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Section 1: FAQs and Process Overview
FAQS
Proposing Curricular Changes

1. **Why do new academic programs and curricular changes require approval?**

   We review and approve proposals advanced by faculty for new programs and curricular changes to provide a broader institutional perspective and ensure programs meet established internal and external quality standards. Does the department have the resource capacity to offer a new program? Is the proposed program aligned with OHSU’s mission and strategic goals or does it stretch the boundaries of the institution? Is there student demand for the program? What are the likely job prospects for a graduate? The review process creates and delivers value to enrolled and prospective students and citizens of Oregon.

   The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities requires its member universities to maintain carefully documented and enforced work processes related to ensuring program quality.

2. **What is the review of curricular changes, including new programs?**

   We have three review levels for proposals of curricular changes, depending on whether the proposed change is substantive or minor.

   - **Category I** proposals are substantive changes to a curriculum, such as adding a new academic program (the unique combination of a specific degree/certificate as well as a specific major), that require the vote of OHSU Faculty Senate, approval by the provost, subsequent approval by the State and may also require notification to and/or approval of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

   - **Category II** proposals are minor, but still change the curriculum, such as substantially redesigning the curriculum of an already authorized program. These changes require the vote of the Educational Policy Committee and administrative review by the provost. **Category II** proposals do not typically require review and approval by either the Faculty Senate or State but notification may be required. Notification to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities may also be required.

   - **Category III** proposals are minor or cosmetic changes that require an administrative review by the provost, which (depending upon the change) may be operationalized through the Office of the Registrar, and usually require notification by the dean or program coordinator a quarter in advance of the change.

3. **What are the steps in the process for reviewing and approving new programs?**

   a. If you are contemplating the development of a new program, it is wise to check in with the dean before designing the curriculum and completing the required proposal. The dean will indicate when it is appropriate to notify the provost of the intent to begin planning a new program. The acceptance of the Notice of Planning Intent (NOPI) by the provost is the clear signal to begin.
b. The provost will confirm the category type and template to be used for developing the proposal. Category I proposals use the OUS template, Category II proposals use an OHSU template and Category III proposals require a memorandum from the dean or program coordinator to the provost or Office of the Registrar.

c. After completing the proposal, you are to go through the school-level process that each school has mapped out on how to get approval from the faculty and dean.

d. When the proposal is approved by the dean, the presumed program director presents the proposal to the provost to initiate the institutional-level review process: (i) administrative review, (ii) Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee review, (iii) Faculty Senate review and (iv) provost review. (This is the end-point for most Category II proposals.)

e. If you are making a substantive change, the program must be approved at the state-level. The provost will carry the proposal forward to the Provosts’ Council and State Board of Higher Education. Pending their approvals, the proposal will be advanced to Oregon’s Office of Degree Authorization and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

4. **How long will it take to get a proposed academic program approved?**

The process can take 12 months or more. Developing either a Category I or II proposal requires a significant investment of faculty time. But, you can take steps to increase the speed. First, it will help to have your department chair and dean as champions for the proposal. Second, the provost’s office will keep the review process moving, scheduling the Faculty Senate reviews and providing feedback. Third, be aware of the organization’s rhythms that can facilitate or delay reviews. For example, the Faculty Senate Educational Committee does not meet over the summer months. Thus, if the proposal gets out of the school-level review in June, the Faculty Senate would not pick it up until September or October. Finally, as you go through each level, expect and respond to any feedback as quickly as possible.

5. **What things should we consider when developing a proposal for a new academic program?**

Limit the length to 15 to 20 pages for Category I proposals and 5 to 10 pages for Category II proposals. The most important thing you can do is to address the criteria in the template. Be direct and stay on topic.

Simple words will help you express your program clearly. Too many complex words slow reviewers down, and readers often skip over professional jargon and abbreviations they do not understand. We recommend spelling out abbreviations, acronyms and specialized language that are well known to you, every time it is used. These include the names of specialized accreditors, such as Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) or Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH); terms (e.g., student learning outcome statements over SLOs as well as names of unique things, e.g., name of the proposed program, faculty governance structures).

The reviewers are intelligent, but are not likely experts in your discipline. They are also very busy and doing this as service to the university. Thus, they are likely to skim over anything they cannot understand and look to see if the proposal has done the required analyzing and designing needed to implement a new program. Always keep in mind what you would want to see and how much time you would have to spend on reading a proposal from another school or university.
6. **How can we easily identify our budget needs to start up and sustain a program?**

With respect to new program requests, the University is interested only in the total direct costs – existing or reallocated costs as well as incremental or out-of-pocket costs – associated with implementing the proposed new program. The full cost of the program, which would include indirect costs or institutional overheads (for example, central university administration or library operations or utilities), need not be reported, unless the curricular change requires substantial new library resources.

The Budget Outline is required as an attachment to the all *Category I* proposals, and some *Category II* proposals. The total direct costs of the program are reported under three categories: (1) the direct costs, such as salaries and benefits, associated with the existing FTE faculty who are in the department(s) as well as any new faculty lines needed to offer the program and who will teach courses in support of the program, (2) all other direct costs (e.g., support staff salaries, travel expenses, supplies) associated with existing resources that are to be used in support of the program, and (3) all incremental or out-of-pocket direct costs associated with implementing the program.

The revenues that will be used to meet the total direct costs of the program are reported under four categories: (1) internal reallocation within a school or OHSU, (2) new student tuition derived from students who would not otherwise attend OHSU, (3) other or non-state funding sources (e.g., federal funds, training grants, community contributions, and income from contractual arrangements with other institutions, private firms, or not-for-profit agencies), and (4) state appropriations through additions to the OHSU’s base budget.

7. **Who has the final word on whether a new program can be implemented?**

The provost has the final authority on whether a new program can be implemented. The decision to approve (or disapprove) will be made at the conclusion of the institution-level process.

8. **If we already offer a master’s degree in our department, do we have to get approval to offer another master’s degree?**

In a word, yes. If the proposal is to: (i) develop a new academic program (the unique combination of a specific degree/certificate as well as a specific major); (ii) establish a new school, department, center or institute; (iii) change the name of any school, department, center or institute; (iv) offer an existing degree or certificate program at new off-campus locations; or (v) develop a joint degree program with another university, you are required to develop a *Category I* proposal and submit it through the review process.

