Process for Determining Priority of Proposed Programs

The General Administration allows each university to have three academic program proposals considered for review at any one time. The group of programs can be a mix of undergraduate and graduate program proposals. It is up to each university to determine which proposals will be submitted to General Administration (GA).

As soon as an existing proposal for establishment has been approved by the Board of Governors, an additional proposal to plan may be submitted to GA. The process for determining the priority for submission is stated in the following guidelines:

1. A Prioritization Committee will consist of the chairs of the UCC and the GSC, and the Deans of the Graduate School and Undergraduate Studies.
2. All new academic proposals should originate from the departments after consultation with their Deans.
3. While developing the proposal by compiling the information required in Appendix A, the department should carefully examine the UNCG Evaluation Rubric that will be used to establish a priority ranking. The department should be certain to fully address each of the issues indicated in the rubric.
4. Further approval of the proposals should go through the standard local curricular review processes.
5. At the University level, both the UCC and GSC must review and approve their respective proposals for new academic programs as part of the faculty governance process.
6. Passage of a proposal by either body will be the starting point for evaluation of its potential for entering the priority listing and positioning within the listing.
7. Appendix A should next be sent to the UNCG Prioritization Committee and to the Office of Assessment and Accreditation to be filed for future consideration.
8. Consideration of new proposals for inclusion among those to be reviewed by the General Administration will occur when a prior proposal in the list has been acted upon by the Board of Governors and removed from the list.
9. At that time, the Prioritization Committee will review the group of approved proposals to provide a ranking among proposals.
10. The process will include the use of the UNCG evaluation Rubric during its deliberations.
11. Appendix A of each proposal will be evaluated using the criteria stated in the Rubric. The Prioritization Committee will ask that a departmental representative be available to answer questions about the proposal.
12. Once the rankings have been agreed upon by the Prioritization Committee, its recommendations will be sent to the Dean’s Council.
13. The Deans Council will discuss the recommendations and forward its ranking request to the Provost.
14. The Provost will make use of the Deans Council’s recommendations as he formulates his ranking recommendation which he will send to the Chancellor for the final determination.
15. If an approved proposal is not recommended for early entrance into the priority listing and changes are later needed for updating, the proposal must go back to its respective committee for further review.

4/3/2013
Criteria for Evaluation of New Undergraduate and Graduate Program Proposals
Program Proposal Reviewed by UNCG:

1=Not acceptable
2=Not acceptable unless significant deficiencies are addressed
3=Acceptable with some considerations
4=Acceptable

While all items are important, item numbers 2, 3, and 10 are critical and should receive the utmost attention:

1. Mission Alignment: Does the proposal provide evidence of strong alignment with the institution's mission and strategic plan? Does the proposal also align itself with the UNC system strategic plan? Score:_____ Comments:

2. Student Demand: Does the proposal provide compelling and appropriate evidence of student demand - local, state, regional and/or national? Are enrollment projections reasonable? Has an effective market analysis been conducted? Score:_____ Comments:

3. Societal Demand: Does the proposal provide compelling and appropriate evidence for market (employment) demand - local, state, regional and/or national? Are projected employment opportunities reasonable? Does the proposal contain both local and national statistics on potential employment of graduates? Score:_____ Comments:

4. Program Status: Is this a new program or a replacement for an existing program that has been in operation under a different name and CIP Code? Is the program essentially the same or are there major modifications? Score:_____ Comments:

5. Relationship to other programs: How common is this type of program within the state of North Carolina and nationally? Is there evidence of unnecessary duplication with other programs within NC? Are there aspects that make the proposed program unique or would enable it to stand out from other similar programs? What impact would it have on existing programs within the state? Score:_____ Comments:

6. Collaborative opportunities: Do collaborative opportunities exist with other system programs that could strengthen the ability of each to address student demand, societal need, or budget needs? Have collaborative opportunities been adequately explored with other programs, where
appropriate? Does the proposal provide evidence of concrete commitments to identified collaborative opportunities, where appropriate? **Will Collaborative efforts result in cost savings or an increase in student enrollments?**

Score:____ Comments:

7. Program requirements and curriculum
Are admissions criteria and requirements appropriate (for Graduate Programs)? Is the curriculum appropriate in scope and depth to cover the field adequately? Are the degree requirements – such as credit hours, examinations, thesis/dissertation, and other field or professional experiences – appropriate for the field? Is the curriculum in line with current directions and advancements in the field (for Undergraduate Programs)? Is there evidence that the curriculum in the major builds upon and extends the work that is done in the general education courses (for Undergraduate Programs)?

Score:____ Comments:

8. Faculty sufficiency and student support:
**Undergraduate:**
Is the faculty sufficient in number and appropriate to support the program, and to appropriately instruct the projected student enrollment?

**Graduate:**
Are the faculty sufficient and with appropriate scholarly productivity (with emphasis on the most recent five years), including peer reviewed publications, grants, awards, etc., to support the program and projected student enrollment? Are there adequate plans for student support, including assistantships, and research grants?

Score:____ Comments:

9. Administration and Instructional, library, and research facilities:
Is the proposed administrative structure for the program appropriate? Is there adequate instructional and (research space for graduate programs), and if necessary, specialized equipment and space to support the program? Are there adequate library resources to support the program?

Score:____ Comments:

10. Budget:
Is the proposed program budget appropriate and reasonable? Does the proposal adequately address budget sustainability? **Based on the assumption that there will be no new enrollment growth money, can the program be sustained with existing resources rather than seeking new external funding?**

Score:____ Comments: