



The University of Georgia

University Council
Athens, Georgia 30602

March 26, 2010

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – 2009-2010

Mr. David E. Shipley, Chair

Agricultural and Environmental Sciences - Dr. Timothy L. Foutz

Arts and Sciences - Dr. Roxanne Eberle (Arts)

Dr. Rodney Mauricio (Sciences)

Business - Dr. James S. Linck

Ecology - Dr. James W. Porter

Education - Dr. Yvette Q. Getch

Environment and Design - Mr. Scott S. Weinberg

Forestry and Natural Resources - Dr. Sarah F. Covert

Family and Consumer Sciences - Dr. Jan M. Hathcote

Journalism and Mass Communication - Dr. Wendy A. Macias

Law – No representative

Pharmacy - Dr. Keith N. Herist

Public and International Affairs - Dr. Jerome S. Legge

Public Health – Dr. Phaedra S. Corso

Social Work - Dr. Patricia M. Reeves

Veterinary Medicine - Dr. K. Paige Carmichael

Graduate School - Dr. Malcolm R. Adams

Undergraduate Student Representative – Cameron Secord

Graduate Student Representative – Lauren King

Dear Colleagues:

The attached proposal for a revised Academic Affairs Policy Statement No. 1, New Degree or Major Program, will be an agenda item for the April 2, 2010, Full University Curriculum Committee meeting. The policy has been revised to comply with Board of Regents revisions.

Sincerely,

David E. Shipley, Chair
University Curriculum Committee

cc: Professor Jere W. Morehead
Dr. Laura D. Jolly

NEW DEGREE OR MAJOR PROGRAMS

Academic Affairs Policy Statement No. 1

1. References

- a. Academic Affairs Handbook, Board of Regents, University System of Georgia, July 1987.
- b. Bylaws of the University Council of the University of Georgia, 1988.

2. Policy

- a. Effective this date and until rescinded, programs of academic work shall not be added to the curriculum of the University of Georgia unless recommended by the University Curriculum Committee in accordance with the Bylaws of the University Council, submitted by the President of the University of Georgia to the Chancellor, and approved by the Board of Regents of the University System. Policy and implementing guidance outlined herein are applicable to all Academic Degree Programs involving 30 hours or more of course work in a field of study. The policy statement may be reproduced for local use. Minor programs (less than 30 hours of course work) and non-degree certificate programs shall be subject to separate policy statements and implementing guidelines. No provisions stated herein are intended to conflict with the Bylaws or the Academic Affairs Handbook.
- b. ~~Two levels of proposals (letter of intent and formal) are normally~~ *A formal proposal is required* when academic units contemplate adding a new degree or major program to the curricula of the institution. The procedure to be followed in developing ~~each~~ *the formal* proposal appears in paragraph four of this statement.

3. Responsibility

- a. Faculty
The responsibility for developing a new degree or major program resides with the faculty in each academic unit; however, only academic programs which promise to contribute to or otherwise enhance the mission of the University of Georgia should be considered for development.
- b. Administrative
It shall be the responsibility of each school or college to ensure that all proposals receive appropriate faculty review prior to submission to the next higher administrative level. Both the head of the academic unit and the appropriate dean of the school or college submitting a proposal must review all proposals before they are submitted to the next higher administrative level. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall be responsible for reviewing proposals and providing any needed internal and external coordination of procedures. This shall include making appropriate recommendations to the President of the University on program proposals which are transmitted to the Board of Regents for action. The Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall keep unit (library, institute,

department, school or college) heads informed of the current status of proposals as they move through the review stages required by governance procedures.

c. Points of contact

Academic units contemplating the development of new undergraduate degree or major programs should consult with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. For new graduate degree or major programs, academic units should consult with the Dean of the Graduate School.

4. Procedure

- a. The Board of Regents requires the submission of ~~both letter of intent and formal~~ **formal** proposal in support of a new degree or major program. The proposal
- ~~b. The letter of intent and formal proposal for a new program~~ should be consistent with the University mission and follow the format provided on the forms attached to this policy.

5. Routing of Proposal

All undergraduate proposals will be submitted by deans of respective schools or colleges or directors of institutes directly to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Graduate Program proposals must first be reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School who will then forward them to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Proposals for all new programs or changes in existing programs will be reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee and subsequently forwarded with a recommendation to the University Council for consideration. University Council recommendations on proposals are forwarded to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost who will transmit the same to the President of the University for consideration. The President will transmit proposals to the Board of Regents with his recommendation.

