<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Level of Action</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
<th>Impact Reviews</th>
<th>Approval Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADD (NEW)</td>
<td>Non-Credit</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>a, c, e</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEACTIVATE</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFY (X)</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER (Q)</td>
<td>OTHER (X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Box 3: ACTION ITEM**

1. Experimental Course
2. Course Title
3. Course Credits
4. Course Number
5. Course Level
6. Pre & Co-Requisite
7. Course Description
8. New Course
9. Deactivate a Course
10. Program Requirements
11a. UG Specialization (24 credits or less)
11b. Masters Specialization (12 credits or less)
11c. Doctoral Specialization (18 credits or less)
12. Closed Site Program
13. Program Suspension
14a. Certificate Program (ug/g) exclusively within existing degree program
14b. Certificate Program (ug/g) where degree programs do not exist or where courses are selected across degree programs (12 or more credits)
15. Off-Campus Delivery of Existing Program
16a. UG Concentration (exceeds 24 credit hours)
16b. Masters Concentration (exceeds 12 credit hours)
16c. Doctoral Concentration (exceeds 18 credit hours)
17. Program Title Change
18. Program Termination
19. New Degree Program
20. Other

**Box 4: DOCUMENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X N. This Cover Sheet</td>
<td>Q. Full 5-page MHEC Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Summary Proposal</td>
<td>R. Financial Tables (MHEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Course Definition Document</td>
<td>S. Contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Approval of experimental 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 UB 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>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. OTS</td>
<td>CIO or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. University Relations</td>
<td>Director or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Admissions</td>
<td>Director or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Records</td>
<td>Registrar or designee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No impact</td>
<td>□ Impact statement attached</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: Michael J. Hayes</td>
<td>03/04/09</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: Margaret W. Bierman</td>
<td>03-03-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Curriculum Review Committee (UFS subcommittee)</td>
<td>Chair: John J. Yan</td>
<td>03-11-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. University Faculty Senate (UFS option)</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. University Council (see #11 above)</td>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. President</td>
<td>President:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Board of Regents – notification only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Board of Regents – approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. MHEC – notification only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MHEC – approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Middle States Association notification</td>
<td>Required only if the mission of the University is changed by the action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O-1: Briefly describe what is being requested:

Revising the course description of Contracts I for delinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD Title: Contracts I</th>
<th>Course # / HEGIS Code: Law 602</th>
<th>Credits: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW Title:</td>
<td>Course # / HEGIS Code: Law</td>
<td>Credits:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Currently, Contracts and Civil Procedure are year-long courses for three credits each semester. In general, the same professor teaches both semesters of his or her section. The curriculum committee is considering a proposal that would “delink” these courses. In other words, the course could be taught by two different professors, each for one semester. This would mean that course descriptions for Contracts I and II and Civil Procedure I and II would have to be uniform. If this proposal passes, the Curriculum Committee will at the next faculty meeting proposing separate course descriptions for Contracts I, Contracts II, Civil Procedure I and Civil Procedure II. The Contracts and Civil Procedure professors are presently in discussions on preparing course descriptions to propose to the Curriculum Committee, and the Committee will also have to hold open hearings on those course descriptions.

If this proposal passes, not all Contracts and Civ Pro courses would be delinked. Rather, it would give the administration flexibility to delink where it would better serve faculty and student interests. There would likely still be sections that retain the same professor for the entire year.

