



Program Review Task Force Final Report

September 17, 2008

Task Force Members

Dr. Felita Williams, University System of Georgia Office (Chair)
Dr. Ronald Henry (Dr. Mary Finn), Georgia State University
Dr. Thomas Hynes, University of West Georgia
Dr. Michael Stoy, Middle Georgia College
Dr. Cathie Hudson, University System of Georgia Office
Dr. Linda Noble, University System of Georgia Office
Dr. Richard Sutton, University System of Georgia Office
Dr. Marci Middleton, University System of Georgia Office (Ex-Officio)
Dr. Melinda Spencer, University System of Georgia Office (Ex-Officio)
Dr. Robert Vaughan, University System of Georgia Office (Ex-Officio)

Program Review Task Force Final Report

Introduction

University System of Georgia institutions have suggested that the process by which they submit and have proposals for new academic programs reviewed and approved lacks clarity and transparency and is bureaucratic, with uneven response times and little recognition of the differences in review that varying levels of programs require. In addition, institutions have also reported frustration with the System's process for comprehensive program review, the systematic review of existing academic programs. The majority of the feedback received indicates that campuses view this process as duplicative of institutional efforts, uneven in quality, with unclear goals and expectations. Institutions generally do not find that the comprehensive program review process employed by the System Office adequately captures the vibrancy of institutional comprehensive review processes nor is the institutional context taken into account.

As a result of this feedback Susan Herbst, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer, appointed a task force to study and make recommendations for improving these two distinct processes. This final report captures the essence of the Task Force's work and puts forward a number of recommendations for improvement to the System's academic program review processes.

Findings and Recommendations

The Task Force met regularly during the late spring and summer, and carefully reviewed the current practices for both new proposal review and comprehensive program review. The Task Force found that the feedback received from institutions was, indeed, valid, and identified a number of areas where improvements could be made.

New Program Proposal Review: Recommendations for Improvement

Changes recommended for reviewing proposals for new academic programs are intended to provide needed clarity and simplification where appropriate. The following table highlights the Task Force's recommended changes to the existing process for reviewing new program proposals. The first column in the table indicates the primary concerns with the current process; the second column indicates the change to the process recommended by the Task Force.

New Program Review Process: Recommended Improvements¹

CURRENT PROCESS CONCERNS	RECOMMENDATION
<i>General Process</i>	
Identical two step process for all proposals that does not take into account the requirements of different degree levels	One step process for associate program proposals (Formal Proposal) Two step process for doctoral, master and bachelor program proposals (Letter of Intent plus Formal Proposal)
System level review and evaluation of program proposals lacks transparency	University System of Georgia review and evaluation guidelines clarified (see attached appendices)
Procedures and program proposals posted on System web page that is not easily found; not all institutions notified of newly received proposals	Letter of Intent for new programs posted to dedicated web page upon receipt by the Director of Programs All University System of Georgia Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs notified by the Director of Programs when Letter of Intent is posted to web page
Institutions allowed to voice concerns about a given proposal at any time, up to and including Board meeting	University System of Georgia Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs notification of Letter of Intent posting to the web page, response timeframe as follows: a. 30 calendar days for University System of Georgia institutions to voice issues/ concerns after Letter of Intent posted; this is the only window for institutions to object to the proposed program b. 30 calendar days for University System of Georgia institutions to voice issues/ concerns after an Associate degree Formal Proposal is posted.
Inconsistent submission of proposals	All proposals submitted electronically
New program proposals submitted by the institutional President or his/her designee	New program proposals submitted by institutional President or Vice President of Academic Affairs
No department point of contact listed	Department contact for program included on formal proposal

¹ The criteria for new certificate programs outlined in Academic Affairs Handbook ({ HYPERLINK "http://www.usg.edu/academics/handbook/section2/2.03/2.03.02.phtml" }) will continue to apply when institutions present new proposals for certificates.

