Academic Program Planning Workshop

March 19, 2015
UNC General Administration
Objectives

• Meet GA staff who assist in degree program planning actions
• Discuss role of the BOG, GA
• Overview relevant policies, processes and forms
• Review most frequent reasons proposals need revisions
• Discuss presentation and justification of budget
• Provide basic training on PREP
A run through the UNC policy manual....
Overview of Authority

UNC Board of Governors (BOG) has authority to:

- Approve new degree programs (400.1)
- Discontinue degree programs (400.1)
- Terminate degree programs (400.1.2)
- Create and change policy related to academic program planning

UNC General Administration (GA) has authority to:

- Recommend approval and discontinuation of degree programs to BOG (400.1)
- Approve distance delivery of existing degree programs (400.1.1[R])
- Approve changes to degree type, degree title, and CIP for existing degree programs (400.1.1.1[G])
- Periodic reviews to determine whether productivity and quality review processes are followed (400.1)
- Create and change regulations and guidelines related to academic program planning

Relevant BOG Committees

- Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs (“Ed Planning” or EPPP) – for establishment and discontinuation
- Budget and Finance - for tuition and fees
UNC Policy Manual Chapter 400.1 Academic Programs

- 400.1
  Policy on Academic Program Planning

- 400.1.1[R]
  Regulations for Academic Program Planning and Evaluation

- 400.1.1.1[G]
  Guidelines for Academic Program Development

- 400.1.1.2[G]
  Guidelines for Alternative, Online, or Distance Education Delivery of Approved Degree Programs

- 400.1.1.3[G]
  Appendix A: University of North Carolina Request for Authorization to Plan a New Degree Program

- 400.1.1.5[G]
  Appendix C: University of North Carolina Request for Authorization to Establish a New Degree Program

- 400.1.1.6[G]
  Appendix D: Request for Authorization to Discontinue a Degree Program

- 400.1.1.7[G]
  Appendix F: Notification of Intent to Plan a New Distance Education Degree Program

- 400.1.1.8[G]
  Appendix G: Request for Authorization to Establish a New Distance Education Degree Program or Site

- 400.1.1.9[G]
  Appendix I: Distance Education Degree Program Site Discontinuation Form

- 400.1.1.10[G]
  Appendix J: Request for Authorization to Participate in an Inter-institutional Arrangement
“...analysis and recommendation of the need for a new academic program, the place for its establishment, and the method of its delivery shall be based on:

1. number, location, and mode of delivery of existing programs,
2. the relation of the program to the distinctiveness of the campus and the mission of the campus,
3. the demand for the program in the locality, region, or State as a whole,
4. whether the program would create unnecessary duplication,
5. employment opportunities for program graduates,
6. faculty quality and number for offering the program,
7. the availability of campus resources (library, space, labs, equipment, external funding, and the like) to support the program,
8. the number and quality of lower-level and cognate programs for supporting the new program,
9. impact of program decision on access and affordability,
10. the expected quality of the proposed degree program,
11. feasibility of a joint or collaborative program by two or more campuses, and
12. any other consideration relevant to the need for the program.”

BOG has asked GA to address these items when presenting a request to establish a new degree program, as well as

Overview of campus and other review processes and recommendations for alternatives to offering the new degree
• Limits number of priority programs under active review with GA
  • Currently three, revisions under review that will allow up to five

• Offers considerations for first professional, joint degrees, dual degrees, interdisciplinary degrees, and degree consortia

• Defines alternative delivery methods

• Addresses discontinuation, including teach-out plans

• Appends flowcharts for review process at each level (baccalaureate, master’s, doctoral)
• Defines degree levels offered by University

• Defines CIP categories in use

• Defines program status: “As a general rule, in order to be considered for degree program status, a course of study should require at least 27 semester hours in the proposed program area at the undergraduate level; at least half the number of hours required for the degree at the master’s level; and at least 21 hours in the proposed program area at the doctoral level. Anything less than this within an existing degree program should be designated a concentration, a decision that can be made at the campus level.”

• Planning and establishment procedures and flowcharts
• 400.1.1.1[G] defines post-baccalaureate certificates and post-master’s certificate requirements.

• 400.1.1.1[G] also states, “Campuses may offer other certificate programs that do not meet these IPEDS reporting requirements.”

• UNC GA does not approve certificates.

• We do manage a certificate inventory that is searchable on the GA website. We only update information, however, when informed by the campuses of additions, deletions or edits.

• Campuses send information on certificates via a web-based process http://www.northcarolina.edu/?q=academic-planning/certification-notification

• Contact Cody Thompson with questions related to certificate notification and inventory management.
• Defines SACS off-site and online parameters

• Describes categories for evaluating distance delivery requests

• In process of adding flowchart with same basic timeline principles as other processes

• G.4.f. “The institution must provide appropriate training for faculty who teach in distance education programs.”

UNCGA currently uses the SREB’s Electronic Campus Regional Reciprocity Agreement (SECRRA) “Principles of Good Practice” and common standards for vetting online/distance education programs to be included in the Electronic Campus inventory maintained by the Southern Regional Education Board. The SACSCOC policy and Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (CRAC) best practices for online/distance education also guide the UNCGA evaluation of program proposals.
• 400.1.12 defines joint degree and approval authority and process

• 400.1.12[R] defines areas that must be addressed in proposals for joint degree programs.
  • Relevant prompts are now under review as additions to Appendix A/C
Appendices - Current

New Degree Program (regardless of delivery method)

400.1.1.3[G] Appendix A
Request to Plan

400.1.1.5[G] Appendix C
Request to Establish

BOG approval

If seeking alternate delivery

Distance offering of BOG Approved Degree Program

400.1.1.7[G] Appendix F
Request to Plan online or distance delivery site

400.1.1.8[G] Appendix G
Request to Establish online or distance delivery site

GA approval

Discontinuations

400.1.1.6[G] Appendix D
Request to Discontinue degree program

BOG approval

OR

400.1.1.9[G] Appendix I
Request to discontinue online or distance delivery site

GA approval
Appendices – Future Vision

400.1.1.[G] 
Appendix A / F Combined 
Request to Plan 
Use for any delivery method

400.1.1.[G] 
Appendix C / G Combined 
Request to Establish 
Use for any delivery method

400.1.1.[G] 
Appendix D / I Combined 
Request to Discontinue 
Use for any delivery method

Any new **degree program**, regardless of delivery method, would be taken to BOG for approval.

Any discontinuation of a **degree program**, regardless of delivery method, would be taken to BOG for approval.

GA could still approve or discontinue additional alternate delivery methods/sites for BOG approved degree programs.

Academic Program Inventory (API) and policy revision initiative underway now at GA....
Appendix J: Request for Authorization to Participate in an Inter-Institutional Arrangement

- 400.1.1[R] defines a Degree Consortium (see right).

- This Appendix is referenced in 400.1.1.2[G] distance delivery guidelines for inter-institutional arrangements and indicates only GA approval in those cases.

- Previously used to govern language consortia that have now become World Language Exchange

- Not needed for dual degrees or articulation agreements

- Under review as to the need
A walk through the approval processes....
Process for Planning and Establishment of New Baccalaureate Degree Program:

Appendix A – Request for Authorization to Plan a New Degree Program
Appendix C – Request for Authorization to Establish a New Degree Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Appendix A Review</strong></th>
<th><strong>Within four weeks</strong></th>
<th><strong>GA responds with approval to move forward with request</strong></th>
<th><strong>GA approves and invites submission of Appendix C</strong></th>
<th><strong>Campus submits Appendix C within four months</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A submitted to GA</td>
<td>GA acknowledges receipt within 48 hrs.</td>
<td>GA responds with questions; campus replies <strong>within four weeks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Appendix C Review</strong></th>
<th><strong>Within four weeks</strong></th>
<th><strong>GA responds that proposal is complete</strong></th>
<th><strong>Completed Appendix C is posted to Academic Planning Website for <strong>four weeks</strong> for system-wide review and comments</strong></th>
<th><strong>Within two weeks</strong></th>
<th><strong>GA makes recommendation to EPPP Committee</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C submitted to GA</td>
<td>GA acknowledges receipt within 48 hrs.</td>
<td>GA requests information; campus replies <strong>within four weeks</strong></td>
<td>Completed Appendix C is posted to Academic Planning Website for <strong>four weeks</strong> for system-wide review and comments</td>
<td>GA reviews comments received</td>
<td>GA is prepared to make recommendation to EPPP Committee or Campus notified of any remaining issues; campus replies <strong>within four weeks</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BOG Action</strong></th>
<th><strong>Upon GA recommendation degree program brought to next EPPP Committee meeting</strong></th>
<th><strong>Upon EPPP Committee approval degree program brought to next BOG meeting</strong></th>
<th><strong>BOG acts on EPPP Committee recommendation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Flowchart – Master’s

Process for Planning and Establishment of New Masters Degree Program:

Appendix A – Request for Authorization to Plan a New Degree Program
Appendix C – Request for Authorization to Establish a New Degree Program

**Appendix A Review**
- Appendix A submitted to GA
- GA acknowledges receipt within 48 hrs.
- **Within four weeks**
  - GA responds with approval to move forward with request
  - or
  - GA responds with questions; campus replies within four weeks
- GA approves and invites submission of Appendix C
- Campus submits Appendix C within four months

**Appendix C Review**
- Appendix C submitted to GA
- GA acknowledges receipt within 48 hrs.
- **Within four weeks**
  - GA responds that proposal is complete
  - or
  - GA requests information; campus replies within four weeks
- Completed Appendix C is forwarded to the UNC Graduate Council for a four-week review period. Graduate Deans submit their campus comments to GA for information and consideration
- GA reviews comments received
- **Within two weeks**
  - GA is prepared to make recommendation to EPPP Committee
  - or
  - Campus notified of any remaining issues; campus replies within four weeks
- GA makes recommendation to EPPP Committee

**BOG Action**
- Upon GA recommendation degree program brought to next EPPP Committee meeting
- Upon EPPP Committee approval degree program brought to next BOG meeting
- BOG acts on EPPP Committee recommendation
Flowchart - Doctoral

Process for Planning and Establishment of New Doctoral Degree Program:

Appendix A – Request for Authorization to Plan a New Degree Program
Appendix C – Request for Authorization to Establish a New Degree Program

**Flowchart:**

- **Appendix A Review**
  - Appendix A submitted to GA
  - GA acknowledges receipt within 48 hrs.
  - Within six weeks:
    - GA responds that proposal is complete
      - or
    - GA requests information; campus replies within four weeks
  - Completed Appendix A is forwarded to the UNC Graduate Council for review and discussion/vote at the next quarterly Graduate Council meeting
  - Within two weeks:
    - If Council vote is positive and key decision-making criteria are met, GA will authorize permission to plan new doctoral program
      - or
    - If Council vote is positive and key decision-making criteria are not clearly met, GA will forward recommendation to EPPP Committee for consideration and vote
      - or
    - If Council vote is negative, campus may revise and re-submit Appendix A;
      - Campus re-submits within four weeks

- **Appendix C Review**
  - Appendix C submitted to GA
  - GA acknowledges receipt within 48 hrs.
  - Within six weeks:
    - GA responds that proposal is complete
      - or
    - GA requests information; campus replies within four weeks
  - Completed Appendix C is forwarded by GA to selected external reviewers
  - Within ten weeks:
    - External reviews sent to campus/campus notified whether reviews will be sent to Graduate Council Subcommittee
  - Within four weeks:
    - If utilized, Graduate Council Subcommittee will respond to GA
    - or
    - GA makes recommendation to EPPP Committee

- **BOG Action**
  - Upon GA recommendation degree program brought to next EPPP Committee meeting
  - Upon EPPP Committee approval degree program brought to next BOG meeting
  - BOG acts on EPPP Committee recommendation
All proposals are reviewed by
• UNC General Administration
  • UNC system faculty
• External reviewers (doctoral)

Any proposal could be viewed by public, via records request.

**Advice:** Write with all of these audiences in mind from the outset.

What detail will each want to see/know in order to make an informed recommendation?
Some key areas of concern for each audience

**BOG**
- Mission
- Student demand
- Societal demand / employability
- Collaboration / unnecessary duplication
- Resources

**UNC System Reviewers**
- Care about same things plus....
- Curriculum
- Faculty capacity
- Graduate student support
- Unnecessary duplication / comparison and competitiveness with their program

**External Reviewers**
Does your proposal match their experience regarding
- Student demand
- Societal demand / employability
- Curriculum
- Resources
- Faculty qualifications
Focus Areas in Approval Process

• The basics
  • Title, CIP, degree type, SACS notification

• Educational objectives
  • Are they about what students will learn?
  • Do they relate to your evaluation plans? CIP?

• Mission appropriateness
  • Any specific limitation in mission statement?

• Student demand
  • See slide on student demand.

• Employability / societal demand
  • See slide on societal demand.

• Related programs in system, NC and beyond
  • Campuses care about how they are characterized and will call you on it if you’re off base.
  • See slide on collaboration.
Focus Areas in Approval Process

• **Curriculum and requirements**
  - Check that the credit hours match up in text and tables.
  - It usually helps to show a curriculum plan for how “typical” students can move through a program.

• **Faculty sufficiency**
  - Is the rationale clear for new faculty hires?
  - If no hires are requested, is it reasonable to sustain current workloads plus that of the new program?
  - Do existing faculty have the expertise needed?
  - Do faculty have expertise for online delivery?

• **Budget**
  - See slide on budget.

• **Administration**
  - Is it a well thought-out plan? Likely to succeed? Especially important in inter-disciplinary programs

• **Evaluation**
  - Is the plan comprehensive? Achievable?
  - Connected to campus objectives or standards in the field?
VII. Administration. Describe how the program will be administered, giving the responsibilities of each department, division, school or college. Explain any inter-departmental or inter-unit administrative plans. Include an organizational chart showing the “location” of the proposed new program.

The response below was from a program on a single campus that required partnership across two major units.

“Faculty will remain with their home academic unit. A joint committee consisting of faculty from the two affected units will be constituted to advise students and to handle administrative tasks that arise as a result of this program spanning two academic units. This program will be jointly offered by the College of X (Department of Y) and the School of Z.”
The proposed program will be jointly offered by the College of (department of ) and the School of . The deans’ offices and a joint advisory committee from the two Schools will oversee the administration of the program. This advisory committee will appoint a program a coordinator who is tasked with the primary responsibility of coordinating the day-to-day affairs of the program. The program coordinator will serve a fixed term on a rotating basis from the two units (College of , department of , and the School of ). The coordinator will be given the appropriate course release to cover the time and effort required for program administration. The deans’ offices will provide additional administrative assistance needed to schedule courses, arrange seminars and lectures, monitor internships and other student activities. The deans’ offices in cooperation with the provost will also be responsible for addressing additional administrative tasks associated with a joint program, i.e., ensuring that the proper facilities are available, instructional technology is adequate and faculty have access to instructional materials as well as providing students with appropriate academic support.

Faculty who teach in the program will officially remain within their home academic unit and will be governed by the policies and practices of their respective units. Faculty who are members of the joint committee will conduct annual program reviews and evaluate program-learning outcomes. Designated faculty who serve on the joint advisory committee will advise students. The joint advisory committee and faculty will be responsible for certifying graduates. The budget for the program will be allocated and administered within the policies and procedures of the Department and Schools and university.
Why proposals need revision

**Student demand** evidence, enrollment projections, and budget are all linked. They must make sense in concert with one another.

---

**Student demand**

**Goal:** Provide data to corroborate your enrollment projections. Even better if your student demand data have clearly been used to shape aspects of the program.

**Strong scenario:** survey data from target applicants + enrollment data in related programs + data on inquiries.

---

We know students will apply for this program.

We know students will apply for this program because they call us and ask about it.

We know students will apply for this program because they call us and ask about it and we track the inquiries. Here is a chart about inquiries and who is inquiring from the last X months.

We know students will apply for this program because we have undergraduate feeder programs [or, we talked to similar programs elsewhere] and they have good enrollments.

We know students will apply for this program because we surveyed XX of YY students in our undergraduate feeder programs (or other target audience) and know XX% are interested.

We know students will apply for this program because we received surveys from XX of YY students in our undergraduate feeder programs (or other target audience) and know XX% are interested. We also know they prefer online delivery, plan to start in next X years, etc. XX institution has YY enrollments in a similar program.
2014 revisions to Appendix A require that multiple sources of societal demand / employability evidence be provided, including State priorities for economic development and job creation in targeted sectors. Submissions have improved in this regard.

Labor market information (BE SPECIFIC TO THE DEGREE LEVEL)
- Area, occupation and industry profiles
- NC occupational and employment projections
- Job postings
- Economic and demographic indicators

National occupational and industry projections

Wages and employment of graduates in NC (www.nctower.com)

Wages and employment of graduates nationally

Job posting analyses

Projections from professional associations or industry reports

Data from UNC alumni surveys
Collaboration should be explored in every case but will draw a higher level of scrutiny when proposed programs are high cost and potentially duplicative.

**Goal:**
Identify concrete opportunities that can help each partner meet issues of student demand, budget, and/or societal need.

**Best case scenario:**
Explore collaborative opportunities deliberately and early in program development, not as an afterthought or an act of response to GA.

We believe there will be opportunities to collaborate with other programs.

We have talked with other programs and all agree we believe there will be opportunities to collaborate.

We have talked with other programs and have identified these broad areas where we believe there will be opportunities to collaborate. They are teaching, research, and service.

We have talked with other programs and have identified these specific areas where we believe there will be opportunities to collaborate. Sharing elective courses, faculty service on committees, etc. (Low hanging fruit)

We have talked with other programs and have identified these specific areas in which to collaborate. Sharing elective courses, faculty service on committees, etc. (Low hanging fruit)

We will collaborate with X program via our letter of commitment and plan for how we will execute our partnership. By doing so, we each can save Y resources, serve Z students, and ...
Why proposals need revision

When proposals argue that a program will serve a unique need and is not duplicative of existing program(s), that argument should be addressed by the evidence presented throughout the entire proposal.

Example: “We will prepare rural practitioners, whereas X campus does not.”

Is this “uniqueness” claim backed up in the
- Educational objectives
- Student demand evidence
- Employability/societal demand evidence
- Curriculum
- Faculty expertise
- Etc.
Faculty Qualifications for Teaching Distance/Online Courses (Appendix G)

Beyond offering orientation and training for faculty and students in the use of online technology, detail is needed about how the institution will ensure faculty preparation and quality instruction rather than just a statement that the institution will do so.

State what is the existing capacity for faculty to add sections of online courses to their teaching load.

Describe how faculty are supported in acquiring the pedagogical skills needed to teach online courses that are different than the skills needed in the face-to-face learning environment.

Describe the availability and quality of professional development and support that will be offered to faculty for maintaining instructional quality.

Describe how the department and institution will assure that online courses are of equal rigor and quality as traditional face-to-face courses.
Why proposals need revision

The strongest submissions...

• Include more than one source of evidence ("triangulation")
  o BLS + relevant job postings + job placement data from other programs + evidence of support from potential employers = hard to deny the need
  o Anecdotal claims are backed up with data, support letters, etc.

• Bring the evidence as "close to home" as possible.
  o Can national reports and statistics be supported by folks in your own backyard?

• Apply evidence to decisions about the program.
  o Designing a program that responds to needs and wants of surveyed students and/or potential employers of graduates
  o Enrollment, curriculum, and budget projections make sense in concert
Checklist:

- Does the budget match the narrative throughout (numbers of new hires, etc.)

- Does projected annual FTE make sense based on FT/PT proposed enrollment?

- Does figure in Differential Tuition Remainder at top match the $$ in Projected Differential Tuition column?

- Are Other New Allocations identified?

- If budget depends on differential tuition and/or enrollment increase funds, is an institutional commitment letter included, in the event these sources do not come to pass?
Two rationales for requesting differential tuition for graduate programs

- Market-based – comparison with similar programs (particularly important for Nonresident rates)
- Cost-based – program requires unique instructional costs (faculty with highly specialized expertise, laboratory construction or equipment purchase, etc.)

Differential tuition vs. Fees

- Tuition supports the general provision of instruction
- Fees are for “limited, dedicated purposes...” UNC Policy Manual 100.1.1

How the BOG approves differential tuition

- Tuition rates are set by the BOG based on 1 FTE for a traditional (Fall & Spring) academic year. By policy, tuition rates are only set per semester credit hour for distance education courses.
- Tuition rates for courses delivered during the summer are set by the President. Each fall campus’ submit summer tuition rate requests for the upcoming summer session based on the rates approved for that academic year.
Sometimes the campus desires to consolidate multiple existing degree programs under a single umbrella degree program. The campus can either:

1) Retain one program as the umbrella (if it makes sense to do so, re: curriculum and CIP) while discontinuing the others (usu. to become concentrations within the umbrella); or

2) Discontinue all existing programs and open a new umbrella program comprised of the component parts (usu. results in a new CIP, title).
   ▪ In this case, we usually ask the campus to submit only an Appendix C for an expedited review process.
   ▪ The new resulting program must be approved by the BOG.
Discontinuations

• Appendix D for face-to-face programs

• Appendix I for distance delivery (off-site or online). SACS wants to know if a site has been active within a five year period; if not, should be either re-approved or discontinued.

• Teach-out plans are required to accompany discontinuation requests per 400.1.1[R], but this requirement is unfortunately not specified in Appendix D or I at this time. Revision of these two documents coming soon.... If you do not proactively send them, we will ask for them.

• Institutions do not have to wait to discontinue a degree program until the last students have graduated from the program. That’s the purpose of the Teach-Out plan for SACS and GA.
RESOURCES

UNC Policy Manual Section 400, Academic Programs -

UNC PREP – https://prep.northcarolina.edu/

SACS Substantive Change - http://www.sacscoc.org/SubstantiveChange.asp and

SREB / SECRA - ide.sreb.org/fedregs/SECRA%206.22.2012%20Final.docx

Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (CRAC) resources via SACSCOC -
http://www.sacscoc.org/handbooks.asp

SACSCOC Best Practices for Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs -

Western Association for Schools and Colleges (WASC) Protocol for review of distance programs -

New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) – Guidelines for evaluation of distance education -
PREP
PREP Training - Objectives

- Where is it?
- What does it do?
- Overview of Roles
- Key actions and tips
  - Public views
  - Logging in
  - Adding a new priority
  - Adding a new document (Appendix A, C or response)
  - Requesting an extension
  - Adding a comment
  - Distance requests
  - Reviewing proposals during comment windows

Refer to separate training manual.
PREP – Where is it?

Pathway:
UNC GA Home Page
- Leadership and Policy
- System Offices
- Academic Affairs
- Academic Planning
- New Degree Programs

OR BOOKMARK IT!
https://prep.northcarolina.edu/
The Program Request Portal application (PREP) provides an online service to North Carolina’s 16 public universities for submission and review of academic program requests at multiple degree levels. PREP facilitates:

• Campus submission of requests to UNC General Administration for approval of no more than five active priority new degree programs and two inactive priority new degree programs
• Campus submission of requests to plan and establish priority new degree programs
• Feedback and revision steps in the review process for new degree programs
• Submission, feedback and revision steps for requests to add distance delivery options to existing degree programs
• A public view to all GA-approved priority new degree programs that are under review or being planned
PREP – Campus Roles

**Campus Program Coordinators (CPCs)** are the only roles who can on behalf of Chancellor:

- Submit new priority program request
- Submit Appendix A (Request to Plan)
- Submit Appendix C (Request to Establish)
- Submit Appendix F (Request to Plan – Distance)
- Submit Appendix G (Request to Establish – Distance)
- Submit other campus response documents
- Retract Program (up until Appendix A submission)
- Request Extension
- Add subscribers

**Subscribers can:**

- View program log for program to which he/she is subscribed

**Graduate Council can:**

- View graduate program when in comment period
- Submit review (able to save draft)
Campus Program Coordinators (CPCs) are the only roles who can on behalf of Chancellor:

- Submit new priority program request
- Submit Appendix A (Request to Plan)
- Submit Appendix C (Request to Establish)
- Submit Appendix F (Request to Plan – Distance)
- Submit Appendix G (Request to Establish – Distance)
- Submit other campus response documents
- Retract Program (up until Appendix A submission)
- Request Extension
- Add subscribers

Graduate Council can:

- View graduate program when in comment period
- Submit review (able to save draft)

Subscribers can:

- View program log for program to which he/she is subscribed

This is new functionality.... does your campus need to update its CPCs?

Known issues:

- When subscriber emails don’t match
- When Graduate Council rep is added as a subscriber
GA Admins (baccalaureate = Tim, graduate = Courtney, and Cody) are the only roles who can:

- Acknowledge a priority new degree program request or Appendix submissions
- Deny program request
- Approve request to plan or establish new program in PREP (leading up to BOG action)
- Approve request to plan or establish distance delivery for existing degree programs
- Return program request to campus
- Accept an extension request
- Add, revise or delete campus CPCs (as User Administrator)
- Add, revise or delete reviewer questions for comment periods (as Question Administrator)

GA Viewer – View program logs (other AA staff)

Doctoral Reviewer – view program, upload review, save draft

UNC Users – view program, upload review, save draft (for baccalaureate level only)

Public – access public view of PREP activity
PREP – Document Tips

• Use comment feature for quick questions or statements. Upload a document for substantive communications.

• Only PDFs can be uploaded.

• Only a single PDF can be uploaded for each action – if you upload one PDF and then try to upload another, you will overwrite the previous upload.

• PLEASE check your Appendix PDF uploads for completeness every time….does it include all CVs, support letters, etc.

• Be careful when selecting what type of document you are uploading (Appendix or Response). If your document contains an Appendix, select Appendix!

• Whatever is included in the final approved Appendix A/C PDFs is going to go out for review.

• Chancellor signatures still required in PDFs, but signed hard copies will be eliminated upon approval of guideline revisions underway.