If the proposal is to offer a non-thesis option for an already authorized M.S. program, a *Category I* proposal would still be required. In this case, a non-thesis masters would be a new academic program (which could have the same major as an already approved M.S., but the degree itself would be different).

9. **If we already offer a master’s degree in a major, do we have to get approval to offer a doctorate in the same major?**

Yes, as this is a different level of study, it is a new academic program. Given the resource requirements of doctoral programs, they always require a *Category I* review.
10. **Does a major curricular revision require a review and approval process?**

Yes, the major redesign of the curriculum including developing new courses, modes of delivery, different student learning outcomes and assessments requires a *Category II* proposal.

11. **Can we market the program and recruit students before we have final approval?**

Yes, under some circumstances. In advertising new academic programs that are still undergoing the review and approval process, the content in oral and written communications should be literally accurate and not capable of being misinterpreted

   a. When the final version of the proposal has been submitted to the OHSU Faculty Senate for review, proposed academic programs may be advertised as "Pending OHSU and OUS approval".

   b. When the proposed academic program has been approved by OHSU and submitted for review by the OUS Provosts' Council and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, the proposed programs may be advertised as "Pending OUS approval."

12. **Where can we get help in developing a new program?**

The required proposal formats and other reference material are available online.
New Program Approval Process: School – University – State – Regional

Timeline: 12 – 24 Months

Excludes process for external review, a requirement for almost all graduate programs.

**School-level Review**

- Faculty develop new program
  - Curriculum Committee (DMD)
  - Advanced Education Committee

*Dean Approval*

*Program Approved*

**University-level Review**

- Office of Academic Programs, Policy and Accreditation
  (provides an administrative review and feedback prior to submission to Faculty Senate)

*Faculty Senate*
  (meets monthly except for July and August – no meetings)

*Program Approved*

**State-level Reviews**

- OUS Provost’s Council
  (meets monthly)

*OSBHE*
  (meets four times a year)

*Program Approved*

**Regional Accreditation**

- NWCCU
  (works year round, expect 6-8 wk response)

*Program approved*

Program admits first cohort of students

*All school-level councils and committees are off July and August, otherwise they meet monthly.*
Approval Process: Committee and Council Meeting Schedules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-level review and approval takes place prior to University-level review.</th>
<th>University review</th>
<th>State-level reviews</th>
<th>Regional review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SoD Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>SoM Grad Council</td>
<td>SoM Faculty Council</td>
<td>SoN Academic Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs need to submit proposal documents 7 days prior to a scheduled meeting in order to get on the agenda. Programs are expected to be present at scheduled meetings to answer any questions regarding the new program proposal. For SoM Faculty Council, the process takes place over two consecutive meetings, first for the council to review and second for the council to vote.
Section 2: Policies
1.0 POLICY STATEMENT

The purpose of this policy is to facilitate the improvement of academic programs, and, thereby the overall strength and reputation of OHSU. The guiding principle for proposing changes in any curriculum is based on the understanding that the responsibility for programmatic curricula rests with the faculty.

The Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee will consider the establishment or disestablishment of curricula or programs, departments, and schools and on administrative policies involving questions of educational policy. As such, it has the primary role in reviewing and approving all graduate and undergraduate curricular changes for the University.

Proposals for curricular changes are described as **Category I**, **Category II** and **Category III** (as defined in 2.3 - 2.5 below) to reflect the nature and extent of the requirements for proposal review and approval.

Curricular changes requiring **Category I** review include proposals to: (i) develop a new degree or certificate program; (ii) offer an existing degree or certificate program at new off-campus location(s) and/or through distance education; (iii) change location of the administrative site(s); (iv) offer a joint degree program with another university; or (v) change international activities, including recruitment or partnerships with institutions undertaken outside the U.S.

Curricular changes requiring **Category II** review include proposals to: (i) move responsibility for an academic program from one academic department to another; (ii) rename a degree or academic department; (iii) substantially redesign the curriculum of an authorized program; (iv) suspend or terminate an active or inactive academic program or department; (v) increase or decrease the total number of credits required for a degree or certificate; (vi) change in method of delivery since the last evaluation of the institution; or (vii) vary the total course credits required for a degree or certificate from University credit hour standards.

Curricular changes requiring a **Category III** administrative review by the Provost, which (depending upon the change) may be operationalized through the Office of the Registrar, include proposals to: (i) revise course catalog descriptions or designations including number, credit hours, and level of study; (ii) update approved program-level student learning outcome statements or competencies; or (iii) change graduation requirements.

2.0 DEFINITIONS

2.1 **Academic Program** is defined as a unique course of study that culminates in the awarding of a specific degree (or certificate) in combination with a specific major. An academic program is characterized by: (i) a coherent and specialized body of knowledge, methods and skills; (ii) a faculty-designed curricular path; (iii) faculty identification with an organized instructional effort in a subject matter area; (iv) increasing complexity in curricular content during the student’s period of study; and (v) specified learning outcomes or competency levels expected of program graduates.

2.2 **Academic Unit** is the entity whose curriculum committee approves a course.
2.3 Category I proposals represent new academic program offerings by a school or department. Category I proposals are substantive changes that require the vote of OHSU Faculty Senate, approval by the state of Oregon, and approval by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. If the proposed program will serve out-of-state students through distance education, individual state authorization may be required before enrolling students.

2.4 Category II proposals are modifications of existing program components. Changes are not major, but still require the vote of the Educational Policy Committee and administrative review by the Provost. Category II proposals typically require notification of the Faculty Senate, State, and NWCCU.

2.5 Category III proposals are minor adjustments to 10%, or fewer, of courses in the curriculum that require an administrative review by the Provost, typically operationalized through the Office of the Registrar.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

Each academic unit and its faculty are charged with the review of its proposals for changes in any curriculum and the implementation of process and criteria for their review, within a university wide framework of expectations for the review and a shared timeline for various phases.