CURRENT PROCESS CONCERNS	RECOMMENDATION
Alternative delivery formats (online and external degrees) not well-integrated into current program review process	Programs delivered by alternative methods require new program review and comprehensive program review. All programs, regardless of their delivery method, that require approval by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) must have Board of Regents approval. Furthermore, University System of Georgia institutions that submit proposals for external degrees must currently have the authority to grant degrees in the discipline requested and at the level requested.
<i>Letter of Intent</i>	
Letter of Intent does not address nationally accepted trends in the discipline	Letter of Intent must address nationally accepted trends in the discipline
Letter of Intent includes limited information concerning the budget of the proposed program	Letter of Intent must provide a holistic look at institutional resources specific to the program
Institutions often skipped the Letter of Intent and only submitted a Formal Proposal (or submitted both at the same time)	Receipt and system-wide posting of a Letter of Intent necessary before Formal Proposal review can proceed (Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral)
The same process is required for associate program proposals as for doctoral program proposals; not all criteria apply	Letter of Intent is not required for associate program proposals; proposal criteria tailored to be appropriate to degree level
Letter of intent does not ensure the institution has considered the adequacy of the core curriculum to support the proposed new program	Institution is asked to consider impact on core curriculum where appropriate in Letter of Intent
University System of Georgia review of the Letter of Intent is inconsistent	Letter of Intent will be posted for 30 calendar days, during which time other System institutions should voice any questions or concerns they have with the proposed program
<i>Formal Proposals</i>	
Formal Proposal does not ensure adequacy of core courses to support proposed new program	Institution is asked to consider impact on core curriculum where appropriate in Formal Proposal
One or two external reviews for formal doctoral program proposals	Institution provides a list of 5 to 8 independent reviewers (from aspirational or comparable programs) not consulted in the development of the proposal; and includes a brief justification for each listing; Academic Affairs System Office staff will contact two reviewers from this list to review the proposal
Formal Proposal considers only annual graduation rate of students majors as a factor for success	Formal Proposal requests a variety of institutional metrics for evaluating program success, i.e. graduation rates, student learning outcomes, career placement, etc.
Formal Proposal requests information on the proposed programs Affirmative Action impact on the institution's desegregation and affirmative action programs, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students.	Institution will establish and evaluate as part of comprehensive program review program-level goals for diversity of students, faculty and staff; review report should include analysis of why goals are or are not met

CURRENT PROCESS CONCERNS	RECOMMENDATION
Institutions informed directly of each external reviewers' comments; this is not always made clear to the reviewers	Institution receives the comments anonymously; however, reviewers will be informed up-front that Georgia is an open-records state
<i>System Review</i>	
Timeline for University System of Georgia review for Formal Proposal is 60 days although adherence to this timeline is uneven	University System of Georgia timeline 30 calendar days, 60 calendar days if external reviews applicable
Proposing institutions informed in inconsistent ways of issues raised by other University System of Georgia institutions; timing of feedback is unpredictable	Director of Academic Programs will inform institutions directly and in writing of any concerns raised by other institutions during Letter of Intent process; institutions are expected to resolve these differences in order for the proposal to move forward

Comprehensive Program Review: Recommendations for Improvement

The System approach to Comprehensive Program Review (the ongoing system of reviewing existing academic programs to ensure high quality and to identify areas of improvement) has been variable, and each approach tried has met with uneven success. The Task Force reviewed the System office approaches and worked to clarify the System interest in this process. The members of the Task Force unanimously concluded that comprehensive program review is a process best left to the institutions. The role of the System Office is to work with institutions to make sure that each college or university has a robust method of reviewing existing programs, and to periodically examine these reviews in order to assure the Board of Regents that institutions are carrying out this responsibility in a way that ensures high academic standards are being met.

The following table summarizes the major changes recommended by the Task Force for System-level Comprehensive Program Review. The first column in the table indicates the concerns identified by institutions with the current process and practices; the second column indicates the Task Force's recommended changes to directly address these concerns.

