

Brothers, Sheila C

From: Brothers, Sheila C
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2012 10:42 AM
To: Lindsay, Jim D.; Blackwell, Jeannine; Badger, Karen
Cc: Jackson, Brian A; Nikou, Roshan; Ett, Joanie M; Withers, Benjamin C; Blonder, Lee; Ellis, Janie; Hippisley, Andrew R; Greissman, Richard
Subject: Criteria for Review of New Programs

Good morning, everyone. At the SC meeting on Monday, September 24, the SC discussed review criteria for new programs.

SC members agree that the current Senate's Academic Programs Committee (SAPC) is doing a very good, very thorough job in reviewing proposals for new programs. There is a sense, however, that perhaps some portions of the SAPC's review could occur earlier in the process, which would then render the SAPC's review redundant.

As a result, the SC moved that the academic councils be asked to individually publish (or create and then publish) by the end December their own review criteria used when reviewing new programs. Once the criteria are published, I will incorporate them into one document (with different sections for specific councils, if necessary), and then give that document to Andrew Hippisley for review by the SAPC. The SAPC will be encouraged to revise, amend and augment the criteria from that cmte's perspective.

Once the SAPC reviews the criteria, it will return to the SC for further action. One likely step is to promulgate the criteria so that faculty/units will know what needs to be included in a new program proposal. If it becomes obvious that the academic councils can conduct their reviews in such a way as to include the perspectives of the SAPC, the SC will then consider revising the SAPC's charge.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask. Please let me know when your council's criteria are available.

Thank you,
Sheila

Sheila Brothers
Staff Representative to the Board of Trustees
Office of the Senate Council
203E Main Building, -0032
Phone (859) 257-5872
<http://www.uky.edu/faculty/senate>

Graduate Council

Brothers, Sheila C

From: Blackwell, Jeannine
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2013 10:04 AM
To: Brothers, Sheila C
Cc: Jackson, Brian A; Nikou, Roshan; Blonder, Lee
Subject: RE: Criteria for Review of New Programs
Attachments: Graduate Council Programme Proposal Check List, clean draft.docx; Pre-Proposal Instructions.doc

Dear Lee and Sheila,

Please find attached the final, approved version of the Graduate Council Program Proposal Guidelines, with the criteria for review of new programs coming through Graduate Council. Please note that we have imbedded here the instructions for fulfilling CPE requirements into the guidelines.

This was passed by vote of Graduate Council on March 26, 2013 after extensive face-t-face discussion and revisions.

Thank you.

Jeannine Blackwell
Dean of the Graduate School
University of Kentucky
102 Gillis Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0033
blackwell@uky.edu



Graduate Council

PRE-PROPOSAL FORM

(For Council on Postsecondary Education)

For questions regarding this form you may call Frieda Gebert at 257-6058 or send an email to frieda.gebert@uky.edu. When completed, this form should be submitted to www.acadoffice.uky.edu.

Program name: _____
(Ex. Linguistic Theory, Musical Theatre, Rhetoric and Writing, etc.)

Degree level and designation: _____
(Ex. Master of Arts, PhD, Bachelor of Science, etc.)

Proposed Implementation Date: _____

Contact Information

(Who is taking charge of submitting the proposal and overseeing its completion?)

Name: _____ Title: _____

Email: _____ Phone: _____

MISSION

Provide a brief description of the program: (130 word limit)

Does this program allow multiple concentrations or tracks? _____ If yes, continue below:

1. Name:
Description: (20 word limit)
2. Name:
Description: (20 word limit)

What are the objectives of the program? Note: this is not the place to list student learning outcomes. The question refers to the program itself. Program objectives should deal with the specific institutional and societal needs that this program will address. (100 word limit)

Graduate Council

Explain how the objectives above support the mission of the university, the strategic agenda of the Council on Postsecondary Education, and the statewide implementation plan. Demonstrate that your proposed program would serve the purposes of at least one or two of the criteria in these documents. **(100 word limit)**

UK Mission Plan – (These are the goals of the Mission Plan that deal with curriculum issues)

Goal 1: Prepare Students for Leading Roles in an Innovation-driven Economy and Global Society

Goal 2: Promote Research and Creative Work to Increase the Intellectual, Social, and Economic Capital of Kentucky and the World beyond Its Borders

Goal 4: Promote Diversity and Inclusion

CPE Strategic Agenda –

The state's strategic plan for postsecondary education focuses on four areas. Please choose which area(s) your proposed program relates to along with which policy objective(s) that your proposed program will address.

- *College readiness – Will the program increase the number of college-ready Kentuckians entering postsecondary education? Will it increase the number of college-ready GED graduates? Will it increase the effectiveness of Kentucky's K-12 teachers and school leaders?*
- *Student success – Does this program increase high-quality degree production and completion rates and close achievement gaps, particularly for lower-income, underprepared, and underrepresented minority students? Does this program decrease financial barriers to college access and completion.*
- *Research, economic, and community development: Does this program increase educational attainment and quality of life in Kentucky communities through regional stewardship, public service, and community outreach?*
- *Efficiency and innovation: Does this program increase academic productivity through program innovations? Does this program maximize the use of postsecondary and adult education resources?*

Is an approval letter from Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) required? _____

(For example, any program leading to teacher, principal, or superintendent certification, rank change, etc.) If yes, attach the approval letter from Educational and Professional Standards Board.

QUALITY

What are the intended student learning outcomes of the proposed program? (100 word limit)

- Try to address one or more of the five areas of learning – broad, integrative knowledge; specialized knowledge; intellectual skills; applied learning; and civic learning.
- Demonstrate a level of learning appropriate for the degree level

How will the program support or be supported by other programs within the institution? (50 word limit)

- For example, shared faculty, shared courses, collaborative research, etc.

Will this program replace or enhance any existing program(s) or specializations within an existing program? If so, please specify.

Will this be a 100% distance learning program? _____

- This refers to an academic program in which all of the required courses in a program occur when students and instructors are not in the same place.

DEMAND

Provide justification and evidence to support the need and demand for this proposed program.

Include any data on student demand, career opportunities at any level, or any recent trends in the discipline that necessitate a new program. (150 word limit)

- This evidence is typically in the form of surveys of potential students and/or enrollments in related programs at the institution.
- Anecdotal evidence is not sufficient. The institution must demonstrate that it has systematically gathered data, studied the data, and can reasonably estimate student demand for the program.
- Provide evidence of student demand at state and national levels.

List any distinctive qualities of the proposed program. (100 word limit)

- Are any of your faculty nationally or internationally recognized for expertise in this field?
- Does this program build on the expertise of an existing locally, nationally or internationally recognized program at your institution?

Graduate Council

- Do you have any specialized research facilities or equipment that are uniquely suited to this program?

Are you aware of any similar programs already being offered in Kentucky? _____ If yes, list and explain why this new program is needed in addition to the one(s) currently in existence. **(100 word limit)**

- Does the proposed program differ from existing programs in terms of curriculum, focus, objectives, etc.?
- Does the proposed program serve a different student population (i.e., students in a different geographic area, non-traditional students) from existing programs?
- Is there more demand for existing similar programs can accommodate?

REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

Identify both the direct and the indirect methods by which the program will be reviewed and assessed. **(100 word limit)**

Graduate Council

Program Proposal Check List

Graduate Council

The Senate Academic Programs Committee has asked Graduate Council to prepare list of items that must be covered in a proposal for a new graduate program. Such a list will aid Council members in reviewing proposals; more importantly it will act as a guide to proposal authors. These guidelines reflect in part, but not fully, the requirements for program proposals from the Senate Council and the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE). [See the attached document for instructions on fulfilling the CPE requirements.]

1 *Program's value*

What is the educational value of the program, including its uniqueness within UK? Supply supporting documentation. Demonstrate that there is a progression in rigor and complexity in the courses that make up the program.

2 *Motivation for program*

What is the motivation for the program? How will students benefit from the program, tangibly and intangibly? Give evidence that they will benefit. Who is the target audience? Give reference to context, including equivalents in benchmark institutions.

3 *Program assessment*

Include a plan of how the **program** will be assessed – different from assessing Student learning outcomes! How will you determine whether the program is a success or a failure – what are the metrics? What are the tools of assessment? What is the plan of action if the program is not delivering on its goals?

4 *Student Learning Outcomes and their assessment*

Include ways in which SLOs are deployed across the curriculum, e.g., provide a curricular map. How will outcomes be assessed? What will be the format and goal of the final project, examination, or thesis?

5 *Program committee and host academic unit*

There must be a roster of faculty responsible for the program (rank & title, degrees). Procedures for entering and exiting this program committee must be outlined. Rationale or criteria must be given for membership.

Identify stakeholders who will be affected by the program's operation, particularly in the case in which the new program will draw on courses or faculty from another unit. Explain how stakeholder departments will be kept informed of changes to the new program. The academic unit hosting the program is legally defined according to Senate Rules. Be sure to use the formal name of the academic unit and of the degree itself.

