's Curriculum Textbook and Peer-Reviewed Journal Report (2018) revealed a need for new textbooks and additional journals. The total cost is estimated to be approximately \$5,000.

A one-time investment in some additional equipment and assessments are needed to provide the appropriate learning environment for students in the proposed entry-level OTD. The equipment and could be used in other Rehabilitation and Movement Science programs.

Additional space is necessary to launch the proposed program. The proposal included two plans, one that meets the minimum requirements to be considered adequate by ACOTE standards, and another more ambitious plan that is strongly preferred by the proposal as it will enhance the ability to deliver a high-quality learning experience for students and can be leveraged to help recruit students. The proposers indicate that the minimal plan is a short-term option, and ultimately new laboratory space such as that described in the more ambitious plan will be needed. Both plans are summarized below. A more complete description of the second plan was included in the proposal. During its review of the proposal for the new entry-level OTD, the Graduate College Executive Council requested a space MOU for the program to accommodate the more minimal plan (Plan One below). The requested space MOU is now in place.

Plan One (minimal): Physical space is needed for seven faculty offices per the collective bargaining agreement. In addition, classroom space is needed to teach the new courses, and storage space is needed for supplies and equipment. To secure the required

interprofessional lab space, the program will reach out to rehabilitation, mental health, senior living, school-based, and pediatric facilities to develop memorandums of understanding that clinical space at said facilities could be used for laboratory teaching of entry-level OTD students.

Plan Two (desired): Space needs for faculty offices, classrooms for teaching, and storage are the same as Plan One. Under this plan, a Pediatric and Health Wellness Lab, Living and Learning Lab, and Design Lab would be established at UVM. Descriptions of each of the three labs along with photos/videos of representative facilities at other institutions were included. The proposers note that all of the health sciences programs are in desperate need of state-of-the-art labs to remain competitive with other programs. The new labs could be used by other CNHS programs including the Doctorate in Physical Therapy, Athletic Training, and Integrative Health Care. The letters of support from the Program Director of the Physical Therapy program, Program Director of the Integrative Health Sciences program, and Chair of the Communication Sciences and Disorders Department highlighted potential uses for the labs in their programs. As an example, the Pediatric and Health Wellness Lab is designed to be easily converted to an open floor plan accommodate an Integrative Health Care classes or a combined OT/PT pediatric floor treatment session. Interprofessional educational opportunities in this lab could also be developed with the Early Childhood Education program, allowing education students to work collaboratively with therapy students to create optimal learning environments for children.

A budget summary was included in the proposal. It indicated required investments in the proposed entry-level OTD for the first three years (\$418,678 in FY 20-21; \$500,924 in FY 21-22; \$221,220 in FY 22-23), with revenue growing over the following five years to around \$3 million in FY27-28. The budget was based upon the anticipated enrollment of 20 and 32 in the first two years, respectively, followed by 40 students per year once the program is fully established. The letter of support from Interim Dean of CNHS, Scott Thomas, submitted with the proposal indicated he had reviewed the proposal carefully, including the financial modeling, and found it to be substantively and financially viable.

During the review process, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Financial & Physical Planning Committee (FPPC), Jane Knodell, raised concerns regarding the expenditure required to establish the proposed entry-level OTD. The proposal was discussed by the FPPC, who ultimately decided not to raise a formal objection. Concern was also raised by many Senators at the Faculty Senate meeting on December 14, 2020. After a long debate, the program was approved with the primary arguments for the proposal being that 1) Vermont is sorely in need of trained occupational therapists and this new program would be of interest to students in undergraduate programs such as Special Education, 2) Vermont is the only state that does not offer a program in OT, 3) the curriculum was thoughtfully constructed and would likely be attractive to students, and 4) the program has the potential to bring in significant revenue in the not-to-distant future.

Evidence of Support

Letters were provided by the individuals below. In addition, Steven Eyler, Director of Therapy, Rehabilitation Therapies and Respiratory Care Services indicated his willingness to write a letter of support in an email to the proposers, but noted he could not write one at the time of the request due to increased demand on his time as a result of the COVID-19 crisis.

- Scott Thomas, Interim Dean CNHS
- Elizabeth Adams, Chair of the CNHS Curriculum Planning Committee
- Theodore Angelopoulos, Chair of the Department of Rehabilitation and Movement Sciences
- Shelly Vellman, Chair of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
- Margaret A. Vizzard, Professor of Neurological Sciences Vice Chair of Education
- Reuben Escorpizo, NH 399 Course Director
- Karen Downey, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee for Higher Education, Vermont Occupational Therapy Association
- Justine Dee PT, Interim Program Director of the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program
- Karen Westervelt, Educational Program Director of Integrative Health
- Patricia Crocker, a private-practice occupational therapist in Essex Junction, VT
- Cynthia Forehand, Dean of the Graduate College

Summary

Occupational therapy is a rapidly growing field, and market analysis indicates a growing demand for trained occupational therapists both regionally and nationally. Vermont is the only state in the country not to offer an educational program in OT. Inauguration of the proposed entry-level OTD would allow UVM to fill that gap. Incorporation of online and hybrid courses along with interprofessional and experiential learning opportunities set the program apart from others in the region. The inclusion of online elements also adds flexibility that is frequently sought by adult learners. While launching the proposed entry-level OTD will require investment of resources for the first three years, over time, significant returns are projected. Letters included in the proposal indicate strong support from the Interim Dean of CNHS, Scott Thomas, chairs of the departments involved, and local stakeholders.

› **Approval of a proposal from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences for a new Bachelor of Science in Community-Centered Design**

The Curricular Affairs Committee approved a proposal for a new Bachelor of Science in Community-Centered Design from the Department of Community Development and Applied Economics (CDAE) in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALs).

The proposal was subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate at the December 14, 2020 meeting. If approved by the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees, the anticipated start date is fall 2021.

Program Description

Drawing primarily on current course offerings as well as existing faculty expertise, the proposed new Community-Centered Design major offers students the ability learn about creative collaboration and design processes by which we understand complex issues and develop, implement, and share new ideas. Focused on sustainable and responsible solutions for real-world communities, the proposed new major places equal emphasis on theory, critical thinking, reflection, creativity, empathy, and working effectively with others, including community members and professionals in different fields. In addition to learning about general design theories, skills, and contexts, students tailor their educational experience by choosing a concentration that allows students to focus on the application of the design process in a specific context. Through the proposed curriculum, students will learn to be human-centered designers and multi-stage problem solvers in applied and relational contexts. The specific learning objectives provided in the proposal are below.

- Develop human-centric, design-based skills necessary to solving complex social, economic, and environmental problems.
- Capacity to generate ideas, think creatively and critically, and ultimately be a multi-stage problem solver.
- Been exposed to diverse and complex applications of design, including sustainability, human-centered design, socially conscious entrepreneurship, and the design and development of impactful products, services, and communities.
- Demonstrated an ability to communicate clearly and effectively through multi-modal applications.
- Acquired skills and qualifications that are relevant to obtaining employment or pursuing further education in the growing design sector.

Rationale and Justification

As problem solving becomes increasingly complex, it is unlikely that any one area of expertise will have all the answers. Rather than having any single area of technical expertise, community-centered design professionals are experts on the process of organizing teams, listening to end-users, conceptualizing a problem, and working together to create and implement new sustainable and responsible solutions using a systems thinking approach. Through the proposed Community-Centered Design major curriculum, students gain the knowledge and skills required to connect people, ideas, and actions across traditional disciplinary boundaries.

With pressing issues of environmental fragility and social inequity, there will be substantial opportunities to apply a community-centered design problem-solving

framework to effect meaningful change at local, national, and global levels. An analysis conducted by UVM's Enrollment Management indicated the national labor market projects a three to six percent growth in design-related fields. Students who complete the proposed Community-Centered Design major will be equipped to enter a range of local and regional entities such as small business, nonprofit organizations, and government institutions. Looking locally, students will be prepared to enter Vermont's environmental, agricultural, social service, and public policy sectors as effective and well-rounded employees.

Evidence for Demand and Anticipated Enrollment

As of summer 2019, six land-grant universities in the US have undergraduate offerings in design-related programs. Undergraduate majors are offered by Iowa State University (BA in Interdisciplinary Design), Oregon State University (BS in Design and Innovation Management), Cornell University (BS in Design and Environmental Analysis) and West Virginia University (BS in Design Studies). Ohio State University and Purdue University offer minors in Design. Several of these programs utilize design in the areas of the arts, architecture, or business. Few include the full depth and breadth that the proposed new Community-Centered Design major will provide students. The analysis conducted by UVM's Enrollment Management indicated that, in New England, bachelor's programs in design are lacking as student interest in the topic increases. Though traditional graphic design programs exist in New England, the transdisciplinary nature of the proposed new major would have a unique niche in the market.

The proposers indicated that institutional research data was available for three of the six design programs offered by other institutions listed above. All three institutions experienced enrollment growth between years one and two of program inception: Iowa State (190% increase), Oregon State University (2879% increase), West Virginia University (54% increase). The two design-related minors offered by CDAE have also experienced a general rise in enrollment – Applied Design and Green Building & Community Design. The proposers suggest this may indicate a growing interest in community-focused design, and a Community-Centered Design major will provide students an avenue to explore and evaluate this discipline.

Based on national trends and enrollment in CDAE's existing programs, the proposers anticipate the newly proposed Community-Centered Design major will enroll approximately 30 majors in two years and 40 in five years. While the proposers indicate it is not possible to predict how many students will choose a Community-Centered Design major among those who are currently minors in CDAE or enrolled in other CDAE majors, they anticipate that a portion of current Public Communication majors will opt to switch to the new major.

Relationship to Existing Programs and Anticipated Impact on Existing Programs

Currently, there are no other UVM majors with the focus and goals of the proposed Community-Centered Design major. The proposed major and courses complement Plant and Soil Science (PSS) offerings in Landscape Horticulture, which includes two design courses: PSS 137 Landscape Design Fundamentals and PSS 238 Ecological Landscape Design. The Chair of the Plant and Soil Science Department provided a letter of support, and a few PSS courses are included in the curriculum for the newly proposed major. The proposed major and courses also complement some offerings from the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources (RSENr), such as NR 288 Ecological Design & Living Technologies. The Dean of RSENr, Nancy Matthews, was given the opportunity to weigh in on the proposal and responded with a positive email, but did not follow up with a letter.

The Department of Studio Art offers courses with design in the title. Design offerings in ARTS include graphic design and studio art courses that include visual design components. CDAE's courses and approach to design are distinct from design courses offered in the ARTS program. Unlike courses in the humanities that are more focused on cultural dimensions of creative expression or performance, CDAE's Community-Centered Design courses draw on theoretical and empirically supported human-centered processes needed to identify complex social problems facing communities in order to develop, test, and share responsible, and sustainable solutions. Furthermore, the design courses offered within CDAE's proposed major focus on community-centered design, meaning new content that meets the unique needs of a client, audience, or complex problem, or creates new social conditions to stimulate change.

The proposed curriculum currently includes a few courses from other departments/units. Students in the proposed Community-Centered Design major will enroll in these courses to the extent that capacity exists. The proposers also expressed an interest in and intent to develop collaborations with other interested units within and outside of CALS once the major is established.

Curriculum

Completion of the proposed Community-Centered Design major requires a minimum of 61 credits. Only three new courses are required to launch the proposed major – CDAE 040, CDAE 060, and CDAE 160. Complete, detailed syllabi were submitted with the proposals. Courses are divided CDAE core courses (required for all majors offered by CDAE), Community-Centered Design core courses, and concentration requirements. All students will select a concentration and further focus their education by choosing a track within their concentration. The proposed curriculum includes two concentrations, Applied Design and Relational Design. As noted previously, the proposers expressed an intention to develop collaborations with other departments/programs. The tables below

summarize the course requirements; the primary goals of each component are included following the table.

Core Courses

CDAE Core Courses (19 credits)		
CDAE 002	World Food, Population & Development	3 credits
CDAE 024	Fund of Public Communication	3 credits
CDAE 061	Principles of Community Development	3 credits
CDAE 102	Sustainable Community Development	3 credits
CDAE 127	Consumer, Markets & Public Policy	3 credits
CDAE 250	Applied Research Methods	4 credits
Community-Centered Design Core Courses (15 credits)		
CDAE 040*	Small Group Communication	3 credits
CDAE 060*	Design Innovation I	3 credits
CDAE 160*	Design Innovation II	3 credits
Advisor-Approved 200-Level Design Course		3 credits
Capstone Experience (from options below) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CDAE 296 Internship - CDAE 298 Undergraduate Research - CDAE 291 Independent Study (Design for American Leadership) - CDAE 200-level project-based study trip - CDAE 200-level service learning course 		3 credits
Concentration (9 courses; minimum of 27 credits)		
<i>Applied Design or Relational Design (see tables below for course options)</i>		

Concentration Options

Applied Design Concentration	
<i>Track 1: Communication Design</i>	<i>Track 2: Green Design</i>
CDAE 015 Visual Communication CDAE 018 Communication Design I CDAE 116 Communication Design II CDAE 016 Digital Illustration CDAE 111 Design: Narrative Media & Video CDAE 112 Social Media: Theory 2 Practice CDAE 114 Doc. Film for Social Change CDAE 164 Design + Cultural Entrprnrshp CDAE 168 SU: Marketing: Com Entrepreneurs CDAE 178 Socially Responsible Marketing CDAE 196/296 Internship CDAE 231 Applied Computer Graphics CDAE 276 Community Design Studio CDAE 295 Special Topics-Publication Design CDAE 2XX Project-based Study Trip	CDAE 001 Drafting & Design in SketchUp CDAE 006 Energy Alternatives CDAE 101 Drafting & Design: SketchUp II CDAE 131 Appl Des Studio: Lt Frame Bldg CDAE 186 Sustain Dev Sm Island States CDAE 170 Green Building Energy Systems CDAE 237 Economics of Sustainability CDAE 273 Project Development & Planning CDAE 276 Community Design Studio CDAE 278 Applied Community Planning CDAE 196/296 Internship CDAE 2XX Project-based Study Trip PSS 010 Home & Garden Horticulture PSS 123 Garden Flowers PSS 125 Woody Landscape Plants

CS 008 Intro to Website Development CS 142 Advanced Website Development CS 148 Database Design for the Web	PSS 137 Landscape Design Fundamentals PSS 156 Permaculture PSS 157 Permaculture Design PSS 238 Ecological Landscape Design GEOG 081 Geospatial Cncpt&Visualization NR 143 Spatial Analysis or GEOG 287 Spatial Analysis
Relational Design Concentration	
<i>Track 1: Community Resilience, Advocacy & Social Change</i>	<i>Track 2: Project Leadership, Management & Planning</i>
CDAE 113 Activist Journalism CDAE 114 Doc. Film for Social Change CDAE 123 Media-Policy-Action CDAE 141 Crisis Communication CDAE 157 Consumer Law Policy CDAE 159 Consumer Assistance Program CDAE 178 Socially Responsible Marketing CDAE 196/296 Internship CDAE 205 Rural Comm in Modern Society CDAE 259 Consumer Assistance Program II CDAE 260 Smart Resilient Communities CDAE 271 Local Community Initiatives CDAE 276 Community Design Studio CDAE 2XX Project-based Study Trip SPCH 031 Argument & Advocacy SPCH 071 Fundamentals of Debate SPCH 072 Citizen Advocacy & Debate	CDAE 004 US Food Social Equity & Dev CDAE 119 Event Planning for Athletics CDAE 140 Leadership in Practice CDAE 166 Intro to Comm Entrepreneurship CDAE 171 Community& Econ Transformation CDAE 186 Sustain Dev Sm Island States CDAE 196/296 Internship CDAE 218 Community Org & Development CDAE 237 Economics of Sustainability CDAE 266 Dec Making: Comm Entrepreneurs CDAE 267 Strat Plan: Comm Entrepreneurs CDAE 271 Local Community Initiatives CDAE 272 Int'l Economic Development CDAE 273 Project Development & Planning CDAE 276 Community Design Studio CDAE 278 Applied Community Planning CDAE 286 Adv Sust Dev Sm Island States CDAE 2XX Project-based Study Trip PA 206 Intro Cont Public Affairs

**New course; progressing through review process*

***Students must fulfill any prerequisites required by the courses they choose for their concentration.*

All students enrolled in a major offered through CDAE complete the CDAE core courses. These courses are designed to teach students about theories, skills, and contexts for complex issues facing local and global communities, including climate change, social inequity, organizing, and sustainable community development. They also introduce students to CDAE's central theories, values, and practices, including community engagement, effective communication, transdisciplinary research, and applied economics.