The Dean will notify the Provost early in its deliberations and prior to the submission of a Category I proposal. Early notification enables the staff to provide information and advice regarding the procedures to be followed in seeking approval.

The Provost has final decision authority on forwarding Faculty Senate-approved Category I proposals to the State for review.

Decisions on forwarding Category II proposals to the Provost are made by the Educational Policy Committee. The Provost will report to the State System on Category II proposals passed by the Educational Policy Committee on a regular basis, usually annually.

The Office of the Provost will facilitate the work of the Educational Policy Committee to directly oversee the curriculum by conducting the administrative review.

4.0 PROCEDURES

Notice of Intent to Plan (NOPI)
New Academic Programs (Category I)
Category II: Minor Program Revisions with Curricular Impact
Category III: Minor Program Revisions, Administrative Review Only

5.0 RELATED POLICIES

0-03-0613 Marketing New Academic Programs
0-04-0613 Suspending or Terminating Academic Programs
xx-xxx-xxx State Authorization of Distance Education Programs Offered Out-of-State
6.0 KEY SEARCH WORDS

Curriculum changes, new academic programs, state authorization

7.0 REVISION HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2013</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>New Policy Statement approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2013</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Policy Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsible Officer:  Provost, Office of the Provost
Policy Contact:  Office of Academic Programs, Policy and Accreditation, 503-494-1445
Supersedes:  N/A
1.0 POLICY STATEMENT
The guiding policy for planning to market new programs and recruit students for a new program is to take into account the required level of review to set a realistic anticipated program start date. Proposals for substantive change (Category I) require review and approval by the Faculty Senate, Provost, State and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). Proposals for less substantive changes (Category II) require Educational Policy Committee review, provost approval, and notification to the State and NWCCU may also be required.

In marketing for new academic programs that are still undergoing the review and approval process, the content in oral and written communications should be literally accurate and not capable of being misinterpreted

- Proposed academic programs in the approval process may be marketed as "Pending OHSU and OUS approval" when the final version of the proposal has been submitted to the OHSU Faculty Senate for review.

- Proposed programs may be marketed as "Pending OUS approval" when the proposal has been approved by OHSU, and has been submitted for review by the OUS Provosts' Council and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, Academic Strategies Committee.

Applications for new, pending programs may be accepted following successful institutional and external review, if required; and once they are undergoing state level review at the approval of the provost. Prospective students cannot matriculate into a proposed academic program until the term following the completion of all review processes, including the notification of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. NWCCU notes that, "If an institution implements a substantive change without prior written notice or if it proceeds to implement a substantive change denied by the Commission, the Commission may consider issuance of an order for the institution to show cause why its accreditation or candidate status should not be terminated."

2.0 DEFINITIONS
2.1 Matriculant refers to a student who, after meeting the academic standards required to be admitted into an academic program, has commenced enrollment in that program.

2.2 Academic Program is defined as a unique course of study that culminates in the awarding of a specific degree (or certificate) in combination with a specific major. An academic program is characterized by: (i) a coherent and specialized body of knowledge, methods and skills; (ii) a faculty-designed curricular path; (iii) faculty identification with an organized instructional effort in a subject matter area; (iv) an increasing complexity in curricular content during the student’s period of study; and (v) specified learning outcomes or competency levels expected of program graduates.
2.3 **Category I proposals** encompass modifications that are new and have never been done before by the program. **Category I proposals** are major changes to a curriculum that require the vote of OHSU Faculty Senate and subsequent approval by the State and may also require notification to and/or approval of NWCCU.

2.4 **Category II proposals** are modifications of existing program components. Changes are not major, but still require the vote of the Educational Policy Committee and Administrative review by the Provost. **Category II proposals** do not typically require review and approval by either the Faculty Senate or State but notification may be required. Notification to NWCCU may also be required.

3.0 **RESPONSIBILITIES**
The appropriate school dean is responsible for overseeing compliance with this policy and others related to new academic programs.

4.0 **PROCEDURES**
N/A

5.0 **RELATED POLICIES**
Proposing New Academic Programs

6.0 **KEY SEARCH WORDS**
*Category I, Category II, new program advertisement, recruitment, academic programs*

7.0 **REVISION HISTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2013</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>New Policy Statement approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2013</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Policy implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responsible Officer:** Provost, Office of the Provost  
**Policy Contact:** Office of Academic Programs, Policy and Accreditation, 503-494-1445  
**Supersedes:** N/A
1.0 POLICY STATEMENT
This policy allows schools to propose program suspension with the approval from the provost. This policy also allows the provost to initiate a program suspension, absent a proposal request from an individual school. The rationale for program suspension could be, but is not limited to any of the following: a declaration of financial exigency (defined in 2.2 below), budget shortfalls, reallocation of institutional resources, changes in demands for programs, realignment of institutional goals as determined by the Vice President, Dean or Director, lack of student demand and/or resources including faculty and staff capacity.

A suspended program may not admit new students. However, the program must continue offering courses until all students already admitted into the program complete their course of study within the maximum time allotted for degree completion.

Within five years, the original program may be reinstated, with provost approval, when demand and resources allow. If the curricular content in the original program will change, a reinstatement of the program may need to go through the full (Category I) authorization process. Programs suspended for a period of six years or more will be permanently closed and will need to go through the full authorization process as would any other new academic program.

2.0 DEFINITIONS

2.1 Program Suspension is the temporary removal of an academic program from the OHSU Inventory of Active Academic Programs and List of Degrees and Majors maintained by the Office of the Registrar.

2.2 Financial Exigency is an imminent financial crisis threatening the survival of the institution as a whole or one or more of its programs that cannot be alleviated by less drastic means other than program reduction, suspension, elimination or reorganization.

2.3 Academic Unit is an entity whose curriculum committee approves a course.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES
The appropriate school dean should submit a written request for approval of Program Suspension to the provost.

The provost will notify the dean and program director if the suspension is approved. The provost will also notify the dean and program director if a program is being suspended, absent a proposal request.