6. System Review

- a. The Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs will, as deemed appropriate, seek the advice of outside consultants in evaluating a program proposal.
- b. As part of the review process for ~~letter of intent and formal~~ **formal** proposals, the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs will disseminate to all University System of Georgia institutions, on a regular basis, a list of program proposals under consideration, and will invite interested parties to request a copy of the proposal for review and comment. Information received through this process will be considered in evaluating the proposals.
- c. Once approved, all programs will undergo a system review during the ~~fourth~~ **seventh** year of operation. This review is designed to evaluate how well the program is meeting the expectations that were laid out in the formal proposal.

University System of Georgia

Baccalaureate and Master's Degree Procedures

Modified January 4, 2010

Criteria and Procedures for New Programs

Criteria for the Evaluation of Bachelor's and Master's Program Proposals

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

1. Demonstrate programmatic need at the state, regional and/or national levels.
2. Provide evidence that program graduates will be regionally/nationally competitive, as appropriate to mission and demonstrate that a program will provide outstanding contributions to Georgia and be competitive with the best programs in the nation.
3. Identify outcomes for students who complete a 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 a 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 a 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 a new program proposal.
9. Demonstrate that a 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. Provide evidence of institutional resources that will be expended specifically for a program (i.e., personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies and expenses, capital expenditures and other) at two critical times: a) program start-up, b) at the time of a program's first comprehensive program review.

Process for the Review of Bachelor's and/or Master's Program Proposals

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia's purpose in reviewing proposed new programs is to examine a new program proposal in the context of the Board of Regents/ University System of Georgia academic operations, state needs, and the USG strategic plan. 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. The process involves the development of one document, a full formal proposal that would have garnered institutional support through internal processes before submission.

One Step Process: Revised Formal Proposal

Proposals will be posted on the web for informational and institutional feedback by the Office of Academic Programs. The Board of Regents/University System of Georgia review will be based upon the aforementioned criteria for evaluation of bachelor's and/or master's programs. The revised formal proposal requires the submission of only one document with all pertinent details

that would have previously been found separately in a letter of intent (preliminary) and formal proposal.

Proposals should address the following issues and may be submitted electronically or in hard copy format:

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, anticipated starting date. Ensure that degree nomenclature is aligned with national, regional, and state norms as well as accrediting body requisites, where applicable, for the discipline with due consideration for accurate representation of program content, facilitation of promotion and marketing, and consistency with the nomenclature of similar degrees.
2. Description and Objective of the Degree – 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 the program (i.e., personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies and expenses, capital expenditures and other - at two times: program start-up and when the program undergoes its first comprehensive program review).
6. Curriculum.
7. Student admissions criteria.
8. Availability of assistantships (if appropriate), provisions to assist students who transfer in or out of this program degree.
9. Anticipated student learning and other outcomes for students who complete the proposed program.
10. Administration.
11. Accreditation.
12. Projected enrollment, revenues, and expenditures for the first three years.
13. Facilities implications of the proposed program.
14. Inventory of faculty directly involved. For each faculty member, give the following data: name, rank, highest degree, degrees earned, academic discipline, current workload for a typical semester, explanation of how workload will be impacted with the addition of the proposed program; expected responsibilities in the proposed program. If it will be necessary to add faculty in order to begin the program, give the desired qualifications of the persons to be added, with a timetable for adding new faculty and plan for funding new positions.

Review by System Office of the Board of Regents, University System of Georgia

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

System-wide Review

As part of the process for reviewing proposals, the Office of Academic Programs will disseminate to all University System of Georgia institutions, on a regular basis, a list of program proposals under consideration, and will invite interested parties to request a copy of proposals for review and comment. Information received through this process will be considered in evaluating proposed programs.

Follow-up Review

Should a program be approved, it will, during its seventh year of operation, undergo a review by the University System of Georgia Office of Academic Affairs commensurate with the institution's comprehensive program review timetable. This review will evaluate how well the program is meeting the expectations that were outlined in the proposal.