The Community-Centered Design core requirements teach students about the theories, mindsets, and practices associated with creative problem-solving, as well as historical and contemporary applications of design. Drawing on theory, case studies, and real-world experiences, students engage with and apply design thinking as a framework for community-centered design. Design thinking is a creative problem-solving methodology that enables interdisciplinary teams to tackle complex, open-ended challenges across many different domains. It is inherently project-based and encourages an experimental/iterative approach to solving open-ended problems. As such, it helps students develop resilience, and strengthen their ability to give and receive constructive feedback.

Through their concentration requirements, students focus on the application of the design process in specific context areas that matter most to the student. Rather than training students to become context-specific experts, the goal is to help students develop a basic understanding, respect for, and ability to operate within a given context. The Applied Design concentration emphasizes design processes needed to create tangible output, built or material products, and simulations, interfaces or experiences that address the needs of the user. The Relational Design concentration emphasizes design processes related to understanding and interacting with stakeholders, and creating within the complex relationships among people, across communities, and within systems.

Advising

Each student in the proposed Community-Centered Design major will be assigned a faculty advisor from CDAE in their first semester. Once students have chosen a concentration, they will transition to an advisor with expertise related to the student's focus area. It is expected that one or two faculty members from the CDAE department will serve as Community-Centered Design advisors initially; additional faculty will be assigned as necessary.

A Community-Centered Design Curriculum Subcommittee will be created to provide clarity and oversight on major and concentration requirements. Advisors will be provided with a set list of Community-Centered Design core requirements. Because advisors will be assigned according to the students' choice of concentration, additional prerequisites will be based on requirements to fulfill concentration requirements.

Assessment Plan

The department's assessment plan runs on a three-year cycle and includes both direct and indirect assessment components. Direct assessment will include review of sample capstone projects and their application to outcomes and summary report of findings presented to faculty. Indirect assessment will include surveys with seniors and town meetings with students, both of which will also be presented to faculty. CDAE faculty will discuss reports and decide whether any immediate action needs to be taken, and if so, what. Appropriate actions may range from an immediate change to a course or internal departmental policy, to tasking the curriculum committee with proposing a plan for curricular change. The proposed major will also be reviewed with other CDAE majors as part of UVM's Academic Program Review.

Staffing Plan, Resource Requirements, and Budget

Inauguration of the proposed Community-Centered Design major will only require minor advertising costs, which will come from the CDAE department's budget. Current

University lab, research, and field experience space will be utilized. The Morrill Hall Computer Lab was just renovated, and an adjacent “flex lab” space added. The investment includes a 30-seat lab, with new desktop computers, hosting necessary software for to support design work, including multi-media, videography, communication design, and audio production and presentation. The three new courses will be absorbed by current faculty. Assistant Professor Steven Kostell and Associate Professor Jane Petrillo will be assigned to the two new design core classes. Associate Professor Heiss and Lecturer James McGuffy will rotate teaching Small Group Communication. As noted above, the proposers anticipate a significant number of Public Communication majors to elect a Community-Centered Design major, reducing demand in other courses within CDAE.

Evidence of Support

Letters were provided by the individuals below. In addition, the proposal was sent to Nancy Matthews, Dean of the Rubenstein School of Environment & Natural Resources (RSENR) and Scott Thomas, Dean of the College of Education & Social Services (CESS) and Interim Dean of the College of Nursing & Health Sciences (CNHS). No reply was received from Dean Thomas. Dean Matthews responded with a brief, positive email that indicated the proposal “looks exciting” and did not include any concerns.

- Jean Harvey, Interim Dean of CALS
- Bill Falls, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences
- Linda Schadler, Dean of the College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences
- Sanjay Sharma, Dean of the Grossman School of Business
- V. Ernesto Méndez, Interim Chair of the Plant and Soil Science Department

Summary

As local and global issues become increasingly complex, it is important to teach students how to be thinkers and doers who possess skills in collaborative problem-solving and design thinking, in addition to any given area of technical or scholarly expertise. Current undergraduate program offerings in New England are too limited in access and scope to fully address the recent interest in design thinking application. The proposed Community-Centered Design major curriculum thoughtfully structured to fill this gap, and is built primarily on existing courses and faculty expertise. Students who complete the proposed Community-Centered Design major will be equipped with the knowledge and problem-solving skills necessary to be successful in a variety of fields including small business, nonprofit organizations, and government institutions as well as Vermont’s environmental, agricultural, social service, and public policy sectors.

› **Approval of a proposal from the Graduate College to terminate the Master of Science in Bioengineering**

NOTE: Pending approval the Faculty Senate on February 1, 2021, this will be an action item for this Board meeting.

The Curricular Affairs Committee approved a request from the Graduate College to terminate the Master of Science (MS) in Bioengineering. This request accompanied a request to change the name of the PhD in Bioengineering to the PhD in Biomedical Engineering, and was also described in the name change proposal. The name change request, which does not require Board of Trustees approval, was supported by program faculty, Director of the PhD in Bioengineering program Jason Bates, the Deans of both the Larner College of Medicine (LCOM) and the College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences (CEMS), Graduate College Dean Cindy Forehand, and the Graduate College Executive Committee. If approved by the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees, termination will be effective fall 2021.

When the PhD in Bioengineering was approved in 2011, an MS in Bioengineering was established to allow students not completing the PhD program to have the potential to satisfy requirements for an MS degree. Students cannot enter directly into the MS in Bioengineering, only transition from the PhD to the MS degree. As an outcome of changing the name of the PhD in Bioengineering to the PhD in Biomedical Engineering, the MS in Bioengineering is no longer needed; an MS in Biomedical Engineering currently exists. Because the MS in Bioengineering is not an entry-level program, there are no students currently enrolled.

Academic Program Reviews

Completed Reviews:

- Public Administration
- Education
- Higher Education & Student Affairs

Reviews in Progress:

- Clinical & Translational Science
- Nursing
- Cellular, Molecular & Biomedical Sciences
- Physical Therapy (NA)

Other Academic Actions

- *Completed Actions – The CAC recently:*
 - › Approved a request from the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) to close the Bachelors of Arts online degree completion pathway offered through the college that included a major in Anthropology and a minor in either Writing or English as well as the University-wide General Education requirements and CAS distribution requirements. Since the pathway did not establish a new curriculum or program, the action did not require formal approval beyond the CAC, but was shared with Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees when it was established in 2019. At the time the pathway was requested, market analysis indicated an enrollment of 40 students in the first year, with 50 additional students in year two. Due to significantly lower than expected enrollments (currently seven students), the program is not financially sustainable, and therefore a decision was made to close the program. Professors Deborah Blom and Emily Manetta in Anthropology, as well as Amelia Wilcox in the Student Services team in the CAS Dean's office will work with each of the seven current students to develop plans that allow them to complete the program.
 - › Approved a request from the College of Nursing & Health Sciences (CNHS) in conjunction with the Graduate College to add four concentrations to the existing Interprofessional Health Sciences PhD. The proposal to add these concentrations was accompanied by letters of support from the CNHS Curriculum Committee and the Graduate College Executive Committee. The letter from the CNHS Curriculum Committee indicated that the proposal was approved by relevant department faculty. Students in the program complete four research rotations, and the new concentrations represent research foci for these rotations. Many students already choose to complete their rotations within a specific research area. Establishing the four concentrations allows this to be documented on a student's transcript. No alterations to the existing curriculum accompanied the establishment of the concentrations, which are listed below. For each, students must complete three of the four required research rotations in that area, and work with their academic advisor, research mentor, and thesis committee to design appropriate projects. Additional criteria specific to each concentration are noted in the list. Example topics were provided for each concentration were provided in the proposal.
- *Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD)*: three of four research rotations in the Department of CSD or a related field
- *Biomedical and Health Sciences (BHSc)*: three of four research rotations in the Department of BHSc or a related field
- *Rehabilitation and Movement Science (RMS)*: two regular (100 hr.) and one extended (200 hr.) research rotations in the Department of RMS or an RMS-approved research laboratory
- *Integrative Health*: three of four research rotations within and approved Integrative Health research setting and educational elective requirements; students encouraged to take advantage of UVM Integrative Health's membership in the Academic Consortium for Integrative Medicine and Health and their Research Working Group

- › Approved a request from the Department of Department of Rehabilitation and Movement Sciences in the College of Nursing and Health Science in conjunction with the Graduate College to deactivate the Post-Professional Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (OTD), which was approved in January 2020. The program has not yet accepted students, and thus there are no students in the program. Deactivation was requested in order to invest efforts in launching a new entry-level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy. While an entry-level program was in development with a planned fall 2024 start, the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE®) unexpectedly offered a chance to move the start to 2022. To take advantage of this opportunity requires re-deploying personnel to that effort, thus necessitating a deactivation of the Post-Professional OTD. The request for deactivation was approved by the Graduate College Executive Committee; they also noted that they hope to see the post-professional program re-open when feasible as it serves a different student population.
- › Revised the guidelines documents for program terminations and program deactivations. The primary goals of the revisions were to 1) provide greater clarity, particularly in the case of contested terminations and deactivations, 2) ensure appropriate unit-level review of proposals prior to submission to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success, and 3) change out-of-date practices and names (e.g. the original guidelines required a hard copy of a proposal to be available at the “Bailey-Howe Library”). The revisions were approved unanimously by the CAC and subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate. Both documents can be found here: https://www.uvm.edu/faculty_senate/curricular_resources.
- › Approved a request from the Department of Rehabilitation & Movement Science in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS) in conjunction with the Graduate College to deactivate the MS in Athletic Training (MSAT). The request for deactivation was approved by program faculty, and was forwarded to the CAC with support from Scott Thomas, Interim Dean of CNHS, and Cindy Forehand, Dean of the Graduate College as well as the Graduate College Executive Council. In 2018, the BS in Athletic Training was transitioned to a master’s level program in response to the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) 2020 Standards requiring all accredited Athletic Training programs move from the bachelors to the Masters Level by 2022. Despite the success of the BS program and efforts of faculty, the MSAT did not recruit any students in AY 2018-2019 or AY 2019-2020. This is in-line with similar trends seen nationally by other Athletic Training programs that transitioned from a bachelors to a Masters degree. A decision was made by the program to cease recruitment efforts, and the MSAT was listed in the AY 2020-2021 catalog as “Not Accepting Students” with the provision that they request to formally deactivate the program. *If approved by the Faculty Senate at the February 1, 2021 meeting, the deactivation will be effective as of fall 2021.*
- › Approved a proposal from the Graduate College to change the name of the PhD in Bioengineering to the PhD in Biomedical Engineering (PhDBIOE). The PhDBIOE is a cross-college interdisciplinary graduate program with participating faculty in the

Larner College of Medicine (LCOM) and the College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences (CEMS). It reports directly to the Graduate College but has an administrative home in the Department of Electrical and Biomedical Engineering in CEMS. Subsequent to the approval of the PhDBIOE in 2011, a BS in Biomedical Engineering (BSBME) was approved in 2015 and a MS in Biomedical Engineering (MSBME) in 2017. Additionally, the CEMS Department of Electrical Engineering was changed to the Department of Electrical and Biomedical Engineering in 2016. When the PhDBIOE was established, the proposers felt that it would be broader than biomedical approaches and hence chose the Bioengineering name. However, the addition of the BS and MS in Biomedical Engineering along with growing numbers of faculty collaborations in biomedical engineering, has changed the program focus to biomedical engineering. Changing the name of the PhDBIOE to the PhDBME will align it with the names of the bachelor's and master's degrees, and better reflect the interests of the faculty in the program. Students currently enrolled in the PhDBIOE will be given the opportunity to graduate with either a PhDBIOE or PhDBME. Students entering the program after the name change is complete will only be able to graduate with the new name (PhDBME). *If approved by the Faculty Senate at the February 1, 2021 meeting, the name change will be effective according to the catalog deadlines set by the Registrar's Office.*

- *Ongoing Work – The CAC is actively:*
 - › Working to promote communication between unit-level curriculum committees and the Curricular Affairs Committee as well as among the unit-level curriculum committees. The primary goals of these efforts are 1) to foster a culture of communication and collaboration in development of new programs and revisions of existing programs, 2) to increase awareness of the guidelines and approval process for new programs, and 3) to promote adherence to university-wide policies and approval processes relating to new course proposals, course revisions, and special topic courses. To help achieve these goals, the CAC Chair is organizing yearly meetings as well as individual meetings when needed between the CAC Chair and Chairs of all unit-level curriculum committees.
 - › Participating in the Educational Stewardship Committee (ESC), a joint committee between the Provost's Office and the Faculty Senate. The purpose of the ESC is to ensure campus-wide good stewardship and coordination of the University's educational mission. The Committee is charged to provide recommendations to 1) safeguard the integrity of the University's educational mission with respect to stated tenets, particularly as those tenets may be impacted by the new incentive-based budget model (IBB); and 2) to provide recommendations to promote excellence in teaching and learning and the educational experience.
 - › Continuing to participate in the oversight of UVM's existing General Educational program, which includes Writing and Information Literacy, Diversity, Sustainability, and Quantitative Reasoning.

- › Collaborating with the Provost's Office to carry out Academic Program Reviews (APRs). With the exception of five externally accredited programs, CAC reviews have been completed for all programs in cycles one through eleven.
- *Proposals Under Consideration (one)*
 - › A new Certificate of Graduate Studies in Resiliency-Based Approaches with Families, Schools & Communities from the College of Education and Social Services in conjunction with the Graduate College

EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

February 5, 2021

Resolution approving the creation of an Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences in conjunction with the Graduate College

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the creation of an Entry-Level Doctorate in Occupational Therapy in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences, in conjunction with the Graduate College, as approved and advanced by the Provost on December 16, 2020 and President on December 17, 2020.

Resolution approving the creation of a Bachelor of Science in Community-Centered Design in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the creation of Bachelor of Science in Community-Centered Design in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences as approved and advanced by the Provost on December 16, 2020 and President on December 17, 2020.

Resolution approving the termination of the Master of Science in Bioengineering in the Graduate College

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees approves the termination of the Master of Science in Bioengineering in the Graduate College, as approved and advanced by the Provost on February 2, 2021 and President on February 3, 2021.

Resolution reaffirming Equal Opportunity policies

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees reaffirms the Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action policy, attached here as Appendix A; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees reaffirms the Equal Opportunity in Educational Programs and Activities and Non-Harassment policy, attached here as Appendix B.



OFFICE OF AUDIT AND COMPLIANCE SERVICES
UVM.EDU/POLICIES



POLICY

Title: Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy
Statement

Policy Statement

The University of Vermont and State Agricultural College is committed to a policy of equal employment opportunity and to a program of affirmative action in order to fulfill that policy. The President of the University fully supports the University's equal employment opportunity policy and the University's affirmative action program.