The appropriate school dean should submit a written request for the reinstatement or closure of a suspended program.
4.0 PROCEDURES
The written request in a memorandum must be made well in advance of the intended date of suspending admission and should address the following factors:

- The rationale for the program suspension.
- The potential impact of suspension on students (e.g. Where will interested students be redirected? What is the allotted time for “teaching out” those finishing the program?)
- The potential impact on faculty and other academic staff.
- Consultation with faculty governance, as appropriately determined by OHSU Policies and school by laws.

To remove a program from suspended status within the five year period, a Category I proposal Will be required and should include evidence that:

- The conditions under which the program suspension was requested no longer apply.
- The market demand for the program is gauged on a needs assessment or market analysis (e.g., targeted students, workforce needs).
- The resources from faculty and staff needed to reinstate the program are available; potential overlaps with other programs that could impact student demand or faculty workload; list faculty and potential involvement.
- Explain the specific plan of sustainability for the program: if this is a grant funded program, what will be the impact of continuing this program once it ends? Why is this reasonable commitment to be making given budget cuts and diminishing grant funds?

5.0 RELATED POLICIES
01-15-001, Program Reduction, Elimination and Reorganization of Academic Programs
Notice of Intent to Plan (NOPI)
0-02-0613, Proposing Curriculum Changes (Category I)
XX-XX-XXX, Time-to-Degree Completion

6.0 KEY SEARCH WORDS
Academic programs, program suspension, inactivation,

7.0 REVISION HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/13/2013</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>New Policy Statement approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/2013</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Policy Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsible Officer: Provost, Office of the Provost
Policy Contact: Office of Academic Programs, Policy and Accreditation, 503-494-1445
Supersedes: N/A
Section 3: Detail Process Flowcharts
Program’s Path: Development – Approval – Implementation
12 – 24 months
_Hypothetical: SoM PhD Program, Fall 2012 – Fall 2014_

Program submits a NOPI to the Provost Office, receives permission to develop a new program proposal, and launches the process below.

- **SoM Faculty** develops new PhD program – 6 – 12 months
- Program presented to SoM Grad Council, April 2013
- Program presented to SoM Faculty Council, May 2013
- Program reviewed, SoM Faculty Council, June 2013
- Approved at School-level, submitted to APPA* for Administrative Review prior to submission to Faculty Senate, June 2013
- Submitted to Faculty Senate, September 2013
- Reviewed by the Provost Office, September 2013
- Approved at University-level, submitted to OUS Provost’s Council, October 2013
- Approved by OUS Provost’s Council, submitted to OSBHE, January 2014
- Approved at state-level, submitted to NWCCU, response +/-8wks = March 2014
- Pending NWCCU approval, program commences Fall 2014

---

*APPA is the Office of Academic Programs, Policy and Accreditation*
School of Dentistry
Academic Program Review and Approval Process

New Program Idea (Abbreviated Proposal)

Dean Review & "Go Ahead"

Curriculum Committee Review & Approval

Predoctoral

Associate Dean Prepares Proposal on OUS Forms

SOD Dean Review & Approval

Yes

Yes

End Process

Yes

No

No

Yes

No

No

No

Revise

Advanced Education

Yes

Proceed to OHSU Institutional Process
School of Medicine
Changes to MD Program Curriculum Review & Approval Process

Curriculum Change Proposed

MD Curriculum Committee Review

SOM Graduate Council Review & Approval

Yes

End Process

No

SOM Faculty Council Review & Approval

Yes

Proceed to OHSU Institutional Process

Yes

No
School of Medicine
Academic Program Review and Approval Process

New Program Idea

Budget, Faculty Requirements, Library, Need for Program, Employment Opportunities, Competitors, Collaborations
Using OUS Forms

Dept. Chair/Provost Review & Provost "Go Ahead"

Yes

SOM Graduate Council Review & Approval

Yes

SOM Faculty Council Review & Approval

Yes

SOM Dean Approval

Yes

End Process

Yes

Revise Process

Revise

Proceed to OHSU Institutional Process
School of Nursing
Academic Program Review and Approval Process

Initial Proposal for New Program, Curricula, or Specialty

Appropriate Curriculum Committee Review

Written Critique of Proposal

Curriculum Committee Chair Presents Proposal

SON Academic Council Review & Approval

SON Faculty Council Review & Approval

Process Repeats for Full Proposal

SON Dean Review & Approval

Proceed to OHSU Institutional Process

End Process

Possible

Yes

No

Possible

Yes

No
OHSU Institutional
Academic Program Review and Approval Process

New Program Proposal Approved by School

Office of Academic Affairs Review & Provost Approval

Yes

Faculty Senate Review Process

No

End Process

Faculty Senate Approval

No

No

OHSU Provost Approval

Yes

Education Subcommittee Review & Critique

Yes

Proceed to OUS/NWCCU Approval Process
Institution program proposal is developed using campus processes (Review by department/division, university curriculum committee, faculty senate, dean, provost)

Proposal is submitted electronically to the Provosts’ Council, via the Chancellor’s Office, for inter-institutional review and comment

Discussed with Provosts’ Council at monthly meeting; consensus achieved on moving to next step

Discussed with Provosts’ Council at monthly meeting; no consensus to move forward; returned to campus for additional information

Still no consensus: proposal referred to appropriate Vice Chancellor for review, along with additional information to address disputed issues. Vice Chancellor discusses program with Provosts’ Council at the following meeting; prepares his/her recommendation.

Positive recommendation

Discussed with Provosts’ Council at monthly meeting; consensus achieved on moving to next step

Negative recommendation

Proposal sent to external reviewers; results discussed at next Provosts’ Council meeting. Barring major issues, proposal moves forward.

