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OUS and Institutional Academic Program Review

Careful initiation and continued review of academic programs are key to an institution’s viability and reputation. Not only does such an approach provide a level of quality assurance to the public, it also contributes to the broader portfolio of the state’s system of public universities.

The review process employed by the Oregon University System and its institutions serves to track the success of each program and identify its unique strengths. It provides a systematic way to improve programs by examining:

- Adequacy of resources needed to sustain a quality offering;
- Continued ability to address access and market demand;
- Currency of the curriculum within the evolution of the discipline or field; and
- Success of the program in terms of student learning.

Usually conducted through a form of self-study or external accreditation, the process for the ongoing review of existing programs engages faculty, administrators, graduates, and community partners in a thoughtful exploration that parallels many of the same elements reviewed during the program’s initial approval. Results help reaffirm an institution’s commitment to a program area, confirm the program’s linkage with the institution’s mission and strategic plan, and provide useful data for the institution’s planning cycle.

In Oregon, this process includes rigorous review and approval processes for all new programs and certificates, a five-year review of new programs approved by the State Board of Higher Education, and a systematic review of all existing programs carried out at the institution level. The latter process may vary across campuses but includes many similar components. Processes used to prepare for re-accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities or specialized professional program accreditations provide many of the essential components valued for program review and, during the appropriate cycle of an accreditation site visit, may substitute for a separate program review report.

Links to individual campus program review activities, policies, and reports can be accessed through the Provosts’ Council website, along with a schedule of programs brought forward for review by the Provosts’ Council.

The roles and responsibilities of OUS institutions, the Provosts’ Council, and the Board, as well as flow charts showing the processes for initiation and review of new undergraduate and graduate programs serve to guide institution administrators, department or program chairs, and faculty through the program development and review processes of the Provosts’ Council and Board. Narrative guidelines and required forms may be accessed at the Provosts’ Council website.
## Oregon University System Roles and Responsibilities for Program Review, Approval, and Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Provosts’ Council</th>
<th>Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional accreditation through Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual report to the Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual report from Provosts’ Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop self-study report, work with site visitation team, present institution perspective to NWCCU, respond to accreditation report findings and recommendations</td>
<td>• Summarize institution accreditation reports and recommendations</td>
<td>• Receive and discuss Provosts’ Council annual report at a regular Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• File NWCCU summary report with Chancellor and Provosts’ Council</td>
<td>• Summarize results of all 5-year follow up reviews</td>
<td>• Use the annual report as an opportunity to discuss institution reviews and actions regarding existing programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialized accreditation</strong></td>
<td>• Provide highlights from specialized accreditation reports</td>
<td><strong>Approval of new programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where applicable, departments/programs carry out same preparation activities for specialized accreditation, working with the institution provost and president to respond to accreditation board findings and recommendations</td>
<td>• Provide highlights from campus reviews of existing programs</td>
<td>• Consider for approval all new program proposals as an action or consent item at each regular Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provost provides specialized accreditation report summaries to Provosts’ Council</td>
<td>• Identify program additions and eliminations</td>
<td>• Approve programs or seek further clarification or modifications from institution requesting the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program eliminations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Review of new programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Five-year follow-up program approval</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify programs to be eliminated</td>
<td>• Receive and review proposals from institutions, following established OUS policy and process</td>
<td>• Act on 5-year follow-up reviews for previously approved new programs in which the program did not meet the required criteria, as an action item at a regular Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Report at monthly Provosts’ Council meetings</td>
<td>• Seek external reviews of graduate program proposals</td>
<td><strong>Institution mission and goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing program review</strong></td>
<td>• Recommend new programs to the Board</td>
<td>• Incorporate results of program reviews into annual discussion of institution missions and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct campus-level review of existing programs</td>
<td><strong>Five-year follow-up reviews for newly approved programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide summary report annually to Provosts’ Council</td>
<td>• Receive and review reports from institutions, following established OUS policy and process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain web link to Provosts’ Council website</td>
<td>• Prepare recommendations to the Board regarding action on programs that did not meet required criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New program proposals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communication of program review information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follow development/review processes of department/division, university curriculum committee, faculty senate, dean, provost</td>
<td>• Maintain Provosts’ Council website with policies, guidelines, reports, and links to institution review activities and reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare proposal for review by Provosts’ Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For graduate programs, secure external review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five-year follow-up review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare report to Provosts’ Council in the fifth year following approval of each new program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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; 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.

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 Board’s regular monthly meeting

Board approves program; program ready for implementation

In a normal process that achieves Provosts’ Council consensus in the first round, does not have an 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 7 weeks for undergraduate programs and all certificates.
Academic Program Approval Process:
New Graduate Programs

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.

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.
Policy and Guidelines for New Program Proposals

The academic program is at the core of and animates an institution’s mission and the manner in which the institution contributes to a broader portfolio of public universities in Oregon. Academic program review within the Oregon University System (OUS) is part of a continuous cycle of feedback and program improvement. This policy serves as a mechanism for careful development and quality assurance of new programs, including learning assessment and other metrics for reporting on institutional performance. Further, this policy is consistent with the philosophy and focus of regional accreditation through the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) – i.e., it is integrative, holistic, closely connected to institution mission and planning, and values interconnectedness and interrelationships within the institution and across the Oregon University System.

Each newly approved OUS program will be reviewed after five years to track progress in achieving program objectives, quality indicators, and financial sustainability. (See: Five-Year Follow-Up Review of a New Academic Program.)

Program Description

Each new program proposal must provide a well-rounded description of the program, including its disciplinary foundations and connections; program objectives; programmatic focus; degree, certificate, minor, and concentrations offered; and curriculum. The proposal should address the 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). Importantly, the proposal must address the ways in which the program will seek to assure quality, access, and diversity.

In addition to the information noted above, each proposal must provide the following specific data in the form provided:

- Anticipated Fall headcount and FTE enrollment over each of the next 5 years
- Expected degrees/certificates produced over the next 5 years
- Characteristics of students to be served (resident/nonresident/international; traditional/nontraditional; full-time/part-time; etc.)
- Adequacy and quality of faculty delivering the program
- Faculty resources – full-time, part-time, adjunct
- Other staff
- Facilities, library, and other resources
- Anticipated start date
- Proposed CIP number

Relationship to Mission and Goals

Reflecting both OUS and NWCCU policy, the proposal must clearly identify the program’s connection to OUS and institution goals for access, student learning, research and/or scholarly work, and service. The proposal should articulate the manner in which the program reflects the institution’s strategic priorities and signature areas of focus. Finally, the proposal should place
the program in the larger state context by describing how the program meets the needs of Oregon and enhances the state’s capacity to respond effectively to social, economic, and environmental challenges and opportunities.

Accreditation
If applicable, the proposal should identify any accrediting body or professional society that has established standards in the area in which the program lies, and characterize the program’s ability 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 the steps needed to qualify the program for accreditation and the date by which it would be expected to be fully accredited.

If the proposed program is a graduate program in which the institution offers an undergraduate program, the proposal should indicate whether or not the undergraduate program is accredited and, if not, what would be required to qualify it for accreditation.

More broadly, if accreditation is a goal for the proposed program, the proposal should indicate the steps that are being taken to achieve accreditation. If the program is not seeking accreditation, the proposal should indicate why it is not.

Need
The proposal must provide a clear statement of market demand for the program. In cases in which the program’s location is shared with another similar OUS program, the proposal should provide externally validated evidence of need (e.g., surveys, focus groups, documented requests, occupational/employment statistics and forecasts, etc.). In addition to market demand, the proposal may also address the ways in which the program serves the need for improved educational attainment in the region and state, as well as the civic and cultural demands of citizenship.

Outcomes and Quality Assessment
Giving substance to OUS’ commitment to “the pursuit of excellence in a culture of evidence,” each proposal must clearly identify expected learning outcomes and the means by which those outcomes will be assessed and used to improve the curriculum and instruction. The proposal should also address program performance indicators, including prospects for success of program graduates – employment or graduate school (if an undergraduate program) – and consideration of licensure, if appropriate.

In addition to addressing learning outcomes, the proposal should indicate the nature and level of research and/or scholarly work expected of program faculty, along with indicators of success in those areas.

Program Integration and Collaboration
A signature component of the OUS portfolio approach is the strength obtained through purposeful integration of programs with other programs at the institution and within OUS, as well as through collaborations with other similar programs. To provide an opportunity to review the potential for such integration and collaboration, the proposal should identify all other closely
related OUS programs and Oregon private college programs. The proposal should articulate the ways in which the program complements other similar programs in other Oregon institutions and other related programs at this institution, and the potential for collaboration. If applicable, the proposal should state why this program may not be collaborating with existing similar programs. Finally, the proposal should describe the potential impacts on other programs in the areas of budget, enrollment, faculty workload, and facilities use.