The University will accordingly recruit, hire, train, and promote persons in all positions and ensure that all other personnel actions are administered without regard to unlawful criteria including race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, place of birth, sex, sexual orientation, disability, age, positive HIV-related blood test results, genetic information, gender identity or expression, or status as a disabled veteran, recently separated veteran, active duty wartime or campaign badge veteran, or Armed Forces service medal veteran (collectively "protected veterans"), or crime victim status, as these terms are defined under applicable law, or any other factor or characteristic protected by law, and ensure that all employment decisions are based only on valid job requirements.

In addition, the University of Vermont recognizes that discriminatory harassment and sexual harassment are forms of unlawful discrimination, and it is, therefore, the policy of the University that discriminatory harassment and sexual harassment will not be tolerated. The University also prohibits unlawful harassment on the basis of other characteristics protected by law.

Further, employees and applicants will not be subjected to harassment, intimidation, threats, coercion, or retaliation because they have engaged in or may engage in the following: filing a complaint or assisting or participating in an investigation regarding alleged discrimination or harassment as prohibited in the policy statement above; filing a complaint or assisting or participating in an investigation, compliance evaluation, hearing, or any other activity related to the administration of the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 ("VEVRAA"), Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 ("Rehabilitation Act"), or the Affirmative Action provisions of any other federal, state or local law; opposing any act or practice made unlawful by VEVRAA or any other federal, state, or local law requiring equal employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities or protected veterans; or exercising any other rights protected by VEVRAA or the Rehabilitation Act. Additionally, the University will not discharge or in any other manner discriminate against employees or applicants because they have inquired about, discussed, or disclosed their own pay or the pay of another employee or applicant.

The University of Vermont maintains an audit and reporting system that: measures the effectiveness of the University's affirmative action program; indicates any need for remedial action; determines the degree to

which the University's objectives have been attained; measures the University's compliance with its affirmative action obligations; and determines whether individuals with disabilities and veterans have had the opportunity to participate in all University sponsored educational, training, recreational and social activities.

Sources: Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Equal Pay Act of 1963; the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; Section 402 of the Vietnam-Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974; Executive Order 11246; the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008; and the Vermont Fair Employment Practices Act, all as amended; and such other federal, state and local non-discrimination laws as may apply.

Note: This Statement of Policy is the official University of Vermont Equal Educational Opportunity Policy Statement and supersedes all prior policy statements regarding its subject matter. It may be modified only by written statement issued by the President as Chief Executive Officer of the University or by formal action by the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College Board of Trustees. This Policy Statement is designed to express the University's intent and commitment to comply with the requirements of federal, state, and local non-discrimination laws. It shall be applied co extensively with those non-discrimination laws and shall not be interpreted as creating any rights, contractual or otherwise, that are greater than exist under those laws.

Contacts

Questions concerning the daily operational interpretation of this policy should be directed to the following (in accordance with the policy elaboration and procedures):	
Title(s)/Department(s):	Contact Information:
Director, Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity	428 Waterman Building (802) 656-3368
Questions about policies related to Title IX, including sex discrimination, sexual harassment, and all forms of sexual violence	
Title IX Coordinator Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity	Nick Stanton (802) 656-3368
Questions about disability related issues	
ADA/Section 504 Coordinator Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity	Amber Fulcher (802) 656-0945
Questions may also be directed to government agencies having oversight and enforcement authority with respect to the referenced laws. A complete listing of such agencies may be obtained from the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity.	
The University has developed an Affirmative Action Plan. The portions of the plan required for disclosure are available for inspection during normal business hours; contact the University's Public Records Officer at (802) 656-8937.	

Related Documents/Policies

- [Disability Accommodation for Employees and Applicants for Employment](#)
- [Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct Policy](#)
- [Equal Opportunity in Educational Programs and Activities and Non-Harassment](#)
- [Handling and Resolving Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct Complaints](#)

Regulatory References/Citations

- Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986
- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972
- Equal Pay Act of 1963
- Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967
- Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
- Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
- Section 402 of the Vietnam-Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974
- Executive Order 11246
- Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008
- Vermont Fair Employment Practices Act

About This Policy

Responsible Official:	Vice President for Finance and Administration	Approval Authority:	President and the Chair of the Board of Trustees
Policy Number:	V. 4.23.11	Effective Date:	February 4, 2017
Revision History:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V. 7.0.1.1 effective April 7, 2006 • V. 7.0.1.2 effective September 5, 2008 • V. 7.0.1.3 effective April 13, 2009 • V. 7.0.1.4 effective March 8, 2010 • V. 7.0.1.5 effective May 22, 2011 • V. 7.0.1.6 effective May 19, 2012 • V. 7.3.7/V. 7.0.1.7 effective February 9, 2013 • V. 7.3.8 effective February 8, 2014 • V. 7.3.9 effective February 7, 2015 • V. 7.3.10 effective February 6, 2016 • Reaffirmed as revised by the President and the Chair of the Board of Trustees: February 3, 2018, March 6, 2019 • Reaffirmed by the President February 3, 2020 and the Chair of the Board of Trustees January 30, 2020 • Responsible official officially changed from the Vice President for Human Resources, Diversity and Multicultural Affairs and Vice President for Finance and Administration on May 1, 2020 		



POLICY

Title: Equal Opportunity in Educational Programs and Activities and Non-Harassment

Policy Statement

The University of Vermont and State Agricultural College is committed to a policy of equal educational opportunity. The University therefore prohibits discrimination on the basis of unlawful criteria such as race, color, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, disability, or gender identity or expression, as those terms are defined under applicable law, in admitting students to its programs and facilities and in administering its admissions policies, educational policies, scholarship and loan programs, athletic programs, and other institutionally administered programs or activities made available to students at the University. The University also prohibits harassment, as defined in the Vermont Statutes at Title 16, section 11(a)(26). Unlawful harassment is a form of discrimination and is therefore prohibited. Sources: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; the Vermont Public Accommodations Act; and such other federal, state, and local non-discrimination laws as may apply.

Note: This Statement of Policy is the official University of Vermont Equal Educational Opportunity Policy Statement and supersedes all prior statements regarding its subject matter. It may be modified only by written statement issued by the President as Chief Executive Officer of the University or by formal action by the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College Board of Trustees. This Policy Statement is designed to express the University's intent and commitment to comply with the requirements of federal, state, and local non-discrimination laws. It shall be applied co-extensively with those non-discrimination laws and shall not be interpreted as creating any rights, contractual or otherwise, that are greater than exist under those laws.+

Contacts

Questions concerning the daily operational interpretation of this policy should be directed to the following (in accordance with the policy elaboration and procedures):	
Title(s)/Department(s):	Contact Information:
Questions regarding this policy statement or compliance with its provisions may be directed to:	
Dean of Students	41-43 South Prospect Street Burlington, VT 05405 (802) 656-3380
Or	
Director, Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity	428 Waterman Building Burlington VT, 0405 (802) 656-3368
Questions may also be directed to government agencies having oversight and enforcement authority with respect to the referenced laws. A complete listing of those agencies may be obtained from the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity.	
Questions about policies related to Title IX, including sex discrimination, sexual harassment, and all forms of sexual violence	
Title IX Coordinator Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity	Nick Stanton (802) 656-3368
Questions about disability related issues	
Student Accessibility Services	Sharon Mone (802) 656-4075
ADA/Section 504 Coordinator Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity	Amber Fulcher (802) 656-0945

Related Documents/Policies

- [Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct Policy](#)
- [Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy Statement](#)
- [Handling and Resolving Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct Complaints](#)

Regulatory References/Citations

- Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972
- Vermont Public Accommodations Act
- Vermont Statutes at Title 16, section 11(a)(26)

About This Policy

Responsible Official:	Vice President for Finance and Administration	Approval Authority:	President and the Chair of the Board of Trustees
------------------------------	---	----------------------------	--