Campus prepares program abstract; transmits to Chancellor’s Office for electronic notification to other postsecondary sectors in Oregon to identify adverse impacts, per Office of Degree Authorization (ODA) requirements

Any adverse impact claims are resolved, with sign-off provided by ODA

Proposal submitted to OSBHE docket for consideration at the next regular Board meeting

Board approves program; program ready for implementation

In a normal process that achieves Provosts’ Council consensus in the first round, positive external review, no adverse impact claim, and is readily approved by the Board, the time from program submission to the Provosts’ Council to program approval by the Board is approximately 16 weeks for graduate programs.
Section 4: Curricular Modification Forms
# Notice of Planning Intent (NOPI) for New Degree and Certificate Programs

## Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Please enter the name of the academic unit that will house the program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Select the school that will host the program:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Degree Title</td>
<td>Please enter the proposed degree title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Options</td>
<td>Select all of the degree options available:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate, Post-Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate, Post-Bachelor’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed CIP Code</td>
<td>Enter the proposed CIP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credits</td>
<td>For each degree option available, enter the total number of credits required for degree completion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Start Date</td>
<td>Enter the quarter and year the program will commence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Enrollment in Year One</td>
<td>Enter Enrollment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed New Funding</td>
<td>Describe the new funding for this program:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Please select all of the funding sources that apply:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Training Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Primary Mode of Delivery/Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Type</th>
<th>Information Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Enter the campus locations where the program will be offered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-site</strong></td>
<td>Enter any off-site locations where the program will be offered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance Learning</strong></td>
<td>Enter distance learning formats if applicable:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>If the delivery mode is something other than those listed above, please describe the delivery mode below:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scheduling

- **Scheduled Courses**: Please select all of the times courses will be offered for this program:
  - Day Classes
  - Evening Classes
  - Weekend Classes
  - Other, please describe

- **Attendance Options**: Please select all of the attendance options available for this program.
  - Full-time
  - Part-time

### Contact Information (Academic Department Representative)

- **Name**: Enter the program contact’s name:

- **Title**: Enter the program contact’s title:

- **Telephone**: Enter the program contact’s phone number:

- **Email**: Enter the program contact’s email address:
OHSU’s Principles and Guidelines for Academic Program Proposals

Category I and II Proposals

1. **Mission.** The proposed new program is appropriate and aligned with OHSU’s statement of mission approved by its Board of Directors. Included in this consideration are: (i) the school’s and department’s mission are aligned with the OHSU mission and (ii) the department has the required focus and expertise to deliver the program. (Reference: OHSU Mission; Vision 2020.)

2. **Student Demand.** Within appropriate limits, students should have the opportunity to enroll in programs of study in which they are qualified and interested. Included in this consideration are: (i) student demand for the proposed program indicated by current and projected enrollments; and (ii) the proposed program’s goal of attracting new students to OHSU, not redistributing students from other programs.

3. **Societal Needs.** OHSU carries a responsibility for preparing students to meet Oregon’s workforce needs for health professionals, scientists, engineers and managers. Job openings are defined as those created as a result of new job growth and those created by individuals permanently leaving the occupation’s labor force. Included in this consideration are: Workforce demand projections made by state and federal government agencies, professional associations, and other groups provide one indicator of the need for a program. (Reference: List of Information Sources.)

4. **Program Costs.** The costs of the program are realistic and based on the costs of other comparable programs at OHSU. Included in the consideration are: (i) costs for new faculty and staff, of deployment of existing faculty, required to deliver the program envisioned; (ii) costs associated with equipment, facilities and library resources; (iii) costs associated with format and program delivery including interprofessional courses, technology-enhanced simulation, on-line or hybrid classes, and/or joint degree awarded with another university; (iv) hidden costs of delivering the new program; and (v) source of funds required for program startup and financial sustainability over time, noting use of grant funds initially and plans for replacing the revenue when the grant period ends, if appropriate. (Reference: Budget Outline)

5. **Competition.** The proposed program is not duplicative of programs offered at OHSU or other postsecondary institutions in the state. Included in the consideration are: (i) programs with similar titles, program objectives and course content offered by other OHSU departments, schools and public or private universities; (ii) demonstrated need of a region in the state; or (iii) need for a public option that provides access to the major or profession for Oregonians. If the program is duplicative to any degree, the proposal provides a rational for the necessity of duplication. (Reference: OHSU Academic Program Inventory, Oregon Inventory of Academic Programs)

6. **Quality.** The proposed program reflects the university’s expectations for quality. Included in the consideration are: (i) standards are equivalent or higher than similar programs at OHSU’s peers; (ii) advances knowledge through new combinations of existing disciplines; (iii) establishes program in a new or emerging discipline; and/or (iv) adds faculty, staff and student capacity to explore new basic, clinical and applied research frontiers. (Reference: List of OHSU Institutional Peers.)
1. Program Description
   a. Proposed Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) number (*contact your Registrar or campus Institutional Research office for this number*).
   b. Brief overview (1-2 paragraphs) of the proposed program, including its disciplinary foundations and connections; program objectives; programmatic focus; degree, certificate, minor, and concentrations offered.
   c. Course of study – proposed curriculum, including course numbers, titles, and credit hours.
   d. Manner in which the program will be delivered, including program location (if offered outside of the main campus), course scheduling, and the use of technology (for both on-campus and off-campus delivery).
   e. Ways in which the program will seek to assure quality, access, and diversity.
   f. Anticipated fall term headcount and FTE enrollment over each of the next five years.
   g. Expected degrees/certificates produced over the next five years.
   h. Characteristics of students to be served (resident/nonresident/international; traditional/nontraditional; full-time/part-time; etc.)
   i. Adequacy and quality of faculty delivering the program.
   j. Faculty resources – full-time, part-time, adjunct.
   k. Other staff.
   l. Facilities, library, and other resources.
   m. Anticipated start date.

2. Relationship to Mission and Goals
   a. Manner in which the proposed program supports the institution’s mission and goals for access; student learning; research, and/or scholarly work; and service.
   b. Connection of the proposed program to the institution’s strategic priorities and signature areas of focus.
   c. Manner in which the proposed program contributes to Oregon University System goals for access; quality learning; knowledge creation and innovation; and economic and cultural support of Oregon and its communities.
   d. Manner in which the program meets broad statewide needs and enhances the state’s capacity to respond effectively to social, economic, and environmental challenges and opportunities.
3. Accreditation
   a. Accrediting body or professional society that has established standards in the area in which the program lies, if applicable.
   b. Ability of the program to meet professional accreditation standards. If the program does not or cannot meet those standards, the proposal should identify the area(s) in which it is deficient and indicate steps needed to qualify the program for accreditation and date by which it would be expected to be fully accredited.
   c. If the proposed program is a graduate program in which the institution offers an undergraduate program, proposal should identify whether or not the undergraduate program is accredited and, if not, what would be required to qualify it for accreditation.
   d. If accreditation is a goal, the proposal should identify the steps being taken to achieve accreditation. If the program is not seeking accreditation, the proposal should indicate why it is not.

4. Need
   a. Evidence of market demand.
   b. If the program’s location is shared with another similar OUS program, proposal should provide externally validated evidence of need (e.g., surveys, focus groups, documented requests, occupational/employment statistics and forecasts).
   c. Manner in which the program would serve the need for improved educational attainment in the region and state.
   d. Manner in which the program would address the civic and cultural demands of citizenship.

5. Outcomes and Quality Assessment
   a. Expected learning outcomes of the program.
   b. Methods by which the learning outcomes will be assessed and used to improve curriculum and instruction.
   c. Program performance indicators, including prospects for success of program graduates (employment or graduate school) and consideration of licensure, if appropriate.
   d. Nature and level of research and/or scholarly work expected of program faculty; indicators of success in those areas.

6. Program Integration and Collaboration
   a. Closely related programs in other OUS universities and Oregon private institutions.
   b. Ways in which the program complements other similar programs in other Oregon institutions and other related programs at this institution. Proposal should identify the potential for collaboration.
   c. If applicable, proposal should state why this program may not be collaborating with existing similar programs.
   d. Potential impacts on other programs in the areas of budget, enrollment, faculty workload, and facilities use.
7. **Financial Sustainability** (attach the completed *Budget Outline*)
   a. Business plan for the program that anticipates and provides for its long-term financial viability, addressing anticipated sources of funds, the ability to recruit and retain faculty, and plans for assuring adequate library support over the long term.
   
   b. Plans for development and maintenance of unique resources (buildings, laboratories, technology) necessary to offer a quality program in this field.
   
   c. Targeted student/faculty ratio (student FTE divided by faculty FTE).
   
   d. Resources to be devoted to student recruitment.

8. **External Review** (if the proposed program is a graduate level program, follow the guidelines provided in *External Review of new Graduate Level Academic Programs* in addition to completing all of the above information)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Program Name:</th>
<th>School/Unit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Proposed Start Term:**

**Fall Quarter (Year 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Winter Quarter (Year 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring Quarter (Year 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summer Quarter (Year 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall Quarter (Year 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Winter Quarter (Year 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Category I and II: Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Quarter (Year 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Term (Year 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etc.</th>
<th>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Faculty Data: Rank and Series of Proposed Program Faculty**

Please provide data for each of the first four years of the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Total # Professor</th>
<th>Total # Assoc. Prof</th>
<th>Total # Asst. Prof</th>
<th>Total # Senior Instructor</th>
<th>Total # Instructor</th>
<th>Total # Scientist</th>
<th>Total # Affiliate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsch</td>
<td>Acad Clin Rsch</td>
<td>Sr Assoc Asst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Detail:**

Provide the name, credentials, terminal degree institution and areas of specialization for each of the program’s primary faculty.

1. Jane R. Smith, Ph.D. in Molecular Biology, Johns Hopkins University. Dr. Smith’s expertise is in...
INSTRUCTIONS

1. Whose viewpoint?

The Budget Outline is intended to show the budgetary impact resulting from offering the new program. This table should be completed from the viewpoint of the budgetary unit that will be responsible for the program. Determine what the budgetary unit will be doing (in terms of new or additional activities) that it is not now doing and show what these activities will cost — whether financed and staffed by shifting of assignments within the budgetary unit; reallocation of resources within the institution; special appropriation of the legislature; or gift, grant, or other funds.

2. No additional resources needed?

If the program is simply a rearrangement of courses already being offered, relying on access to library resources available for other programs, with no requirements for new or additional specialized facilities, equipment, or technology, and with no increase or decrease in students served by the budgetary unit responsible for the program, the budgetary impact would be near zero and should be so reported in the table.

3. Additional resources needed?

If FTE faculty or support staff assigned to the budgetary unit must be increased to handle an increased workload as a result of the new program (or to provide added competencies), indicate the total resources required to handle the new activities and workload (e.g., additional sections of existing courses) by specifying: (1) how much of this total figure is from reassignment within the budgetary unit (Column A), and (2) how much is from resources new to the budgetary unit (Columns B-E). Please provide line item totals in Column F.
Budget Outline Form
Estimated Costs and Sources of Funds for Proposed Program

Total new resources required to handle the increased workload, if any. If no new resources are required, the budgetary impact should be reported as zero.

Indicate the year:  _____ First  _____ Second  _____ Third  _____ Fourth

Prepare one page each of the first four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Column D</th>
<th>Column E</th>
<th>Column F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Current Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>Institutional Reallocation from Other Budgetary Unit</td>
<td>From Special State Appropriation Request</td>
<td>From Federal Funds and Other Grants</td>
<td>From Fees, Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>LINE ITEM TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel Subtotal

Other Resources Subtotal

Physical Facilities Subtotal

GRAND TOTAL

Institution: _____________________________  Program: _____________________________  Academic Year: _____________________________

Personnel

Faculty (Include FTE)
Graduate Assistants (Include FTE)
Support Staff (Include FTE)
Fellowships/Scholarships
OPE
Nonrecurring

Other Resources

Library/Printed
Library/Electronic
Supplies and Services
Equipment
Other Expenses

Physical Facilities

Construction
Major Renovation
Other Expenses
Background

Each Oregon University System (OUS) institution requesting a new graduate level professional or graduate degree program must complete an external review of the proposed program. The purpose of the external review is to consider the proposed program in relation to the Board's four goals — quality, access, employability, and cost effectiveness — and include evaluation that uses the criteria set forth in IMD 2.015(2) for review of new academic programs. These criteria are:

- The needs of Oregon for higher education and the state's capacity to respond effectively to social, economic, and environmental challenges and opportunities.
- Student demand that may not be met satisfactorily by existing programs.
- Program duplication is primarily of concern at the graduate and professional levels; therefore, a duplicated graduate or professional program must be specifically justified in terms of state's needs, demand, access, and cost effectiveness.
- The resources necessary for the program are available within existing programs; have been identified within existing budgets and will be reallocated; or will be secured to meet reasonable time lines for implementation, typically within a two year limitation.
- The congruity of the proposed program with the campus mission and its strategic direction.
- Where appropriate and feasible, the program is a collaboration between two or more institutions that maximizes student access, academic productivity, and quality.

The External Review Panel

The external review process for a proposed new graduate level degree program must include a site visit by a panel composed of three highly qualified individuals in the specific field/discipline of the proposed program. Although scholars and professionals from Oregon may be included, the majority of the panel members must be selected from peer institutions outside the state. Only under extraordinary circumstances may an individual from an Oregon University System institution serve on the panel.

The selection of the panel members shall be determined by the co-chairs of the OUS Provosts’ Council, in consultation with the institution, from a list of candidates provided by the proposing institution. The co-chairs may also identify additional reviewers.

Site Visit

Invitations to serve on the external review panel and to act as chair are extended by the institution. The institution will provide panel members with (1) the full written program

---

1 By agreement with the OUS Provosts’ Council, the review requirement may be modified or waived if the proposed degree program is closely related to an institution's authorized existing program — for example, adding a Master of Engineering in Civil Engineering where the Master of Science in Civil Engineering is already in place.
proposal, (2) participating faculty vitae, (3) the projected budget, (4) other supporting or contextual materials, as needed, and (5) a site visit schedule and itinerary, including all arrangements. All costs associated with the external review will be borne by the institution.

Report and Institution's Response

On the basis of its visit, review of materials, and panel members' expertise, the panel will make a written report for which guidelines are provided. After receipt of the panel's report, the institution may elect to withdraw the program proposal from further consideration and notify the Chair of the OUS Provosts’ Council that the external review panel has satisfied its charge. If the institution wishes to proceed, the academic unit must respond, in writing, to the panel's recommendations and assessments. The revised program proposal, external review report, and any institutional responses will be submitted to the OUS Provosts’ Council for consideration. Subsequently, the review and approval process set forth in IMD 2.015(3) for all new academic programs will be followed, including provision for an institution to submit for Board consideration a program proposal that does not have the support of the OUS Provosts Council.

External Review Panel Responsibility

The external review panel's primary task is to evaluate, not investigate. All data, information, documentation, and supporting material will be provided by the institution, thus enabling the panel to focus its efforts on the review. The panel is responsible for preparing the final report in a timely manner. The report will be based primarily on the full panel's evaluation of the written program proposal and the information gathered during the site visit, and will address areas set forth in these guidelines. Once completed, the chair will send the report to the institution president or provost and graduate dean; a copy will be provided to the academic unit that developed the program proposal.

Report Guidelines

The panel is asked to assess the program within the present and projected future contexts, addressing program elements, faculty, need, and resources.

1. Program

   a. The program objectives and requirements; the mechanisms for program administration and assessment.

   b. The program's alignment with the institution's mission and strategic objectives.

   c. The depth and breadth of coverage in terms of faculty availability and expertise, regular course offerings and directed study, and access to and use of support resources within and external to the institution.

   d. The relationship of this program to undergraduate and other graduate programs at the institution and other institutions in the state, if appropriate. Consider collaborative arrangements, partnerships, interdisciplinary programs, service functions, joint research projects, support programs, etc.

   e. The justification in terms of state needs, demand, access, and cost effectiveness (if this program represents System duplication).
Administrative Review Template

An administrative review of all proposals for new academic programs is undertaken by the Office of Academic Programs, Policy and Accreditation after the proposal has successfully advanced out of the school-level review and approved by the appropriate school dean. The administrative review is part of the proposal packet advanced to the OHSU Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee for its review and approval. Faculty developing a program proposal may find these standards and criteria useful as they develop their proposals.

Ten categories will guide the review of each proposal:

1. **Academic Rigor**: The academic rigor of the proposed program is of utmost importance. How is academic rigor defined and assured by the faculty? What are the academic merits of the program? Will the program attract high caliber students? Does the unit have relevant experience to provide a high quality program at the degree levels proposed?

2. **Financial Viability**: The proposal should stress the financial stability of the proposed program and provide a budget for the first four years and contingency plans. The required Budget Outline (one outline for each year) includes the identification of revenue sources, start up costs, build out costs, steady state funding expectations, personnel costs, and capital costs/space needs. Proposals that do not use the approved format in the proposal narrative or Budget Outline will be returned by the OAPP&A. Failure to provide a detailed presentation and discussion of the budget or develop a budget that includes a deficit or shortfall will be viewed as a cause for rejection of the proposal.

3. **Faculty Resources**: The proposal should clearly specify the faculty guiding the program development and teaching the core courses including the names of faculty, department, highest degree(s) and awarding institution. Does the proposal demonstrate that the members of the faculty listed have the aggregate expertise and experience with the discipline, specialty or subspecialty? Are they primarily tenure-track faculty? Is the FTE faculty required to teach the required core courses available, or does the program require additional FTE, in a specialty or subspecialty and at what desired rank? Are the curriculum vitae for faculty teaching the core courses included in an appendix? If course and faculty from other departments or schools are used to deliver the program, does that program have the capacity to accept new students without additional sections? Can the program share or leverage faculty resources in other schools or units to increase cost efficiency or effectiveness?

4. **FTE Requirements**: The proposal should include a clear plan for faculty FTE requirements for each stage of development. The proposal should clearly list the number of faculty FTEs needed at start-up, the various stages of the program’s build-out, and steady-state. Does the proposal describe the balance of full-time faculty at various ranks with lecturers and other temporary or part-time teaching help? The school’s financial plan should describe in detail how FTEs will be funded, including whether any faculty will be shared with other departments or schools (or other universities if this is a joint degree
program). The proposal should also pay particular attention to both the amount of time and resources needed to hire new FTEs (salary and OPE). Finally, the need for particular specialties and sub-specialties should also be articulated and should fit with the curriculum.

5. **Capital Requirements**: All capital requirements must be carefully detailed and analyzed.

6. **Sources of Revenue**: All sources of revenue, including revenue from the current budgetary unit, institutional reallocation from other budgetary units, state-support, federal funds and other grants, tuition revenue and other income must be detailed. It is also expected that a development plan for the fiscal sustainability of the program will be submitted with the proposal.

7. **Need for the Program**: The proposal should clearly state and make the case for a distinct need for the new program by documenting the following:
   a. A clear societal need for professionals, researchers, or faculty in the field;
   b. The demand is not being fully met by existing programs; and
   c. Clear student demand for the new program.
   Additionally, the proposal should
   a. Define how the program will address this unmet need;
   b. How will the program attract qualified, fully-competitive and diverse students;
   c. Show projections of employment opportunities for the program’s graduates.

   If there are other programs of the same type in Oregon, does the proposal include a clear analysis of how it would assume a needed, and perhaps even unique place, in the University's portfolio. Are comparisons with existing programs at Oregon universities or other peer institutions of the desired rank included?

8. **Curriculum**: The criterion for course descriptions is to "ensure that course description(s) clearly and appropriately describe(s) the course.” Is the course description a coherent statement of a unified body of knowledge, as well as, in compliance with relevant professional responsibilities? All required core courses need to be detailed (course number, title, any prerequisites, and actual or proposed catalogue description) and approved electives in tracks listed (course number and title only). Descriptions of courses in a series should distinguish the progression of knowledge, skills and performance expectations as well as the delivery method(s): traditional face-to-face formats, online/ web-based formats/streaming video, or hybrid).

   Reviewers will primarily examine the subject matter and pedagogical methods (e.g., lecture/discussion, seminar, simulation, clinical, laboratory) outlined in the course descriptions. In order for the Provost’s Office and Faculty Senate authority to steer clear of faculty rights, administrative review and Faculty Senate review of course descriptions will confine itself to determining whether these descriptions satisfy relevant professional standards.
Does the proposal include a course syllabus for every course in the core curriculum as an attachment? How does the academic rigor of the program compare with similar programs at OHSU and peer institutions?

9. **Student Demand:** In addition to societal and workforce needs, student demand for programs need to be detailed. Demand can be documented in a proposal by citing results of needs assessments, employment projections? Will this program attract new students to OHSU or redistribute students in existing programs?

10. **Fit within the state of Oregon:** The proposal should clearly articulate the program’s fit within the state and the other segments in Oregon. The proposal should stress how the program or school will fit in with the overall academic profile of OHSU, including how existing programs will be enhanced by the new program and, likewise, how these existing programs will enhance the quality and development of the school including the achievements of the core themes and core theme objectives for NWCCU institutional accreditation. The capital plan should also show how it fits with *Vision 2020.*
Category II: Minor Program Revisions with Curricular Impact

Maximum page number appropriate to revision.

Program Director/Dean:

School: ☐ Dentistry ☐ Medicine, MD ☐ Medicine, Grad Studies ☐ Nursing ☐ Public Health ☐ Other

Type of Proposed Revision:
☐ Move program  ☐ Suspend/terminate program or unit
☐ Merge/split academic unit  ☐ Redesign Curriculum
☐ Rename program  ☐ Increase/decrease credits required for degree/certificate
☐ Change delivery method  ☐ Alter existing admissions requirements
☐ Vary total course credits for an award from the University’s essential qualifications standards

Title of New or Revised Program or of Programs Impacted by Revision:

Faculty Vote: ____ Yes  ____ No  ____ Abstained

Proposed Implementation: _____ Quarter _____ Year

1. Identify the level of students to whom your program revision is directed:
   ☐ undergraduate  ☐ master’s  ☐ professional doctorate  ☐ research doctorate  ☐ certificate

2. How does the program revision fit with the department and school’s long term goals/strategic plans? How does this program revision enhance or overlap with other programs in the department or school? Does the proposal include new or revised courses? ☐ YES  ☐ NO

3. Based on needs assessment data, is there a need and demand from potential students and employees for the revised program? Specifically, is this need or demand in the Portland Metropolitan Area or statewide?

4. What impact will this revision have on the targeted student group? What is the estimated number of students that will be impacted?

5. If the program is being suspended, terminated, moved, merged or split, what are the hidden/assumed costs to the department? Include a summary analysis of the cost versus benefit/savings of the proposed program revision and short or long term savings or efficiencies that might occur as a result of the revision.

6. What resources from faculty and staff are needed to implement the proposed program revision, and how does that impact other programs? List faculty and their projected involvement.

7. If the program is being moved, merged or split, explain the specific plan of sustainability for the program. For a grant funded program, will the program revision impact the grant in any way? If so and the grant impact is negative, is this a reasonable commitment to make given budget cuts and diminishing grant funds?

8. What will the revised program accomplish that is not available from the programs being offered at OHSU?
Category III: Minor Program Revisions, Administrative Review Only
Limit proposals to a maximum of three pages.

Program Director/Dean:

School: ☐ Dentistry ☐ Medicine, MD ☐ Medicine, Grad Studies ☐ Nursing ☐ Public Health ☐ Other

Type of Proposed Revision:
☐ Revise course catalog descriptions or designations (number, credit, level)
☐ Update approved program-level student learning outcome statements or competencies
☐ Change graduation requirements
☐ Other, describe:

Proposed Implementation: _____ Quarter _____ Year

1. Identify the level of students to whom your program revision is directed:
   ☐ undergraduate ☐ master’s ☐ professional doctorate ☐ research doctorate ☐ certificate

2. Why is the program proposing this revision?

3. How does the program revision fit with the department and school’s long term goals/strategic plans? How does this program revision enhance or overlap with other programs in the department or school?

4. How does the program revision improve program effectiveness?

5. If the proposal includes an update to program-level student learning outcomes or competencies, provide both the new and eliminated/revised outcomes or competencies to fully demonstrate the alteration.

6. For changes to graduation requirements, describe the new requirements. How will the change impact current students? What is the rationale for the change?

7. What resources from faculty and staff are needed to implement the proposed revision, and how does that impact other programs? List faculty and their projected involvement.