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
BACCALAUREATE AND MASTER'S
DEGREES

NEW PROPOSAL FORM: ONE-STEP PROCESS
(Submit One Copy)

REVISED FORMAL PROPOSAL

Institution:

Institutional Contact (President or Vice President for Academic Affairs):

Date:

School/Division:

Department:

Departmental Contact:

Name of Proposed Program/Inscription:

Degree:

Major:

CIP Code:

Anticipated Starting Date:

1. Program Description and Objectives:

- a. Objectives of the program
- b. Needs the program will meet
- c. Brief explanation of how the program is to be delivered
- d. Prioritization within the institution's strategic plan

2. Description of the program's fit with the institutional mission and nationally accepted trends in the discipline.

3. Description of how the program demonstrates demand and a justification of need in the discipline and geographic area and is not unnecessary program duplication.

4. Brief description of institutional resources that will be used specifically for the program (e.g., personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies and expenses, capital expenditures at program start-up and when the program undergoes its first comprehensive program review.

5. Curriculum: List the entire course of study required and recommended to complete the degree program. Provide a sample program of study that would be followed by a representative student.

- a. Clearly differentiate which courses are existing and which are newly developed courses. Include the course titles as well as acronyms and credit hour requirements associated with each course.
- b. Append course descriptions for all courses (existing and new courses).
- c. When describing required or elective courses, list all course prerequisites.
- d. Provide documentation that all courses in the proposed curriculum have met all institutional requirements for approval.
- e. Append materials available from national accrediting agencies or professional organizations as they relate to curriculum standards for the proposed program.
- f. Indicate ways in which the proposed program is consistent with national standards.
- g. If internships or field experiences are required as part of the program, provide information documenting internship availability as well as how students will be assigned and supervised.
- h. Indicate the adequacy of core offerings to support the new program.

6. Admissions criteria. Please include required minima scores on appropriate standardized tests and grade point average requirements.

7. Availability of assistantships (if applicable).

8. Student learning outcomes and other associated outcomes of the proposed program.

9. Administration of the program:

- a. Indicate where the program will be housed within the academic units of the institution.
- b. Describe the administration of the program inclusive of coordination and responsibility.

10. Waiver to Degree-Credit Hour (if applicable): If the program exceeds the maximum credit hour requirement at a specific degree level, then provide an explanation supporting the increase in hours (Note: The maximum for bachelor's degrees is 120-semester credit hours and the maximum for master's degrees is 36-semester credit hours).

11. Accreditation: Describe disciplinary accreditation requirements associated with the program (if applicable).

12. Projected enrollment for the program especially during the first three years of implementation. Please indicate whether enrollments will be cohort-based.

13. Faculty

a. Provide an inventory of faculty directly involved with the administration of the program. For each faculty member, provide the following information:

Faculty Name	Rank	Highest Degree	Degrees Earned	Academic Discipline	Current Workload
Explanation of how workload will be impacted by the new program:					
Expected responsibilities in the program:					

Total Number of Faculty: _____

b. If it will be necessary to add faculty in order to begin the program, give the desired qualifications of the persons to be added, with a timetable for adding new faculty and plan for funding new positions.

14. Fiscal, Facilities, Enrollment Impact, and Estimated Budget

a. Provide a narrative that explains how current institutional resources will be expended specifically for this program. Provide a narrative that explains how the institution will fiscally support the establishment of the new program through the redirection of existing resources and acquisition of new resources. Indicate whether the institution will submit a request for new funds as part of its budget request. The narrative also needs to explain the basis of the institution's projections with regard to anticipated EFT, head count, student enrollment, estimated expenditures, and projected revenues.

	First Year FY	Second Year FY	Third Year FY	Fourth Year FY
I. ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS				
Student Majors				
Shifted from other programs				
New to the institution				
Total Majors				
Course Sections Satisfying Program Requirements				
Previously existing				
New				
Total Program Course Sections				

Credit Hours Generated by Those Courses				
Existing enrollments				
New enrollments				
Total Credit Hours				
DEGREES AWARDED				
II. EXPENDITURES	EFT Dollars	EFT Dollars	EFT Dollars	EFT Dollars
Personnel – reassigned or existing positions				
Faculty				
Part-time Faculty				
Graduate Assistants				
Administrators				
Support Staff				
Fringe Benefits				
Other Personnel Costs				
Total Existing Personnel Costs				

EXPENDITURES (Continued)				
Personnel – new positions				
Faculty				
Part-time Faculty				
Graduate Assistants				
Administrators				
Support Staff				
Fringe Benefits				
Other personnel costs				
Total New Personnel Costs				
Start-up Costs (one-time expenses)				
Library/learning resources				
Equipment				
Other				
Physical Facilities: construction or major renovation				
Total One-time Costs				
Operating Costs (recurring costs – base budget)				
Supplies/Expenses				
Travel				
Equipment				
Library/learning resources				
Other				
Total Recurring Costs				
GRAND TOTAL COSTS				

III. REVENUE SOURCES				
Source of Funds				
Reallocation of existing funds				
New student workload				
New Tuition				
Federal funds				
Other grants				
Student fees				
Other				
New state allocation requested for budget hearing				
Nature of Funds				
Base budget				
One-time funds				
GRAND TOTAL REVENUES				

Facilities Information for New Academic Programs

Proposed Location for the Program: _____

Floor area required for the program (gross and net square feet): _____

Type of spaces required:

- Number of classrooms _____
- Number of labs _____
- Number of offices _____
- Other spaces _____

Place an "X" beside the appropriate selection:

_____ Existing facility will be used as is (area square footage):

_____ Existing facility will require modification (area square footage):

Projected renovation cost:

Estimated relocation cost:

Total funding required:

Source of Funding:

_____ Construction of new facilities will be required (area square footage):

Estimated construction cost:

Estimated total project cost:

Proposed source of funding:

List any infrastructure impacts that the program will have (i.e., parking, power, HVAC, etc.) and indicated estimated cost and source of funding.

Other comments:

Note: A system office Facilities Project Manager (through the Office of Facilities) may contact you with further questions separate from the review of the new academic program.

University System of Georgia

Doctoral Degree Procedures

Modified January 4, 2010

Criteria and Procedures for New Programs

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 has high quality (especially doctoral) and 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 program 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 graduate program strengths.
7. Identify highly qualified program faculty with national and/or international reputations, researching and publishing in 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 tenured and tenure track 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 (e.g., personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies and expenses, capital expenditures and other, etc.) at two times during the development and maturation of the program: at initial start-up and during the program's first comprehensive program review.

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 a new program proposal within the context of the Board of Regents/

University System of Georgia academic operations, state needs, and the USG strategic plan. 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. The process involves the development of one document, a revised formal proposal that would have garnered institutional support through internal processes before submission.

One Step Process: Revised Formal Proposal

Proposals will be posted on the web for informational and institutional feedback by the Office of Academic Programs. The Board of Regents/University System of Georgia review will be based on the criteria for doctoral programs. The revised formal proposal requires the submission of only one document with all pertinent details that would have previously been found separately in a letter of intent (preliminary) and formal proposal. Supplemental criteria for applied doctoral programs developed at non-research universities can be found on this website as well at the following url: http://www.usg.edu/academic_programs/new_programs/ Proposals should address the following areas and may be submitted electronically or in hard copy format:

1. Basic Information: Name of institution, institutional contact (President or Vice President for Academic Affairs), institutional contact for proposed program, school/office, department.
2. Programmatic information – name of proposed program, degree, major, degree inscription, CIP code, anticipated start date. Ensure that the degree nomenclature is aligned with national, regional, and state norms as well as accrediting body requisites, where applicable, for the discipline with due consideration for accurate representation of program content, facilitation of promotion and marketing, and consistency with the nomenclature of similar degrees.
3. Description and objective of the degree – abstract suitable for presentation to the Board of Regents.
4. Program fit to institutional mission and to nationally accepted trends in the discipline.
5. Program demonstrates a response to demand and is justified within the discipline/ geographic region/state/nation and is not unnecessary program duplication.
6. Institutional resources that will be expended specifically for this program (e.g., personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies and expenses, capital expenditures and other — at two times: program start-up and when the program undergoes its first comprehensive program review).
7. Curriculum.
8. Student admissions criteria.
9. Availability of assistantships as well as outcomes associated with the program inclusive of careers/jobs available to graduates.
10. Anticipated student learning and other outcomes associated with completion of the proposed program.
11. Administration.
12. Accreditation.
13. Projected enrollment, revenues, and expenditures for the first three years of program implementation.
14. Facilities implications of the proposed program.
15. Inventory of faculty directly involved. For each faculty member, give the following data: name, rank, highest degree, degrees earned, academic discipline, current workload for a typical semester, explanation of how workload will be impacted with the addition of the proposed program; expected responsibilities in the proposed program. If it will be

necessary to add faculty in order to begin the program, give the desired qualifications of persons to be added, with a timetable for adding new faculty and a plan for funding new positions.

16. External Reviews – Each institution will provide a list of five to eight reviewers from aspirational or comparable programs/institutions, and should include an explanation of why the reviewers were suggested. This list should not include individuals who the department or institution consulted during the process of program proposal development.

Review by the Board of Regents/University System of Georgia

Upon receipt at the System Office, a new program proposal will be posted on the web for information and institutional feedback. The Office of Academic Programs will also consult the appropriate Regents Advisory Committee(s) (e.g., academic or administrative committees) for additional review of the proposal. The program review staff will make a recommendation regarding acceptance of the proposal to the University System Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor.

System-wide Review

As part of the process for reviewing proposals, the Office of Academic Programs will disseminate to all University System of Georgia institutions, on a regular basis, a list of program proposals under consideration, and will invite interested parties to request a copy of proposals for review and comment. Information received through this process will be considered in evaluating the proposal.

Follow-up Review

Should a program be approved, it will, during its seventh year of operation, undergo a review by the University System of Georgia Office of Academic Affairs commensurate with the institution's comprehensive program review timetable. This review will evaluate how well the program is meeting the expectations that were outlined in the formal proposal.

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
DOCTORAL DEGREES
NEW PROPOSAL FORM: ONE-STEP PROCESS
(Submit One Copy)

REVISED FORMAL PROPOSAL

Institution:

Institutional Contact (President or Vice President for Academic Affairs):

Date:

School/Division:

Department:

Departmental Contact:

Name of Proposed Program/Inscription:

Degree:

Major:

CIP Code:

Anticipated Starting Date:

-
1. Program Description and Objectives:
 - a. Objectives of the program
 - b. Needs the program will meet
 - c. Brief explanation of how the program is to be delivered
 - d. Prioritization within the institution's strategic plan
 2. Description of the program's fit with the institutional mission and nationally accepted trends in the discipline.
 3. Description of how the program demonstrates demand and a justification of need in the discipline and geographic area (region, state, and nation) and is not unnecessary program duplication.
 4. Brief description of institutional resources that will be used specifically for the program (e.g., personnel, library, equipment, laboratories, supplies and expenses, capital

expenditures at program start-up and when the program undergoes its first comprehensive program review.

5. Curriculum: List the entire course of study required and recommended to complete the degree program. Provide a sample program of study that would be followed by a representative student.
 - a. Clearly differentiate which courses are existing and which are newly developed courses. Include the course titles as well as acronyms and credit hour requirements associated with each course.
 - b. Append course descriptions for all courses (existing and new courses).
 - c. When describing required or elective courses, list all course prerequisites.
 - d. Provide documentation that all courses in the proposed curriculum have met all institutional requirements for approval.
 - e. Append materials available from national accrediting agencies or professional organizations as they relate to curriculum standards for the proposed program.
 - f. Indicate ways in which the proposed program is consistent with national standards.
 - g. If internships or field experiences are required as part of the program, provide information documenting internship availability as well as how students will be assigned and supervised.
 - h. Indicate the adequacy of foundation course offerings to support the new program.
6. Admissions criteria. Please include required minima scores on appropriate standardized tests, grade point averages, and master's level graduate degree attainment.
7. Availability of assistantships.
8. Student learning outcomes and other outcomes of the proposed program.
9. Administration of the program:
 - a. Indicate where the program will be housed within the academic units of the institution.
 - b. Describe the administration of the program inclusive of coordination and responsibility.
10. Waiver to Degree-Credit Hour (if applicable): If the program exceeds the total credit hours normally associated with similar programs offered both within and outside of the system, provide the institution's rationale for increased credit hour requirements.
11. Accreditation: Describe disciplinary accreditation requirements associated with the program (if applicable).
12. Projected enrollment for the program (especially during the first three years of implementation). Please indicate whether enrollments will be cohort-based.

13. Faculty

a. Provide an inventory of faculty directly involved with the administration of the program. For each faculty member, provide the following information:

Faculty Name	Rank	Highest Degree	Degrees Earned	Academic Discipline	Current Workload
Explanation of how workload will be impacted by the new program:					
Expected responsibilities in the program:					

Total Number of Faculty: _____

b. If it will be necessary to add faculty in order to begin the program, give the desired qualifications of the persons to be added, with a timetable for adding new faculty and plan for funding new positions.

14. External Reviews: Provide a list of five to eight reviewers, external to the system, from aspirational or comparable programs/institutions. This list should include an explanation of why the reviewers were suggested. This list should not include individuals for whom the department or institution has consulted during the process of program proposal development.

15. Fiscal, Facilities, Enrollment Impact, and Estimated Budget

a. Provide a narrative that explains how current institutional resources will be expended specifically for this program. Provide a narrative that explains how the institution will fiscally support the establishment of the new program through the redirection of existing resources and/or acquisition of new resources. Indicate whether the institution will submit a request for new funds as part of its budget request. The narrative also needs to explain the basis for the institution's projections with regard to anticipated EFT, head count, student enrollment, estimated expenditures, and projected revenues.

	First Year FY	Second Year FY	Third Year FY	Fourth Year FY
I. ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS				
Student Majors				
Shifted from other programs				
New to the institution				
Total Majors				

Course Sections Satisfying Program Requirements				
Previously existing				
New				
Total Program Course Sections				
Credit Hours Generated by Those Courses				
Existing enrollments				
New enrollments				
Total Credit Hours				
DEGREES AWARDED				
II. EXPENDITURES	EFT Dollars	EFT Dollars	EFT Dollars	EFT Dollars
Personnel – reassigned or existing positions				
Faculty				
Part-time Faculty				
Graduate Assistants				
Administrators				
Support Staff				
Fringe Benefits				
Other Personnel Costs				
Total Existing Personnel Costs				

EXPENDITURES (Continued)				
Personnel – new positions				
Faculty				
Part-time Faculty				
Graduate Assistants				
Administrators				
Support Staff				
Fringe Benefits				
Other personnel costs				
Total New Personnel Costs				
Start-up Costs (one-time expenses)				
Library/learning resources				
Equipment				
Other				
Physical Facilities: construction or major renovation				
Total One-time Costs				
Operating Costs (recurring costs – base budget)				
Supplies/Expenses				
Travel				
Equipment				
Library/learning resources				
Other				
Total Recurring Costs				

GRAND TOTAL COSTS				
III. REVENUE SOURCES				
Source of Funds				
Reallocation of existing funds				
New student workload				
New Tuition				
Federal funds				
Other grants				
Student fees				
Other				
New state allocation requested for budget hearing				
Nature of Funds				
Base budget				
One-time funds				
GRAND TOTAL REVENUES				

16. Supplemental Applied Doctoral Degree Criteria for Non-Research Universities (if applicable): If the proposed program has been developed by a non-research university in terms of University System of Georgia sector differentiation for institutions, then the following supplemental criteria will need to be submitted along with the new proposal.

Supplemental Criteria for Applied Doctoral Degrees – Points of Clarification

Please describe how the institution meets each of the qualifying principles below:

- a. Proposals must clearly demonstrate high and sustained market demand for the professional degree.
- b. The proposing institution must clearly demonstrate readiness to implement the degree program and be prepared to cover all startup costs. Proposals must clearly demonstrate that the program’s infrastructure is sustainable by having available faculty resources and other support attributes.
- c. The proposed doctoral degree curriculum must be of high quality, including a significant requirement for independent, original research.
- d. A program may not be proposed if there is a cost-effective and high-quality alternative delivery approach that could be offered through a proximate institutional partnership and/or hosting arrangement.
- e. The institution must demonstrate a history of success in delivering undergraduate and/or master’s degrees in the discipline(s) of the proposed doctorate.
- f. The institution must demonstrate that establishment of the program will not

diminish its commitment to existing undergraduate and master's degree programs offered.

Facilities Information for New Academic Programs

Proposed Location for the Program: _____

Floor area required for the program (gross and net square feet): _____

Type of spaces required:

- Number of classrooms _____
- Number of labs _____
- Number of offices _____
- Other spaces _____

Place an “X” beside the appropriate selection:

_____ Existing facility will be used as is (area square footage):

_____ Existing facility will require modification (area square footage):

Projected renovation cost:

Estimated relocation cost:

Total funding required:

Source of Funding:

_____ Construction of new facilities will be required (area square footage):

Estimated construction cost:

Estimated total project cost:

Proposed source of funding:

List any infrastructure impacts that the program will have (i.e., parking, power, HVAC, etc.) and indicated estimated cost and source of funding.

Other comments:

Note: A system office Facilities Project Manager (Office of Facilities) may contact you with further questions separate from the review of the new academic program.