Policy Number:	V. 4.24.11	Effective Date:	February 4, 2017
Revision History:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V. 7.0.5.1 effective April 7, 2006 • V. 7.0.5.2 effective September 5, 2008 • V. 7.0.5.3 effective April 13, 2009 • V. 7.0.5.4 effective March 8, 2010 • V. 7.0.5.5 effective May 22, 2011 • V. 7.0.5.6 effective May 19, 2012 • V. 7.4.7/V. 7.0.5.7 effective February 9, 2013 • V. 7.4.8 effective February 8, 2014 • V. 7.4.9 effective February 7, 2015 • V. 7.4.10 effective February 6, 2016 • V. 7.4.11 Reaffirmed as revised by the President and the Chair of the Board of Trustees: February 3, 2018 and March 6, 2019 • V. 7.4.11 Reaffirmed by the President February 3, 2020 and the Chair of the Board of Trustees January 30, 2020 • Responsible official officially changed from the Vice President for Human Resources, Diversity and Multicultural Affairs to the Vice President for Finance and Administration on May 1, 2020 		

Faculty Senate Proposal and Process to Deactivate an Academic Program

The program deactivation process allows for the formal suspension of an academic program for a period of up to five years. The program will not be able to accept students once the deactivation is approved by the Faculty Senate. Detailed information on the deactivated program will be removed from the University Catalogue according to the Catalog production timeline and department/program webpage(s). The program title will be listed in the graduate or undergraduate catalogue under the heading “Programs Not Currently Accepting Students.” Unless the program has been reactivated or terminated, the unit and the department housing the program will be notified by the Office of the Provost during the fourth year that action must be taken prior to the catalogue deadline in the coming academic year. At that point, the sponsoring unit has three choices: request continuation of deactivated status (see below), begin a Program Termination process, or reactivate the program. Guidelines for proposals to terminate programs and to reactivate programs are posted on the Faculty Senate Curricular Resources page (see [here](#)).

A proposal to deactivate an academic program may be initiated by a faculty committee, a department/unit, or the Provost. Proposals for deactivation are considered no-contest if the program initiates or agrees with the deactivation. Deactivation proposals are considered contested if initiated by a party other than the program itself, and the program does not support the request by a majority vote of the department (if the program is part of a department) or program faculty (if the program is free-standing).

Requests for Continuance of Deactivated Status: Continuance of deactivated status beyond five years can be granted on the grounds that the conditions that prompted deactivation are likely to change in the near future. Changes might include approved hires in the next three years, evidence of increased demand for the program, or new collaboration with another unit/department that will help support the program. Requests for continuance of deactivated status should be made by the department chair/program director in the form of a memo, accompanied by a support letter from the unit dean; graduate programs also require a letter from the Graduate College Dean. The memo should provide sufficient rationale for remaining deactivated rather than reactivating or terminating the program and a brief history of the program, including why it was deactivated. Memos should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. Upon successful review by the Provost, proposals will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) for review and approval. Requests for continuation of deactivated status do not require approval beyond the CAC. If a request for continuation of deactivated status is not approved by the CAC, the program may appeal to the Provost. In the event that continuation of deactivated status is not approved, a program can opt to initiate a reactivation or termination process.

No-Contest Deactivation Requests: In the case where the program initiates and/or agrees with a request for deactivation, a deactivation proposal can be put forth by the chair/program director in the form of a memo. The memo should present the rationale for the request, a brief history of the program, the number of students currently enrolled in the program and a plan to facilitate their completion, and a record of the faculty vote on the deactivation request. If there are no students enrolled in the program being deactivated, the deactivation proposal should also address plans to deactivate any courses offered solely for this program.

Proposal to Deactivate an Academic Program (established Dec. 2019; revisions approved by the Senate Dec. 2020)

Following approval according to college/school-level procedures (e.g. department/program, unit curriculum committee, and dean's office; unit faculty in some units), proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. Graduate programs also require a support letter from the Graduate College Executive Committee and Dean. Upon successful review by the Provost's office, proposals will be sent to the CAC for review and approval. Once received, proposals will be circulated for a minimum of 30 days prior to a vote by the CAC. As noted above, deactivation of a program also requires a vote of approval by the Faculty Senate; deactivations are shared with the Board of Trustees, but do not require Board of Trustee approval. See the Timeline for Policy & Proposal Review Process available [here](#) for further details.

Contested Deactivations: A contested deactivation process should be initiated *only after other possible avenues for resolution have been explored* including, but not limited to program changes, partnerships with other programs/departments, and compromises that would allow a no-contest deactivation. Proposals for contested deactivations must be prepared using the guidelines below. Proposals should address all questions/items, and data should be provided as support wherever relevant.

Deactivation proposals must be reviewed at the college/school level prior to submission in accordance with college/school procedures (e.g. department, unit curriculum committee, and dean's office; unit faculty in some units). Graduate programs also require a review by the Graduate College Executive Committee and Dean. At each level of review, the head of the relevant voting body should submit a letter in support of the deactivation, or a letter that summarizes the reasons for not approving the deactivation including any additional information relevant to review of the termination by the CAC (e.g. impacts of termination not included in the proposal). Once college/school-level review of a proposal is complete, and review by the Graduate College for graduate programs, proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. The review process and timeline are described in detail following the proposal requirements. Incomplete proposals will be returned with a request for the missing information; the timeline will not begin until a proposal is considered complete by both the Provost's office and the Chair of the CAC. *Proposers should carefully review the timeline below and plan accordingly.* When initiating a contested deactivation, proposers and those contesting the deactivation should be prepared to respond promptly to Provost and CAC subcommittee requests for additional information or materials in order to avoid preventable delays in the process.

The role of the CAC in contested deactivation is to evaluate the request at a curricular level only; *the outcome of the contested deactivation process is therefore a recommendation solely regarding the curricular viability and quality of the program, not the financial feasibility of maintaining the program.* Data related to program efficiency and resource use provides valuable context in that resources are necessary to support program quality, but financial concerns are not a factor in the CAC's evaluation.

Unless a hiatus in operation is explicitly acceptable to the program faculty (as reflected in a majority vote), the Dean, and the Provost, a program will operate as normal during the deactivation review process; *a deactivation will not be considered finalized until voted on by the Faculty Senate.* If a program is deactivated, students in the program at the time of deactivation will be given the opportunity to complete the program within a reasonable timeframe.

Proposal to Deactivate an Academic Program (established Dec. 2019; revisions approved by the Senate Dec. 2020)

Guidelines for Contested Deactivation Proposals

I. Abstract

A one-page summary of the essential information from each of the sections below. Please submit this abstract both as an introduction to the proposal and as a separate document; proposals will not be considered complete without the abstract.

II. Rationale for Deactivation and Summary of Communications with the Program

- A. Clearly describe the reasons for requesting deactivation of the program at this time, including reasons why other options such as partnership with another unit/program are not appropriate.
- B. Summarize all communications with the program regarding the requested deactivation, including the details indicated below. Include all written communications (e.g. emails, memos) in an appendix to the deactivation request.
 - individuals involved and roles/positions
 - primary points of discussion
 - any compromises offered by either party
 - outcome(s) of the communication
- C. Describe the specific steps taken to reach an agreement between the proposal initiator and the program faculty.

III. Program History

- A. When was the program initiated?
- B. Have there been any significant changes, including name changes, since the time of initiation? If so, provide a summary of these changes.

IV. Program Quality and Internal Demand

Address all questions outlined below, providing relevant data as support.

- A. What are the current learning objectives of the program? For programs that require formal assessment (i.e. degree programs), provide evidence obtained through the assessment process to indicate how well students are meeting the stated learning objectives.
- B. Were any concerns related to program quality raised during the most recent assessment of the program through the Academic Program Review process, or for externally accredited programs, in the most recent accreditation review? Concerns may include whether program staffing was sufficient to maintain quality and/or whether the curriculum reflects expectations within the field.
- C. Are courses required for the program offered on a regular and consistent basis? For graduate programs, are sufficient courses at the 300-level or above offered to maintain program quality?
- D. For programs that include a required, mentored component (e.g. research project; dissertation/thesis; internship; practicum), is there sufficient support and oversight of students?
- E. Provide enrollment data for the past 10 years or lifetime of program, whichever is shorter. How do the trends compare to enrollment in similar programs nation-wide?
- F. Are there any concerns related to advising of students in the program?
- G. Have students in the program raised any concerns related to the quality of their educational experiences?