Graduate Council

6 *Avoid duplication*

List all programs which could be *conceived* as duplicating the function, or significant part of the function that the new program will perform. Give a rationale for why this is not in fact duplication or is a necessary duplication. (Linked to 1.)

7 *Resources*

The Graduate Council is not equipped to evaluate the sufficiency of resources for new programs. However, we exhort program proposers to ensure with their chairs, deans, and provost that teaching, staff, and student resources are in place. Also see CPE requirements.

8 *The online conundrum*

Justify any **extensive** use of online or e-learning courses on pedagogical grounds. The online alternative must be just as effective, or more effective, than the traditional mode of presentation. Is the online component synchronous or asynchronous? Have pedagogically motivated adjustments been made, using the guidelines of Distance Learning Programs?

<http://www.uky.edu/DistanceLearning/faculty/devBlueprint/CourseDevelopment.html>

Are there hybrid elements? What is the balance of online and traditional?

Undergraduate Council

To: Lee Blonder, PhD, University Senate Chair

From: Karen Badger, PhD, Undergraduate Council Interim Chair

Ben Withers, PhD, Interim Associate Provost of Undergraduate Education

Re: Undergraduate Council Review Criteria and Administrative Feasibility

Date: January 23, 2013

Attached is a summary that describes the Undergraduate Council's (UC) current proposal review criteria. The summary delineates the responsibilities of UC when reviewing items such as new degree, certificate, or course proposals in relation to their academic merit.

Although the focus of UC activities when vetting proposals concerns academic merit the Council has found it difficult at times to clearly separate this from administrative feasibility. For example, in some situations we have found that assessment of the academic merit of a proposed course is impacted by the availability of faculty resources or expertise to deliver that course. This overlap was also discussed by Council members during the preparation of the attached review criteria and is referenced in its introductory paragraph. The Senate Rules clearly assign this responsibility to the Academics Programs Approval Committee in relation to new programs and certificates, but the venue for this approval process is not clear regarding other proposals (such as courses). From these experiences, we have learned that it would be helpful to 1) clarify the Undergraduate Council's role regarding the extent to which administrative feasibility concerns should be identified and/or explored in relation to new courses or other academic component/policies other than new programs, and (2) clarify to which committee or individual such recommendations made by UC would be forwarded for review and approval status.

On behalf of the UC, We are asking Senate Council to examine and clarify the issues identified above. This clarification would be particularly helpful to the UC at this time given the anticipated budget model changes, which may make these issues more relevant.

Thank you so much for your consideration of and response to this request.

Undergraduate Council

Review Criteria of the Undergraduate Council January 2013

The primary concern of the Undergraduate Council (UC) is to function in the best interest of undergraduate students at the University of Kentucky. Undergraduate Council is charged with evaluating the “*academic merit*” of proposed educational activities such as new degree programs. The UC also provides inquiry or advisory commentary relevant to all issues and the resources (faculty, administrative time and oversight) deemed necessary for evaluation of educational activity proposals in relation to academic merit.

Undergraduate Council activities include:

- Employing the rules and regulations of the University Senate relevant to educational programming during the review of proposals concerning undergraduate curricula and new/revised degree programs (specifically SR 3.2.3.B.2) .
- Reviewing degree proposals and related course proposals for duplication and overlap with existing courses, degrees, etc.
- Reviewing the completeness of submitted proposal materials required for review.
- Assessing the academic merit of rationales for and conceptualizations of proposed new degree programs, certificates, or major program changes and the components of the new request.
- Reviewing 500 level courses to ensure compliance with requirements for undergraduate students enrolled in the course (e.g., presence of the undergraduate grading scale, differentiation of assignments between grad and undergraduate students or differentiated grading scales (e.g., interval of points required for an A, B, etc.)
- Reviewing the sample syllabi for measureable learning outcomes, correct course titles, course descriptions, and pre-requisites to ensure consistency with those proposed on form submissions and in congruence with Senate Rules and Regulations. (Note: Minor concerns are passed onto proposers as suggestions vs. holding up approval due to these items)
- Checking for possible adverse effects on students who are enrolled in programs undergoing change or in a major dependent on a course that is being revised or dropped, and reviewing the plans in place to address any identified effects..
- Evaluating proposed distance learning (DL) delivery of established face-to-face courses to assess if proposed DL delivery would provide students with a comparable experience without compromising the integrity of the course; ensuring that all required DL elements are clearly provided on submission materials and syllabi.
- Evaluating if proposed off-campus programs are academically comparable to their main campus counterparts.