

DATE: April 26, 2018

TO: Jacqueline E. Huntoon  
Provost & VP for Academic Affairs

FROM: Martin J. Thompson  
Senate President

SUBJECT: Senate Proposal 23-18

COPIES: Glenn D. Mroz, President  
Roberta M. Dessellier, Secretary of the Board of Trustees

At its meeting on April 25, 2018, the University Senate approved Proposal 23-18, "Format for Academic Program Proposal". The Senate looks forward to approval of this proposal by the administration. Please keep me informed about the decision of the administration on this proposal and feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

**APPROVED:**



Jacqueline E. Huntoon, Provost & VP for Academic Affairs  
on behalf of the University Administration

18 May 2018

Date

# The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

## Proposal 23-18 (Voting Units: Academic)

### “Format for Academic Program Proposals”

Proposed by: Provost Office and the Curricula Policy Committee

**Rationale:** This proposal is aimed at clarifying and revising the existing procedure 108.1.1 “Formats for Proposing New Academic Programs” with the goal of having a clearer set of guidelines. A core set of requirements more clearly conveys Michigan Tech’s minimum standards and should reduce the need to update senate procedures every time an external group (i.e. the state or our institutional accreditor) changes their procedures.

The requirements outlined in the “Criteria for Financial Evaluation of Proposed Academic Programs”, are more clearly highlighted as a requirement. Some recent program proposals have not addressed these requirements as they are easy to overlook in their current location. This slows down the proposal process and necessitates more rounds of revision by the proposing unit.

#### Summary of Changes:

- Update 108.1.1 to outline the set of requirements for all academic program proposals that allows for internal review.
  - Additional information needed for external constituents (e.g. for state review and institutional accreditor) would be built into templates that build off this core set.
  - The creation and maintenance of program proposal templates will be tasked to the provost’s office in consultation with the CPC.
- Suggested: update procedural language in Proposal 15-11, Policy 406.1, and Policy 411.1 to consistently reference senate procedure with the following language:
  - See Senate Procedures 108.1.1 for proposal requirements.

## Format for Academic Program Proposals

I. This format is based upon the minimum requirements to satisfy Michigan Tech's internal standards. The order of discussion of these items may be changed to fit their relative importance to individual programs. Simple phrases such as "Not required" "Not applicable," etc. should be used where appropriate. A separate proposal is required for each program.

II. Additional external requirements are provided for through templates maintained by the Provost office. Templates are updated by the Provost office as needed in consultation with the Senate's Curricular Policy Committee. Units should consult the available templates when preparing a proposal as more information may be required to meet external needs. Failure to provide all information may result in delays.

III. Requirements for all new academic program proposals

1. Include date on proposal (to distinguish any future versions)
2. Include proposer contact with department of proposer.
3. Interdisciplinary programs require an attached approval from each department and dean named as sponsors.
4. General description and characteristics of program, including learning goals of the proposed program (Learning goals are knowledge and skills that a student will demonstrate upon completion and are not necessarily official University Student Learning Goals).
5. Title of program
6. Rationale.
7. Discussion of related programs within the institution and at other institutions.
8. Project how many students can be enrolled based on current faculty numbers or requested faculty lines.
9. Curriculum design -
10. New course descriptions
11. Model schedule demonstrating completion time.
12. Library and other learning resources.
13. Description of available/needed equipment.
14. Program costs (Additional information may be requested by the Senate Finance Committee.)
15. Accreditation requirements.
16. Planned implementation date.

**All new degree programs must additionally include:**

1. Program-specific policies, regulations, and rules. Append student handbook or indicate which existing handbook would apply (as applicable).
2. Scheduling plans.
3. Space
4. Faculty resumes (a web site link is sufficient).
5. Information required for financial review as outlined in senate proposal 51-04. (see also section V of this proposal)

#### **IV. . Guidance for all proposals**

1. Proposal formatting should include standard headings for senate proposals.
2. Curriculum Design section will include:
  - List of Courses: include total credit requirements and general restrictions. List course numbers, titles and credits. Divide courses into sub-lists as appropriate (e.g. Required, Elective, Thematic Groupings)
    - Any new courses that are being developed for the program should be highlighted, or otherwise marked.
    - If the program can be completed online, mark all courses that are currently available online and any that will be adapted to be online.
    - If students must select courses from pre-defined list, include the minimum or maximum number of credits per list and any restrictions (e.g. course level).
  - Prerequisites: List the course number followed by its prerequisites, for example, GE4750 (GE 3000, GE2350).
3. New Course Descriptions
  - New Course Add Forms are needed for each new course. These may be submitted either:
    - at the same time as the program proposal, OR
    - as part of the annual curriculum proposal process (the “binder process”) prior to program approval.

Courses developed exclusively for the new program will be held by the Registrar’s Office until the program is approved.

#### **V. Criteria for Financial Evaluation of Proposed Academic Programs (Proposal 51-04)**

Under the Senate Constitution, the Senate has primary responsibility in the establishment of new academic programs, and advisory responsibility on issues of financial management. To facilitate the advisory responsibility on issues of financial management, the Senate proposes that Senate proposals for creation of new degree programs include documentation of the financial implications of the new program. This information allows the Senate, and especially the Senate Finance Committee, to provide consistent and complete analysis of the possible financial implications of the new program as part of the Senate's advisory role in financial decision making. Guidelines for items to be included in the financial documentation follow. Items one to six should be provided by the proposing unit. Items seven and eight should be provided with the Provost's Office assistance.

1. Relation to University Strategic Plan
  - a. Relation of program to the university's educational and research goals.
  - b. Consistency with the university's resource allocation criteria.
2. Impact on University Enrollment
  - a. Projected number of students in the program.
  - b. Source of new students; in particular, will the students be drawn from existing programs, or will they be students who would otherwise not have come to MTU?

- c. What is the likely correlation between demand for the new program and existing enrollment patterns at MTU?
  - d. What is the current enrollment in the unit?
- 3. Impact on Resources Required by Department in Which the Program is housed. This would include, but not be limited to:
  - a. Faculty lines.
  - b. Faculty and student labs, including ongoing maintenance.
  - c. Advising.
  - d. Assessment.
- 4. Impact on Resources Required By other Units Within the University. This analysis would include, but not necessarily be limited to, the impacts on:
  - a. Other academic (e.g., Gen Ed) units with regard to faculty, labs and assessment. (NOTE: The current Student to Faculty ratio for the university as a whole is approximately 12:1 per Institutional Analysis.)
  - b. Information Technology, the Library, central administration and career planning with respect to the impact on the need for computing services, library resources, advising, record keeping, development of employer relations etc.
- 5. Assessment of the ability to obtain the necessary resources assuming requested funds are obtained
  - a. For high demand fields (e.g., business fields, etc.), will it be possible to fill allocated lines
- 6. Past proposals. Has the department initiated any other new degree programs in the last five years? If so:
  - a. Describe the extent to which the new program has met the original goals with respect to:
    - 1. Enrollment,
    - 2. Costs,
    - 3. New faculty,
    - 4. Other resources required for the program
  - b. How have degree programs added in the past five years affected total enrollment in the department?
- 7. Departmental Budget contribution
  - a. What is the department's total general fund budget?
  - b. How much tuition does the department generate? This information should be provided for both the credit hours taught by the department and the number of credit hours taken by the department's majors.
- 8. How do the benefits from this program compare to other alternatives that are currently under consideration or development. Will approval and allocation of resources to this program preclude the development of other programs?