V. External Demand and Societal Needs

- A. Is there limited or decreasing demand regionally and/or nationally for individuals with the knowledge/skills of graduates of the program? Provide relevant evidence such as employment trends, placement of graduates, etc.
- B. Is the program not providing graduates with the skills/knowledge necessary to be successful following graduation from UVM? If so, have potential changes to remedy the situation been discussed?

VI. Contribution to Missions and Long-Range Plans

- A. Is the program misaligned with current university-level missions, mission as a land-grant university, strategic priorities, vision, and/or academic goals (e.g. university-wide curricular requirements)? If so, explain how; if not, explain the effects of deactivating the program on the ability to achieve the current university-level missions, strategic priorities, and academic goals.
- B. Is the program misaligned with current college/school-level missions, strategic priorities, vision, and/or academic goals? If so, explain how; if not, explain the effects of deactivating the program on the ability to achieve the current university-level missions, strategic priorities, and academic goals.
- C. Do UVM's peer and competitor institutions offer similar programs? Would loss of the program affect UVM's ability to attract high-quality students?

VII. Program Sustainability

- A. Are there currently insufficient faculty resources to teach required courses and/or oversee other required program components (e.g. research projects; internships)? If so, have potential partnerships with other departments/units been explored?
- B. Are there anticipated, voluntary losses of faculty (e.g. via retirement) that could affect the ability of program to maintain quality?
- C. Include data from the Office of Institutional Research that is relevant to the financial sustainability of the program.
- D. Are other programs being negatively impacted by investment resources in the program? If so, provide specific evidence.

VIII. Impact of Deactivation

- A. What are the potential impacts of deactivation on any closely associated programs at UVM (e.g. a minor or certificate program in the case of a request to deactivate a major)?
- B. Will course offerings be affected if the program is deactivated? If so, provide:
 - a list of the courses including enrollment trends for the past six semesters
 - evidence of communication with any units/departments/programs that include the courses listed above in their required and/or elective courses
- C. Are the enrollments in other programs and/or courses outside the program being considered for deactivation likely to be affected? Include evidence of communication with any potentially affected units/departments/programs.
- D. Would deactivation of the program affect research projects of any faculty outside the program (e.g. via loss of collaborations)?

- E. Are there any community partners that would be affected by deactivation (e.g. service learning projects; practicums; internships)? If so, provide evidence of communication with the community partners, including offers to maintain those partnerships in new administrative locations.
- F. How would deactivation affect the responsibilities and roles of faculty involved the program?
- G. Provide a detailed teachout plan for accommodating program completion for all students currently enrolled in the program should it be deactivated.

Process and Timeline for Contested Deactivations

As noted previously, completed proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. If the Provost determines that the proposal is complete and a reasonable case has been made for deactivating the program, the Provost will forward the proposal to the Faculty Senate with a request for review by the CAC. The Provost has **two weeks (14 days)** to make a decision.

The proposal abstract will then be circulated via email to all faculty, academic deans, and department chairs with a link to a survey to submit feedback/comments; the survey will be available for **30 days**. The full proposal will be made available on the Faculty Senate webpage.

At the time of circulation, a subcommittee consisting of two CAC members who are *not* part of the home unit (college/school) of the program will be appointed to review the proposal. All feedback collected during the public comment period will be made available to the CAC subcommittee. During their review, the subcommittee may ask the proposers to respond to specific comments. Additionally, the subcommittee will meet with the authors of the proposal, the dean of the responsible unit, and program faculty, and may request additional information as part of their review. Upon completion of their review, the subcommittee will write a report summarizing any additional information gathered during the review process, make a recommendation to support or reject the deactivation proposal, and provide rationale to explain their position.

The full **CAC will discuss and vote on the subcommittee's report at the meeting following the close of the 30 day comment period, unless significant issues arise that require additional time for the CAC subcommittee to complete its review**. CAC members will be provided with the full proposal along with the subcommittee's report as part of the meeting materials. The CAC will vote to support or reject the proposal for deactivation.

Following the meeting, the Chair of the CAC will write a memo that includes the CAC decision and a brief summary of the rationale for the decision. The memo and the CAC subcommittee's report will be sent to the Faculty Senate President and the director/department chair of the program **within 5 days** of the CAC vote. A copy of the memo will be sent to the Provost for information purposes only.

After receiving the memo, the program has **30 days** to submit a written rebuttal to the Faculty Senate President; the program can also choose not to submit a rebuttal.

The CAC memo and rebuttal (if submitted) will be **considered by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) at their next meeting**. The FSEC may accept the CAC position or send the matter back to CAC for further discussion, with

specific instructions about what aspects of the report require additional consideration and a deadline for the CAC response. If additional consideration is requested, the FSEC will consider it at their next meeting.

Once accepted by the FSEC, the deactivation will be placed on the agenda for a vote the **next Faculty Senate meeting**. Materials including the CAC memo, rebuttal submitted by the program if any, and any other information deemed relevant by the FSEC will be **sent to all Faculty Senators immediately** to allow sufficient time for consideration prior to the Faculty Senate meeting.

Results of the Faculty Senate vote will be communicated as advisory to the President and Provost **the day after the Faculty Senate meeting**.

Faculty Senate Proposal and Process to Terminate an Academic Program

A proposal to terminate an academic program may be initiated by a department, the Dean's office of the home unit, or the Provost. The sections below describe the proposal requirements and processes related to no-contest and contested terminations. Proposals for termination are considered no-contest if the program initiates or agrees with the termination. Termination proposals are considered contested if initiated by a party other than the program itself, and the program does not support the request by a majority vote of the department or program. Following review by the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC), all termination proposals must also be considered by the Faculty Senate and presented to the Board of Trustees for a vote.

No-Contest Termination Requests: In the case where the program initiates and/or agrees with a request for termination, a termination proposal can be put forth by the chair/program director in the form of a memo. The memo should present the rationale for the request, a brief history of the program, the number of students currently enrolled in the program and a plan to facilitate their completion, and a record of the faculty vote on the termination request. Following approval according to college/school-level procedures (e.g. department/program, unit curriculum committee, and dean's office; unit faculty in some units), proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. Graduate programs also require a support letter from the Graduate College Executive Committee and Dean. Upon successful review by the Provost's office, proposals will be sent to the CAC for review and approval. Once received, proposals will be circulated for a minimum of 30 days prior to a vote by the CAC. As noted above, termination of a program also requires a vote of approval by the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees. See the Timeline for Policy & Proposal Review Process available [here](#) for further details.

Contested Terminations: A contested termination process should be initiated *only after other possible avenues for resolution have been explored* including, but not limited to program changes, partnerships with other programs/departments, compromises that would allow a no-contest termination, and program deactivation. Proposals for contested terminations must be prepared using the guidelines below. Proposals should address all questions/items, and data should be provided as support wherever relevant.

Termination proposals must be reviewed at the college/school level prior to submission in accordance with college/school procedures (e.g. department, unit curriculum committee, and dean's office; unit faculty in some units). Graduate programs also require a letter from the Graduate College Executive Committee and Dean. At each level of review, the head of the relevant voting body should submit a letter in support of the termination, or a letter that summarizes the reasons for not approving the termination including any additional information relevant to review of the termination by the CAC (e.g. impacts of termination not included in the proposal). Once college/school-level review of a proposal is complete, proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. The review process and timeline are described in detail following the proposal requirements. Incomplete proposals will be returned with a request for the missing information; the timeline will not begin until a proposal is considered complete by both the Provost's office and the Chair of the CAC. *Proposers should carefully review the timeline below and plan accordingly.* When initiating a contested termination, proposers and those contesting the termination should be prepared to respond promptly to Provost and CAC subcommittee requests for additional information or materials in order to avoid preventable delays in the process.