Comprehensive Program Review Final Recommendations:

CURRENT PROCESS CONCERNS	FINAL RECOMMENDATION
<i>Institutional Responsibilities</i>	
Current practice calls for the creation of an institutional comprehensive review process approved by System Office, but follow through on this has been uneven	Institutional process approved by System Office; with emphasis on program improvement System Office will provide workshops, consultations and support to institutions to assist with this
Most degrees are reviewed, but there are gaps	Review of all degrees conferred by University System of Georgia institutions will be completed by the degree-granting institution
Formal proposal requested information on the proposed programs Affirmative Action impact on the institution's desegregation and affirmative action programs, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students	Institution will establish and evaluate as part of comprehensive program review program-level goals for diversity of students, faculty and staff; review report should include analysis of why goals are or are not met
Ongoing and systematic review of general education (core curriculum) not required	Institutional review of general education is required; in addition, institutions may elect and are encouraged to review groups of courses considered a program e.g. English as a Second Language, 1 st Year Experience, Senior Experience, etc.; review process assures institution that desired student learning outcomes are being met
Institutions submit 3 page comprehensive program reviews to University System of Georgia	Institution will post program review results on a <i>password protected</i> institutional web site; Academic Affairs System Office staff will have access to these sites
Triggered (low enrollment) program reports require institutional response to the System, even though low enrollments may not mean a program is in academic trouble	Triggered program reports are informational reports to the institution's leadership for review and follow-up as appropriate
Reviewing all new programs in three years does not allow enough time to get a sense of the success of the program, plus it is "out of sync" with Comprehensive Program Review	Each new program will be reviewed within seven years (not to exceed ten) to allow institutions to include new programs into regular comprehensive review cycle; a successful new program is defined as on track, making adequate progress toward becoming firmly established; unsuccessful as not on track and making inadequate progress (if deemed unsuccessful, institution should submit a plan and timeline for corrective actions)
Accredited programs substitute accreditation results for Comprehensive Program Review; however, the goals of these processes differ (meeting minimum or threshold standards versus improvement toward excellence, respectively)	Program accreditation reports cannot be substituted for Comprehensive Program Review; however, institutions are expected to use information from the accreditation process for Comprehensive Program Review purposes

CURRENT PROCESS CONCERNS	FINAL RECOMMENDATION
<i>System Responsibilities</i>	
Academic Affairs System Office staff reviews all programs submitted for review, often in the same year	Academic Affairs System Office staff will perform institutional spot audits on institutional reviews posted to respective institutional web sites to ensure institutional decision making follows programmatic recommendations for improvement
System Office emphasis on oversight	Academic Affairs System Office emphasis on quality assurance, facilitation and support
The term “culture of evidence” not objectively defined	Culture of evidence – indicators or outcomes collected, tracked and analyzed to help determine how to improve the quality of a program; the goal is for programs to seek improvement, not just decide if high quality or not
Comprehensive Program Review guidelines for online programs are not clear	Online programs should be reviewed by the same guidelines

Implementation of Task Force Recommendations

With the approval of these recommendations, the Academic Affairs System Office staff will immediately develop mechanisms to operationalize the new procedures for New Program Review and Comprehensive Program Review. For clarity on when the new processes begin and to allow enough time for institutions to take these changes into account, the Task Force recommends the following:

1. The revised New Program Review procedures begin January 2009.
2. The revised Comprehensive Program Review procedures apply to program reviews due Fall 2009.
3. An annual review of the NPR and CPR procedures will be conducted in order to identify and make any necessary adjustments that are deemed necessary.

This report is respectfully submitted by the Program Review Task Force.

APPENDIX A

University System of Georgia

Guidelines, Criteria and Processes for Reviewing Doctoral Program Proposals

The Office of Academic Affairs provides the following University System Office guidelines, criteria and processes for reviewing doctoral program proposals.

