### BOX 3: ACTION ITEM
(check appropriate boxes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
<th>Impact Reviews</th>
<th>Approval Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experimental Course</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>a, c, e</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course Title</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Credits</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Course Number</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Course Level</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prereq &amp; Co-Requisite</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Course Description</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New Course</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Deactivate a Course</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Program Requirements</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>b, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a. UG Specialization (24 credits or less)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b. Masters Specialization (12 credits or less)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c. Doctoral Specialization (18 credits or less)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Closed Site Program</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Program Suspension</td>
<td>NO,5</td>
<td>a, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a. Certificate Program (ug/g) exclusively within existing degree program</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>a, c, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b. Certificate Program (ug/g) where degree programs do not exist or where courses are selected across degree programs (12 or more credits)</td>
<td>NOQR, 6</td>
<td>a, c, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGHJL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Off-Campus Delivery of Existing Program</td>
<td>NO, 4</td>
<td>a, b, c, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGHIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a. UG Concentration (exceeds 24 credit hours)</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGHJL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b. Masters Concentration (exceeds 12 credit hours)</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGHJL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c. Doctoral Concentration (exceeds 18 credit hours)</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGHJL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Program Title Change</td>
<td>NO, 5</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGHJL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Program Termination</td>
<td>NO, 10</td>
<td>d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGHJL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. New Degree Program</td>
<td>NOQR, 3.8</td>
<td>a, c, d, e</td>
<td>ABCDEFGHJL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BOX 4: DOCUMENTATION (check boxes of documents included)

- N. This Cover Sheet
- Q. Full 5-page MHEC Proposal
- T. Other
- O. Summary Proposal
- R. Financial Tables (MHEC)
- P. Course Definition Document
- S. Contract

1. Approval of experiential course automatically lapses after two offerings unless permanently approved as a new course.
2. Codes: a) Library Services (Langsdale or Law) b) Office of Technology Services c) University Relations d) Admissions
3. Letter of Intent is required by USM at least 30 days before a full proposal can be submitted. Letter of Intent requires only the approval of the dean and the provost and is forwarded to USM by the Office of the Provost.
4. One-page letter to include: Program title & degree/certificate to be awarded; resources requirements; need and demand; similar programs; method of instruction; and oversight and student services (MHEC requirement)
5. One-page letter with description and rationale (MHEC requirement)
6. One or two-page document that describes: centrality to mission; market demand; curriculum design; adequacy of faculty resources; and assurance program will be supported with existing resources. (MHEC requirement)
7. Learning objectives, assessment strategies; fit with US strategic plan
8. Joint Degree Program or Primary Degree Programs require submission of MOU w/ program proposal. (MHEC requirement)
9. Temporary suspension of program to examine future direction; time not to exceed two years. No new students admitted during suspension, but currently enrolled students must be given opportunity to satisfy degree requirements.
10. Provide:
   a. evidence that the action is consistent with UB mission and can be implemented within the existing program resources of the institution.
   b. proposed date after which no new students will be admitted into the program;
   c. accommodation of currently enrolled students in the realization of their degree objectives;
   d. treatment of all tenured and non-tenured faculty and other staff in the affected program;
   e. reallocation of funds from the budget of the affected program; and
   f. existence at other state public institutions of programs to which to redirect students who might have enrolled in the program proposed for abolition.

11. University Council review (for a recommendation to the President or back to the Provost) shall be limited to curricular or academic policy issues that may potentially affect the University's mission and strategic planning, or have a significant impact on the generation or allocation of its financial resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 5: IMPACT REVIEW</th>
<th>SIGNATURES (see procedures for authorized signers)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Library</td>
<td>Director or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. OTS</td>
<td>CIO or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. University Relations</td>
<td>Director or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Admissions</td>
<td>Director or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Records</td>
<td>Registrar or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 6: APPROVAL SEQUENCE</th>
<th>APPROVAL SIGNATURES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Department / Division</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Final faculty review body within each School</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. College Dean</td>
<td>Dean:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Provost:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E. Curriculum Review Committee (UFS subcommittee) | Chair:  
| F. University Faculty Senate (UFS option) | Chair:  |
| G. University Council (see #11 above) | Chair:  |
| H. President | President: |
| I. Board of Regents – notification only |  |
| J. Board of Regents – approval |  |
| K. MHEC – notification only |  |
| L. MHEC – approval |  |
| M. Middle States Association notification | Required only if the mission of the University is changed by the action |  |
O-1: Briefly describe what is being requested:
Addition of new course – Comparative Land Law Reform

O-2: Set forth the rationale for the proposal:

Students: Comparison of the land law reforms in the three countries studied will provide insight into their divergent legal, social and political structures, as well as provide fresh insight into Americans taking jurisprudence.

Law School: To strengthen already existing links with Aberdeen University Law School, a top-rated (RAE 5) UK Law School.

University: To strengthen already existing links with Aberdeen University Law School, a top-rated (RAE 5) UK Law School.
Document P: Required Format for Course Definition Document

1. Date Prepared: February 23, 2007
2. Prepared by: Professor Michael Hayes
3. Department: School of Law
4. Course Number(s), including HEGIS code(s): n/a
5. Course Title: Comparative Land Law Reform
6. Credit Hours: 3
7. Catalog Description (Paragraph should reflect general aims and nature of the course): The course in Comparative Land Law Reform will consider and compare land law reforms in Scotland, South Africa the United States. The 2003 Scottish Land Reform Act provides for a general public right of access to land throughout Scotland and empowers communities to take private lands with a forced sale. A post-Apartheid South African land reform program derives from the 1996 Constitution and provides for restitution and redistribution. By contrast current land reforms in the United States are a product of judicial not legislative action. In a series of decisions the United States Supreme Court seems intent upon limiting public regulations of private property.
8. Prerequisites: None
9. Faculty qualified to teach course: Faculty in the Aberdeen summer abroad program
10. Course Type (check appropriate) Open Enrollment: x
11. Suggested approximate class size: 40
12. Content Outline: Should private property be made a constitutional right? The timeless controversy continues. Classic liberal thought views constitutional property as a necessary condition of economic development and as the bedrock protection of individual liberty. Contrary critics consider entrenched property rights a source of inequality in both wealth and political power. This course will reconsiders this age-old debate by taking a comparative look at the protection of property under the constitutions of the United States, South Africa and Scotland.
All three countries are constitutional democracies with free market economies, but they seem to be making divergent choices as to whether to understand their constitutions so as give private property a qualified immunity from majority rule. The inconsistency seems in part the result of the dissimilar texts of the several constitutions, and in part the result dissimilar interpretation of the several constitutions by law-makers.

Differences in the constitutional texts of the three countries are well defined. The time-worn language of the United States document includes multiple provisions protecting property without exception. South Africa’s 1996 constitution contains a clause securing private property but limits it by an overriding language requiring that the property serve the needs of society. And Scotland has no written document at all; protections for private property must be found in Scotland’s unwritten constitution, or not at all.

In a number of recent decisions the United States Supreme Court has reconsidered the relationship between private property and public regulatory authority. The U.S. Court seems poised to mount a more activist constitutional challenge against redistributive legislation that upsets the “investment-backed expectations” of property holders. South African land reformers, on the other hand, have used its post-Apartheid constitution as the basis for restitution, redistribution and tenure reform. While in Scotland the 2003 Land Reform Act provides for a general public right of access to land throughout Scotland and empowers communities to take private lands, mineral rights and fishing rights with a forced sale.

13. Learning Goals: Comparison of the land law reforms in the three countries studied will provide insight into their divergent legal, social and political structures, as well as provide fresh insight into American takings jurisprudence.

14. Assessment Strategies: Examination