**Financial Sustainability**

Each new program proposal must include a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long-term financial viability of the program. The specific information (some of which may be included in the accompanying forms) will include:

- Anticipated annual program expenses over the next five years
- Anticipated annual program revenues over the next five years
- External sources of funds
- Projected faculty resources over the next five years; ability to recruit and retain faculty
- Targeted student/faculty ratio
- Resources to be devoted to student recruitment
- Graduate assistantships and fellowships, if applicable
- Plans for assuring adequate library support over the long term
- Development and maintenance of unique resources (buildings, laboratories, technology) necessary to offer a quality program in this field

**External Review**

All proposals for new graduate programs must include a review by external program faculty and administrators. The provost of the institution submitting the proposal will submit names of reviewers for consideration by the co-chairs of the Provosts’ Council. The co-chairs may also identify additional reviewers. The campus provost will be responsible for securing the external reviews.

Neither undergraduate nor certificate program proposals require external review.

**Forms for Institution Submission**

The form, *Proposal for a New Academic Program*, provides a template for institution submission of new academic program proposals. In addition, the *Budget Outline*, containing estimated costs and sources of funds for the proposed program, must be attached to the proposal.

Guidelines and questions for external reviews are contained in *External Review of New Graduate Level Academic Programs*. 
FORMS
Proposal for a New Academic Program

Institution:  
College/School:  
Department/Program:  

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)
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

| Institution: ______________________________ | Academic Year: ______________________________ |

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

**Personnel Subtotal**

**Other Resources**
- Library/Printed
- Library/Electronic
- Supplies and Services
- Equipment
- Other Expenses

**Other Resources Subtotal**

**Physical Facilities**
- Construction
- Major Renovation
- Other Expenses

**Physical Facilities Subtotal**

**GRAND TOTAL**
External Review of New Graduate Level Academic Programs

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 goals 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 proposal, (2) participating faculty vitae, (3) the projected budget, (4) other supporting or

---
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.
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 co-chairs 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.

**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 panel 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).
f. The probable impact of the program on the department or academic unit, as well as its effect on current programs.

g. The program's major strengths and weaknesses.

2. Faculty

a. The quality of the faculty in terms of training, experience, research, scholarly contributions, ability to generate external support, stature in the field, and qualifications to serve as graduate faculty.

b. The faculty in terms of size, qualifications for area(s) of specialization offered, and the student body served. Include analysis of program sustainability in light of such factors as upcoming retirements, etc.

c. Areas of faculty strength and weakness.

d. Faculty workload, including availability for student advising, research oversight, mentoring, and teaching effectiveness.

e. The credentials, involvement of, and reliance upon support faculty from other departments within the institutions, from other institutions, and/or adjunct faculty.

3. Need

a. The evidence that there is significant demand for this program.

b. The evidence of sufficient and relevant employment opportunities for graduates of this program.

c. The overall need for the program within the institution, the Oregon University System, state and/or region, and nation.

4. Resources

a. The adequacy of library, computer, laboratory, and other research facilities and equipment; offices; classrooms; support services for the program; and, if relevant, the program's utilization of resources outside the institution (e.g., field sites, laboratories, museums, libraries, and cooperative arrangements with other institutions).

b. The proposed budget and any need for new resources to operate the program effectively. Where appropriate, review resources available to support graduate students (e.g., fellowships and other scholarships, teaching and research assistantships).

c. In terms of national standards, the institution's commitment to the program as demonstrated by the number of faculty relative to workload and student numbers, support for faculty by nonacademic personnel (e.g., support, staff, technicians), financial support for students, and funds for faculty research and professional activities (e.g., conferences, visiting lectures).

d. Institution leaders' commitment to this program in the long term.

e. The institution's ability to sustain the program in the foreseeable future along with its current and future projected commitments.
1. General Information
   a. What was the program originally approved by the Board? When was it last reviewed?
   b. Explain any major modifications in the program from the original proposal. Do you foresee modifications of this program in the future?
   c. Have new locations or delivery models been implemented since the program was first approved?
   d. Please describe any new related degrees, certificates, or concentrations that are now offered in areas related to this program. Are there collaborations with other institutions (community college, OUS institution, and/private college/university)?
   e. How does the program support the mission and strategic plan of the institution, spires of excellence, and signature programs?
   f. How does the program meet the needs of Oregon and enhance the state’s capacity to respond effectively to social, economic, and environmental challenges and opportunities?
   g. How does the program address student and faculty diversity in the context of its discipline?