A. Guidelines for Review of Doctoral Program Proposals

1. Doctoral program proposals must contain detailed information that show the proposal meets all the criteria required for academic program approval. Criteria include program description and objectives, program fit to institutional mission and to nationally accepted trends in the discipline, justification and need for the program, program duplication, curriculum, planning to assist timely degree completion, current and future institutional resources (faculty, facilities, library resources, equipment, etc.), comparison to outstanding programs at other institutions nationwide, admissions criteria, administration, accreditation, revenues and expenditures for establishing the program at two time points. The full set of criteria is in the Academic Affairs Handbook ({ HYPERLINK "<http://www.usg.edu/academics/handbook/section2/2.03/2.03.02.phtml>" }).
2. Each doctoral program proposal must be critically reviewed and supported by relevant curriculum review processes at the proposing institution prior to being forwarded to the System Office, including but not limited to the institutional faculty committee on academic affairs or its equivalent, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the President. Proposals should be submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer or her designee over the institutional President's signature or the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
3. Upon receipt of a doctoral program proposal, the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer will forward the proposal to the Director of Academic Programs. The proposing institution will include a list of five to eight reviewers who are currently at aspirational or comparable institutions outside the University System of Georgia. After consultation with the Program Review staff, the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer will send the proposal to at least two reviewers from this list for review. In addition, the Director of Academic Programs will send notification that the formal proposal has been received to all University System of Georgia institutions. The proposal will be posted on the University System of Georgia's website.
4. Each doctoral program proposal will be critically reviewed by the Academic Affairs System Office staff, who, as part of their review, will take external reviewer feedback into account. The System-level review process will include discussions and correspondence with institutional faculty and administrators at the proposing institution to clarify information and to answer questions that develop during the review. The System Office will also consult the appropriate Regents Advisory Committee(s) (e.g., academic or administrative) for additional review of the proposal.
5. Upon a favorable recommendation from the Academic Affairs System Office staff, and with the support of the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer and the Chancellor, the

Office of Academic Affairs will recommend satisfactory doctoral program proposals to the Board of Regents for review and approval.

B. Criteria for Evaluation of Doctoral Program Proposals

The Office of Academic Affairs expects that each doctoral program proposal will:

1. Demonstrate program need at the state and/or national level (national level required for doctoral proposals).
2. Provide evidence that program graduates will be nationally competitive and demonstrate that the program of high quality (especially doctoral) will provide outstanding contributions to Georgia.
3. Provide evidence that doctoral graduates will be capable of creating knowledge and contributing to their discipline or area through a career of research and/or scholarship.
4. Provide evidence that applied doctoral graduates can apply knowledge, serve as leaders in the field, and aspire to excellence in professional practice.
5. Demonstrate full financial program support through an institutional commitment of resources sufficient to guarantee program excellence and/or the ability to obtain external resources.
6. Build upon existing undergraduate and/or graduate program strengths.
7. Identify highly qualified program faculty with national and/or international reputations, researching and publishing in the primary refereed journals (books, or other venues) as appropriate to their discipline, who have experience directing doctoral dissertations and also cover an array of subspecialties in their discipline or area; and enough full-time faculty to assure that the program will not be built on part-time or temporary faculty.
8. Show that the program has a clear plan to socialize doctoral students into the discipline or area by teaching, participating in research and research conferences, or having some other clearly delineated professional socialization experience.
9. Show that plans are in place for doctoral program students to experience practica, internships, and clinical placements, as appropriate and demonstrate high institutional standards are in place to guide terminal academic research and advanced professional dissertations.
10. Show that goals are in place for normative time to degree, with consideration of how to help students complete their degrees in a timely manner.
11. Demonstrate financial support is available or may be obtained for most full-time graduate students during their studies; if possible, stipends large enough to attract highly qualified students.
12. Demonstrate that, if the program is in a discipline or an area in which specialized or professional accreditation is available, it will attain accreditation in a reasonable time.
13. Provide evidence of the institutional resources that will be expended specifically for this program – i.e. personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies & expenses, capital expenditures and other – at two critical times: a) program start-up, b) at the time of the program's first comprehensive program review.

C. Process for Review of Doctoral Program Proposals

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia's purpose in reviewing proposed new programs is to examine the new program proposal in the context of the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia academic operations. A primary goal of the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia is to offer high quality educational opportunities for the citizens of Georgia. With this goal in mind, new doctoral program proposals should use the process defined below:

I. Letter of Intent

A. Letter Submission

The institution's purpose for writing a letter of intent is to alert the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia and System institutions of their intent to offer a new program. This electronically submitted letter should address the following issues in no more than three pages:

1. Program information – name, classification, CIP code
2. Description and objective of the degree – one page abstract suitable for presentation to the Board of Regents
3. Program fit to institutional mission and to nationally accepted trends in the discipline
4. Program demonstrates a response to demand and is justified within the discipline/ geographic region/state/nation and is not unnecessary program duplication
5. Institutional resources that will be expended specifically for this program i.e. personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies & expenses, capital expenditures and other - at two critical times: a) program start-up, b) when the program undergoes its first comprehensive program review.