The role of the CAC in contested terminations is to evaluate the request at a curricular level only; *the outcome of the contested termination process is therefore a recommendation solely regarding the curricular viability and quality of the program, not the financial feasibility of maintaining the program.* Data related to program efficiency and resource use provides valuable context in that resources are necessary to support program quality, but financial concerns are not a factor in the CAC's evaluation. Faculty employment, *including as a result of program terminations approved by the Board of Trustees*, is addressed in the contractual agreement covering bargaining unit faculty, and in the Larner College of Medicine Faculty Handbook (for LCOM faculty) and is outside the purview of the CAC.

Unless a hiatus in operation is explicitly acceptable to the program faculty (as reflected in a majority vote), the Dean, and the Provost, a program will operate as normal during the termination review process; *a termination will not be considered finalized until voted on by the Board of Trustees.* If a program is terminated, students in the program at the time of termination will be given the opportunity to complete the program within a reasonable timeframe.

Guidelines for Contested Termination Proposals

I. Abstract

A one-page summary of the essential information from each of the sections below. Please submit this abstract both as an introduction to the proposal and as a separate document; proposals will not be considered complete without the abstract.

II. Rationale for Termination and Summary of Communications with the Program

- A. Clearly describe the reasons for requesting termination of the program at this time, including reasons why other options such as deactivation or partnership with another unit/program are not appropriate.
- B. Summarize all communications with the program regarding the requested termination, including the details indicated below. Include all written communications (e.g. emails, memos) in an appendix to the termination request.
 - individuals involved and roles/positions
 - primary points of discussion
 - any compromises offered by either party
 - outcome(s) of the communication
- C. Describe the specific steps taken to reach an agreement between the proposal initiator and the program faculty.

III. Program History

- A. When was the program initiated?
- B. Have there been any significant changes, including name changes, since the time of initiation? If so, provide a summary of these changes.

IV. Program Quality and Internal Demand

Address all questions outlined below, providing relevant data as support.

- A. What are the current learning objectives of the program? For programs that require formal assessment (i.e. degree programs), provide evidence obtained through the assessment process to indicate how well students are meeting the stated learning objectives.
- B. Were any concerns related to program quality raised during the most recent assessment of the program through

the Academic Program Review process, or for externally accredited programs, in the most recent accreditation review? Concerns may include whether program staffing was sufficient to maintain quality and/or whether the curriculum reflects expectations within the field.

- C. Are courses required for the program offered on a regular and consistent basis? For graduate programs, are sufficient courses at the 300-level or above offered to maintain program quality?
- D. For programs that include a required, mentored component (e.g. research project; dissertation/thesis; internship; practicum), is there sufficient support and oversight of students?
- E. Provide enrollment data for the past 10 years or lifetime of program, whichever is shorter. How do the trends compare to enrollment in similar programs nation-wide?
- F. Are there any concerns related to advising of students in the program?
- G. Have students in the program raised any concerns related to the quality of their educational experiences?

V. External Demand and Societal Needs

- A. Is there limited or decreasing demand regionally and/or nationally for individuals with the knowledge/skills of graduates of the program? Provide relevant evidence such as employment trends, placement of graduates, etc.
- B. Is the program not providing graduates with the skills/knowledge necessary to be successful following graduation from UVM? If so, have potential changes to remedy the situation been discussed?

VI. Contribution to Missions and Long-Range Plans

- A. Is the program misaligned with current university-level missions, mission as a land-grant university, strategic priorities, vision, and/or academic goals (e.g. university-wide curricular requirements)? If so, explain how; if not, explain the effects of deactivating the program on the ability to achieve the current university-level missions, strategic priorities, and academic goals.
- B. Is the program misaligned with current college/school-level missions, strategic priorities, vision, and/or academic goals? If so, explain how; if not, explain the effects of deactivating the program on the ability to achieve the current university-level missions, strategic priorities, and academic goals.
- C. Do UVM's peer and competitor institutions offer similar programs? Would loss of the program affect UVM's ability to attract high-quality students?

VII. Program Sustainability

- A. Are there currently insufficient faculty resources to teach required courses and/or oversee other required program components (e.g. research projects; internships)? If so, have potential partnerships with other departments/units been explored?
- B. Are there anticipated, voluntary losses of faculty (e.g. via retirement) that could affect the ability of program to maintain quality?
- C. Include data from the Office of Institutional Research that is relevant to the financial sustainability of the program.
- D. Are other programs being negatively impacted by investment resources in the program? If so, provide specific evidence.

VIII. Impact of Termination

- A. What are the potential impacts of termination on any closely associated programs at UVM (e.g. a minor or

- certificate program in the case of a request to terminate a major)?
- B. Will course offerings be affected if the program is terminated? If so, provide:
 - a list of the courses including enrollment trends for the past six semesters
 - evidence of communication with any units/departments/programs that include the courses listed above in their required and/or elective courses
 - C. Are the enrollments in other programs and/or courses outside the program being considered for termination likely to be affected? Include evidence of communication with any potentially affected units/departments/programs.
 - D. Would termination of the program affect research projects of any faculty outside the program (e.g. via loss of collaborations)?
 - E. Are there any community partners that would be affected by termination (e.g. service learning projects; practicums; internships)? If so, provide evidence of communication with the community partners, including offers to maintain those partnerships in new administrative locations.
 - F. How would termination affect the responsibilities and roles of faculty involved the program?
 - G. Provide a detailed teachout plan for accommodating program completion for all students currently enrolled in the program should it be terminated.

Process and Timeline for Contested Terminations

As noted previously, completed proposals should be submitted to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. If the Provost determines that the proposal is complete and a reasonable case has been made for terminating the program, the Provost will forward the proposal to the Faculty Senate with a request for review by the CAC. The Provost has **two weeks (14 days)** to make a decision.

The proposal abstract will then be circulated via email to all faculty, academic deans, and department chairs with a link to a survey to submit feedback/comments; the survey will be available for **30 days**. The full proposal will be made available on the Faculty Senate webpage.

At the time of circulation, a subcommittee consisting of two CAC members who are *not* part of the home unit (college/school) of the program will be appointed to review the proposal. All feedback collected during the public comment period will be made available to the CAC subcommittee. During their review, the subcommittee may ask the proposers to respond to specific comments. Additionally, the subcommittee will meet with the authors of the proposal, the dean of the responsible unit, and program faculty, and may request additional information as part of their review. Upon completion of their review, the subcommittee will write a report summarizing any additional information gathered during the review process, make a recommendation to support or reject the termination proposal, and provide rationale to explain their position.

The full **CAC will discuss and vote on the subcommittee's report at the meeting following the close of the 30 day comment period, unless significant issues arise that require additional time for the CAC subcommittee to complete its review**. CAC members will be provided with the full proposal along with the subcommittee's report as part of the meeting materials. The CAC will vote to support or reject the proposal for termination.

Following the meeting, the Chair of the CAC will write a memo that includes the CAC decision and a brief summary of the rationale for the decision. The memo and the CAC subcommittee's report will be sent to the Faculty Senate President and the director/department chair of the program **within 5 days** of the CAC vote. A copy of the memo will be sent to the Provost for information purposes only.

After receiving the memo, the program has **30 days** to submit a written rebuttal to the Faculty Senate President; the program can also choose not to submit a rebuttal.

The CAC memo and rebuttal (if submitted) will be **considered by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) at their next meeting**. The FSEC may accept the CAC position or send the matter back to CAC for further discussion, with specific instructions about what aspects of the report require additional consideration and a deadline for the CAC response. If additional consideration is requested, the FSEC will consider it at their next meeting.

Once accepted by the FSEC, the termination will be placed on the agenda for a vote the **next Faculty Senate meeting**. Materials including the CAC memo, rebuttal submitted by the program if any, and any other information deemed relevant by the FSEC will be **sent to all Faculty Senators immediately** to allow sufficient time for consideration prior to the Faculty Senate meeting.

Results of the Faculty Senate vote will be communicated to the President and Provost **the day after the Faculty Senate meeting**. As noted previously, all program terminations must be approved by the Board of Trustees.