2. Faculty Resources
   a. Please identify the program faculty by name, FTE, rank/title, and expertise/specialization.
   b. Describe how the institution has maintained adequate qualified faculty members and staff members in relation to the program’s growth since first approved.

3. Enrollment/Degree Production
   a. How many student majors are currently in the program? To what extent have enrollment limitations been imposed?
   b. How many degrees have been awarded, per year, since program implementation? How do these figures correspond to the numbers projected in the program’s original proposal?
   c. How has the program been made available for part-time, evening, weekend, and/or place-bound students?
   d. Is there evidence of regional or national need for additional qualified individuals such as the program is producing? Please specify.
4. **Accreditation/Advisory Board**
   a. Is the program accredited? If so, by what agency? If not, will accreditation be sought?
   b. Describe how the program curriculum stays current and responsive to changes within the related field.

5. **Other Resources**
   a. What is the current budget (present year) for this program?
   b. To what extent were the anticipated annual program expenses and revenues realized since the program’s initial approval?
   c. Have grants been generated through, or because of, this program? Please specify.
   d. Evaluate the adequacy of other resources necessary to support this program (e.g., library, computer equipment, other equipment, facilities, labs).

6. **Student Outcomes**
   a. Describe the program’s current student learning outcomes and the means by which these are assessed and used to improve the curriculum and instruction.
   b. Briefly describe any employment related experiences required in this program (e.g., internship, student teaching, practicum, clinical experience) that document students’ learning outcomes. What have the faculty learned from reviewing these results that has improved the program?
   c. Describe any senior projects, capstones, or exit requirements in the program that document students’ learning outcomes. How have the results been used to improve the program?
   d. Are there professional licensure exams for this degree? If so, how have students performed (e.g., how many students took the exam; what percentage passed)?
   e. What evidence does the program have about employment and/or further professional or graduate level activities of program completers?

7. **Other information**
   a. What else would you like to tell us about your program that was not addressed in this review?
Proposal for Delivery of an Existing Program to a New Location

1. Program Description
   a. Program title, level, and delivery sites.
   b. Department and school/college that would offer the program. Include the name of the institution program coordinator.
   c. Briefly describe the academic program. List all course titles, including number of credits.
   d. Indicate in what ways the proposed program at the new location(s) will differ from the on-campus program.
   e. List any special requirements or prerequisites for admission to the program at the new location(s).
   f. Is there an accrediting agency or professional society that has established standards for this program? If so, is the program currently accredited? If accredited, what steps would be needed to accredit the program at the proposed new location(s)?

2. Demand
   a. List any similar programs offered at the proposed or nearby location(s).
   b. Provide evidence of need for the program at the new location(s).
   c. Estimate enrollment and number of graduates over the next five years. Will any enrollment limitation be imposed? If so, how will those to be enrolled be selected?

3. Personnel
   a. List the names and qualifications of faculty (regular and adjunct) who will be involved in delivering the program to the proposed location(s). Will new faculty be needed?
   b. Estimate the number and type of support staff needed to provide the program at the new location(s).

4. Other Resources
   a. Describe facilities (e.g., buildings, labs, equipment) necessary to offer the program at the new location(s).
   b. Indicate how library needs will be met.
   c. Indicate how students at the new location(s) will receive student services (e.g., academic advising, financial aid assistance, course registration, access to book/text purchases).

5. Alternative Delivery Methods/Formats
   a. Are alternative delivery methods being used (e.g., distance learning or technology-enhanced)? Please describe.
   b. Will this program be delivered in an alternative format (e.g., weekend, evening, on-site)? Please describe.
6. Budgetary Impact

a. Indicate the estimated cost of the program for the first four years of its operation. (Use the Budget Outline form, accessible from the Provosts’ Council website.)

b. If grant funds are required to launch the program, what does the institution propose to do with the program upon termination of the grant?

c. Will the allocation of going-level budget funds in support of the program have an adverse impact on any other institutional program, including the on-campus program? If so, in what ways?

d. If the program will be financed from existing resources, specifically state:
   i. What the budgetary unit will be doing as a result of the new program that is not now done, in terms of additional activities.
   ii. What these new activities will cost and whether financed or staffed by shifting of assignments within the budgetary unit or reallocation of resources within the institution. State which resources will be moved and how this will affect those programs losing resources.