B. Review by the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia

The letter of intent will be posted by the System Office on the System Program Review web site for informational and institutional feedback. The Board of Regents/University System of Georgia review will be based upon the attached criteria for evaluation of doctoral programs. An approved letter of intent is required before a formal proposal will be reviewed.

II. STEP TWO: Formal Proposal

A. Proposal Submission

This electronically submitted document should address the following:

1. Basic information: Name of institution, institutional contact (President or Vice President of Academic Affairs, institutional contact for program, school/office, department, name of proposed program, degree, degree inscription, major, CIP code, starting date.
2. Curriculum plan.
3. Student admissions criteria.

4. Availability of assistantships, careers/jobs available to graduates.
5. Administration.
6. Accreditation.
7. Revenues and expenditures for the first three years.
8. Impact of program on facilities.
9. External Reviews – institution will provide a list of 5-8 reviewers from aspirational or comparable programs/institutions, and should include an explanation of why these reviewers are suggested. This list should *not* include individuals who the department or institution has consulted during the process of program proposal development.

B. Review by the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia:

The formal proposal will be forwarded for external review by the System Office. The System Office will also consult the appropriate Regents Advisory Committee(s) (e.g., academic or administrative committees) for additional review of the proposal. The Academic Affairs System Office staff will make a recommendation regarding acceptance of the proposal to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer.

APPENDIX B

University System of Georgia

Guidelines, Criteria and Processes for Reviewing Bachelor's, and Master's Program Proposals

The Office of Academic Affairs provides the following University System Office guidelines, criteria and processes for reviewing bachelor's and master's program proposals.

A. Guidelines for Review for Bachelor's and Master' Program Proposals

1. Program proposals must contain detailed information that show the proposal meets all the criteria required for academic program approval. Criteria include program description and objectives, program fit to institutional mission and to nationally accepted trends in the discipline, justification and need for the program, program duplication, curriculum, student competencies, planning to assist timely degree completion, current and future institutional resources (faculty, facilities, library resources, equipment, etc.), outstanding programs at other institutions, admissions criteria, administration, accreditation, revenues and expenditures for the next three years. The full set of criteria is in the Academic Affairs Handbook, Section 2.03.02. (See: { HYPERLINK "<http://www.usg.edu/academics/handbook/section2/2.03/2.03.02.phtml>" }).
2. Each bachelor's and master's program proposal must be critically reviewed and supported by relevant curriculum review processes at the proposing institution prior to being forwarded to the System Office, including but not limited to the institutional faculty committee on academic affairs or its equivalent, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the President. Proposals should be submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer or her designee over the institutional President's signature or the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
3. Upon receipt of a bachelor's and master's program proposal, the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer will forward the proposal to the Director of Academic Programs. In some instances, external review of the proposal may be warranted. If needed, Academic Affairs System Office staff will request a list of five to eight reviewers from aspirational or comparable programs. In addition, the Director of Academic Programs will send notification that the proposal has been received to University System of Georgia institutions along with access to the proposal via a website. The proposal will be posted on the University System of Georgia's website.
4. Each bachelor's and master's program proposal will be critically reviewed by the Academic Affairs System Office staff, which as part of its review may take external reviews into account. The process will often include discussions and correspondence with faculty and administrators at the proposing institution to clarify information and to answer questions that develop during the review. The System Office will also consult the appropriate Regents Advisory Committee(s) (e.g., academic or administrative) for additional review of the proposal.
5. Upon a favorable recommendation from the Academic Affairs System Office staff, and with the support of the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer and the Chancellor, the Office of Academic Affairs will recommend satisfactory program proposals to the Board of Regents for review and approval.