There are several justifications for this proposal. Most importantly, it would give the administration greater flexibility in staffing these courses in light of the new ILS requirement. Currently, there are professors who are interested in teaching ILS, but who do not want to teach the second semester of the course. Given the vast time commitment involved in teaching ILS for six credits in the first semester, it would be ideal to give these professors the opportunity to teach other courses in the second semester. In addition, it would allow clinical professors the opportunity to teach a semester of these courses. Currently, no clinical professor can teach Civ Pro or Contracts because clinical faculty only teach outside the Clinic for one semester. This eliminates at least eight possible faculty members from teaching these core courses; at the same time, these are courses in which clinicians have particular expertise. For these reasons, delinking would increase the pool of available ILS teachers. Notably, we have committed to providing ILS to all first-year students in both the day and evening sections. Delinking also equalizes the obligations of teaching at night. Currently, an evening ILS professor would have to teach 10 credits at night per year. For some professors, this is shouldering an inequitable burden. Finally, delinking helps the administration facilitate sabbaticals and other leaves for those faculty members teaching these two semester classes.

While there are costs to delinking, we believe these can be overcome. To begin with, we would need uniform course descriptions for each semester of these courses. Professors who teach in these areas are already working on defining which topics should be taught in each semester. (Uniform course coverage
would also benefit students on academic probation who have to retake first-year courses. They could enroll in any section of the course and ensure adequate coverage of the material.) In addition, students might need to purchase two different casebooks if professors were unable to agree on a casebook. Given that students typically need to buy new books for new courses, we believe this cost is not unreasonable. At the same time, we would hope that faculty sharing a section would work to select a shared casebook. Regardless, students may benefit from being taught the material from two different perspectives on the same, bar-tested course and develop greater understanding and learning of the material.

We have researched local schools to see how they deal with this issue. If we approve the delinking approach, we would not be alone. Maryland and GW both offer these courses over two semesters (for at least some students) and both delink. At Catholic, Georgetown, and American, both Civ Pro and Contracts are one semester courses, and thus, the issue does not arise. At UDC, Contracts and Civ Pro are year-long, and the courses are taught by the same faculty member for the entire year. However, UDC is very small, and there is only one professor for each topic. At Howard, Contracts is taught by the same professor both semesters. A summary listing of approaches is below. Also set forth below are tentative course descriptions for the Contracts I and Contrats II courses, to give you an idea of the kinds of course descriptions for which the Committee will be seeking approval next month.

**George Washington**
- Civ Pro, 6 credits (3/3) two semesters – delinked
- Contracts, 6 credits (3/3) two semesters – delinked

**Maryland**
- Civ Pro, 4 credits, one semester OR 5 credits, two semesters – delinked
- Contracts, 4 credits, one semester OR 5 credits, two semesters – delinked

**Howard**
- Civ Pro, 4 credits, one semester
- Contracts, 5 credits, two semesters, taught by same professor both semesters.

**Catholic**
- Civ Pro 4 credits, one semester
- Contracts, 5 credits, one semester

**Georgetown**
- Civ Pro, 4 credits, one semester
- Contracts, 4 credits, one semester

**American University**
- Civ Pro, 4 credits, one semester
- Contracts, 4 credits, one semester
1. Date Prepared: January 16, 2009
2. Prepared by:
3. Department: School of Law
4. Course Number(s), including HEGIS code(s): LAW 602
5. Course Title: Contracts I
6. Credit Hours: 3
7. Catalog Description (Paragraph should reflect general aims and nature of the course):
   This course will present an introduction to the formation of contractual arrangements. Among the topics covered will be mutual assent, including offer and acceptance; consideration; promissory estoppel; and the statutes of fraud.
8. Prerequisites: None
9. Faculty qualified to teach course: Professors who teach Contracts
10. Course Type (check appropriate): Open Enrollment
11. Suggested approximate class size: Up to 80
12. Content Outline: These are well-established, core, required courses. The content is not changing but making clear that certain covered subjects are assigned to one semester or the other.
13. Learning Goals:
14. Assessment Strategies: Examinations
15. Suggested Text(s) and Materials (example: textbooks, equipment, software, etc.):
16. Concentrations (check appropriate): None
   - Business Law
   - Criminal Practice
   - Estate Planning
   - Family Law
   - Intellectual Property
   - Int’l & Comp
   - Litigation & Advocacy
   - Public Service
   - Real Estate Practice