B. Criteria for Evaluation for Bachelor's and Master's Program Proposals

The Office of Academic Affairs expects that each program proposal will:

1. Demonstrate the programmatic need at the state, regional and/or national level.
2. Provide evidence that program graduates will be regionally/ nationally competitive, as appropriate to mission and demonstrate that the program will provide outstanding contributions to Georgia and be competitive with the best programs in the nation.
3. Identify outcomes for students who complete the proposed program, i.e. knowledge skills, values and competencies to be demonstrated by graduates, career opportunities.
4. Demonstrate full financial program support through institutional commitment of resources sufficient to guarantee program excellence. Include the program's/institution's ability to obtain external resources.
5. Identify highly qualified program faculty, who cover an array of subspecialties in their discipline or area, and enough full-time faculty to assure that the program will not be built on part-time or temporary faculty.
6. Show, where appropriate, plans are in place for students to experience practica, internships, and clinical placements.
7. Show how the proposing institution will help students complete their degrees in a timely manner.
8. Demonstrate adequacy of core offerings in support of the new program proposal.
9. Demonstrate that, the program will attain accreditation in a reasonable time if it is in a discipline or an area in which specialized or professional accreditation is available.
10. Request (when applicable) external reviews.
11. Provide evidence of the institutional resources that will be expended specifically for this program – i.e. personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies & expenses, capital expenditures and other – at two critical times: a) program start-up, b) at the time of the program's first comprehensive program review.

C. Process for Review for Bachelor's and Master's Program Proposals

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia's purpose in reviewing proposed new programs is to examine the new program proposal in the context of the Board of Regents/ University System of Georgia academic operations. A primary goal of the Board of Regents/ University System of Georgia is to offer high quality educational opportunities for the citizens of Georgia. With this goal in mind, new bachelor's and master's program proposals should use the process defined below:

I. STEP ONE: Letter of Intent

A. Letter submission

The institution's purpose for writing a letter of intent is to alert the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia and System institutions of a new program. This electronically submitted letter should address the following issues in no more than three pages:

1. Programmatic information – name, classification, CIP Code.
2. Description and Objective of the Degree – one page abstract suitable for presentation to the Board of Regents.
3. Program fit to institutional mission and to nationally accepted trends in the discipline.
4. Program proposal demonstrates demand and justification in discipline/geographic region/state/nation and is not unnecessary program duplication.
5. Institutional resources that will be expended specifically for this program i.e. personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies & expenses, capital expenditures and other - at two critical times: a) program start-up, b) when the program undergoes its first comprehensive program review.

B. Review by the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia:

The letter of intent will be posted on the web site for informational and institutional feedback by the System Office. The Board of Regents/University System of Georgia review will be based upon the attached criteria for evaluation of bachelor's and master's programs. An approved letter of intent is required before a formal proposal will be reviewed.

II. STEP TWO: Formal Proposal

A. Proposal Submission:

This electronically submitted document should address the following:

1. Basic information: Name of institution, institutional contact (President or Vice President of Academic Affairs), institutional contact for program, school/office, department, name of proposed program, degree, degree inscription, major, CIP code, starting date.
2. Curriculum.
3. Student admissions criteria.
4. Availability of assistantships (if appropriate), provisions to assist students who transfer in or out of this program degree.
5. Anticipated student learning and other outcomes for students who complete the proposed program.
6. Administration.
7. Accreditation.
8. Revenues and expenditures for the first three years.

- B. Review by the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia:
The System Office will also consult the appropriate Regents Advisory Committee(s) (e.g., academic or administrative) for additional review of the proposal. The Academic Affairs System Office staff will make a recommendation regarding acceptance of the proposal to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer.

APPENDIX C

University System of Georgia

Guidelines, Criteria and Processes for Reviewing Associate's Program Proposals

The Office of Academic Affairs provides the following University System Office guidelines, criteria and processes for reviewing program proposals.

A. Guidelines for Review for Associate's Program Proposals

1. Program proposals must contain detailed information that show the proposal meets all the criteria required for academic program approval. Criteria include program description and objectives, program fit to institutional mission and to nationally accepted trends in the discipline, justification and need for the program, program duplication, curriculum, student competencies, planning to assist timely degree completion, current and future institutional resources (faculty, facilities, library resources, equipment, etc.), outstanding programs at other institutions, admissions criteria, administration, accreditation, revenues and expenditures for the next three years. The full set of criteria is in the Academic Affairs Handbook, Section 2.03.02. (See: { HYPERLINK "http://www.usg.edu/academics/handbook/section2/2.03/2.03.02.phtml" })
2. Each program proposal must be critically reviewed and supported by relevant curriculum review processes at the proposing institution, including but not limited to the institutional faculty committee on academic affairs or its equivalent, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the President. Proposals should be submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer or her designee over the institutional President's signature or the Vice President of Academic Affairs stating institutional commitment to the necessary resources to make the program successful.
3. Upon receipt of a program proposal, the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer will forward the proposal to the Director of Academic Programs. If needed, the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer or her designee will consult with the proposing institution. In addition, the Director of Academic Programs or her designee will send notification that the proposal has been received to University System of Georgia institutions along with access to the proposal via a website. The proposal will be posted on the University System of Georgia's website.
4. Each associate's program proposal will be critically reviewed by the Academic Affairs System Office staff. The process will often include discussions and correspondence with faculty and administrators at the proposing institution to clarify information and to answer questions that develop during the review. The System Office will also consult the appropriate Regents Advisory Committee(s) (e.g., academic or administrative) for additional review of the proposal.
5. Upon a favorable recommendation from the Academic Affairs System Office staff, and with the support of the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer and the Chancellor, the Office of Academic Affairs will recommend satisfactory program proposals to the Board of Regents for review and approval.

B. Criteria for Evaluation for Associate’s Program Proposals

The Office of Academic Affairs expects that each program proposal will:

1. Ensure program fit to institutional mission and to nationally accepted trends in the discipline.
2. Determine if program need in the state or a particular region; has substantial need/demand to support the proposed new program.
3. Determine if program is duplicative the proposing institution must obtain letters of no contest from other nearby University System of Georgia institutions.
4. Identify outcomes for students who complete the proposed program, i.e. knowledge skills, values and competencies to be demonstrated by graduates, career opportunities.
5. Demonstrate full financial program support through institutional commitment of resources sufficient to guarantee program excellence and/or the ability to obtain external resources.
6. Identify highly qualified program faculty and enough full-time faculty to assure that the program will not be built on part-time or temporary faculty.
7. Show, where appropriate, plans are in place for students to experience practica, internships, and clinical placements.
8. Show how the proposing institution will help students complete their degrees in a timely manner.
9. Provide evidence of the institutional resources that will be expended specifically for this program – i.e. personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies & expenses, capital expenditures and other – at two critical times: a) program start-up, b) at the time of the program’s first comprehensive program review.

C. Process for Review for Associate’s Program Proposals

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia’s purpose in reviewing proposed new programs is to examine the new program proposal in the context of the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia academic operations. A primary goal of the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia is to offer high quality educational opportunities for the citizens of Georgia. With this goal in mind, new associate’s program proposals should use the process defined below:

I. Formal Proposal:

A. Proposal Submission:

The Institution's purpose for submitting a formal proposal is to request Board of Regents/University System of Georgia approval of a new program. This document should be submitted electronically.

1. Basic information: Name of institution, institutional contact (President or the Vice President of Academic Affairs), institutional program contact, name of proposed program, degree, major, CIP code, starting date.
2. Program classification.
3. Description and objective of the degree – one page abstract suitable for presentation to the Board of Regents.
4. Degree inscription.
5. Program fit to institutional mission and to nationally accepted trends in the discipline.
6. Addresses a need in discipline/geographic region/state, program duplication.
7. Curriculum.
8. Anticipated student learning and other outcomes for students.
9. Exceptions – will this degree require an exception for the maximum hours allowed for a degree?
10. Adequacy of core offerings to support new program.
11. Admissions criteria.
12. Administration.
13. Institutional resources that will be expended specifically for this program i.e. personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies & expenses, capital expenditures and other - at two critical times: a) program start-up, b) when the program undergoes its first comprehensive program review.
14. Accreditation (if applicable).

B. Review by Board of Regents/ University System of Georgia:

Upon receipt at the System Office, the new program proposal will be posted on the web site for information and institutional feedback. The Board of Regents/University System of Georgia review is based on the criteria for evaluation of associate's programs. The System Office will also consult the appropriate Regents Advisory Committee (disciplinary committee) for additional review of the curriculum. The Academic Affairs System Office staff will make a recommendation regarding acceptance of the proposal to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer.