

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Universities Division**

**Policies & Procedures Manual
Table of Contents**

Guidelines for Recognition and Classification of Courses and Degree Program Offerings.....	4
Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) 2000 Edition	5
Degree Programs, Support Areas, and Degree Titles	6
Timelines for Review of Proposals for New Degree Programs and Administrative Changes.....	8
Principles, Conditions, Procedures and Timetables for Course Review.....	9
Principles	9
Conditions	10
<u>Within Authorized Degree or Certificate Programs</u>	10
<u>Within Support Areas</u>	10
Format for Substantive Degree Program Requests.....	11
Program Administration	11
Program Description	11
Educational Objectives.....	11
Admission Standards	11
Evaluation	13
Program Need/Demand	14
Program Potential	14
Resources.....	15
Costs.....	17
Additional Guidelines Helpful for the Coordinating Board in Evaluating a Program Request.....	17
Substantive Degree Program Request Title Page Model.....	18
Certification of Adequacy of Financing Procedures.....	19
COST Forms.....	22
Format for Substantive Administrative Change Request.....	26
Change Request	26
Reason for Request.....	26
Role and Mission	26
Accreditation	26
Additional Proposals	27
Resources.....	27
Costs.....	27
Substantive Administrative Change Request Title Page Model.....	29
Format for Nonsubstantive Degree Program Requests.....	30
Reason for Request	30

Program Description	30
Relationship to Existing Authorized Programs.....	30
Expected Enrollment.....	30
Resources.....	30
 Nonsubstantive Degree Program Request	
Title Page Model.....	32
 Format for Nonsubstantive Administrative Change Request.....	33
 Nonsubstantive Administrative Change Request	
Title Page Model.....	34
 Periodic Review of Existing Programs.....	35
 Guidelines for Institutional Self-Evaluation Instrument.....	36
Statewide Review of Doctoral Programs	36
Program Objectives.....	36
Need.....	37
Program Structure and Curriculum	37
Faculty.....	38
Students.....	38
Administration and Management	39
Resources and Financial Support.....	39
Special Features of the Program	40
Accreditation	40
Additional Comments	40
General Coordinating Board Guidelines	41
Procedures for Statewide Review of Doctoral Programs	41
General Criteria for Evaluation of Doctoral Programs.....	43
 Guidelines for Developing Cooperative Doctoral Programs	46
STEP 1: THECB approval in accordance with existing Board rules (Sections 5.151- 5.152)	
.....	46
STEP 2: THECB approval of the second level of cooperation.....	47
STEP 3: THECB authorization for the Cooperating Institution to grant degrees in	
its own name	47
 Distinctions Between EdD and PhD Programs in Education	48
Doctor of Education Degree.....	48
Doctor of Philosophy Degree	48
 Standards for EdD Programs in Educational Administration/Leadership	50
Recruitment/Admission	50
Curriculum.....	50
Faculty and Classes.....	51
 Standards for Consideration of New Doctoral Program Requests	52
Non-Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions.....	52
Single-Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions.....	53
Multiple-Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions	53
 Guidelines for Offering and State Funding of Remedial English/Reading/Writing Courses	55
 Teacher Education	56

Teacher Education Field-Based Courses (TEF).....	57
Definition	57
Procedures for Gaining Recognition	57
Guidelines on Teacher Education	58
Post-Baccalaureate Certification Preparation	58

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Guidelines for Recognition and Classification of Courses and Degree Program Offerings

1. In identifying degree programs and course offerings at Texas institutions, the Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System (IPEDS) classification structure of the U.S. Department of Education will be used to assure comparability of information among institutions in Texas and across the country. [See attached list.]
2. Degree programs will be identified and approved by the Coordinating Board according to uniform definitions of degree programs and support areas. [See attached definitions.]
3. Staff review and approval of course offerings at institutions of higher education include consideration of the following factors:
 1. Approved Role and Mission of the Institution
 2. Approved Degree and Certificate Programs
 3. Institutional degree requirements
 4. Range and variety of courses necessary to make a quality education available to students
 5. Licensing, Certification or Accreditation Requirements
 6. Utilization Measures (Frequency of the use of courses and the semester credit hours generated)
 7. Size of Course Inventory in relation to number of faculty
4. The Coordinating Board encourages institutions to implement internal, systematic reviews of their course inventories.

Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) 2000 Edition

For course and degree program approvals and classifications, the Coordinating Board uses an adaptation of the system used by the U.S. Department of Education in its Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The IPEDS taxonomy currently in use, A Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP), includes 47 broad academic categories. All courses and degree programs are classified within these divisions:

01	AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURE OPERATIONS, & RELATED SCIENCES	32	BASIC SKILLS
03	NATURAL RESOURCES & CONSERVATION	33	CITIZENSHIP ACTIVITIES
04	ARCHITECTURE & RELATED SERVICES	34	HEALTH-RELATED KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS
05	AREA, ETHNIC, CULTURAL, & GENDER STUDIES	35	INTERPERSONAL & SOCIAL SKILLS
09	COMMUNICATION, JOURNALISM & RELATED PROGRAMS	36	LEISURE & RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES
10	COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES/ TECHNICIANS & SUPPORT SERVICES	37	PERSONAL AWARENESS & SELF-IMPROVEMENT
11	COMPUTER & INFORMATION SCIENCES & SUPPORT SERVICES	38	PHILOSOPHY & RELIGIOUS STUDIES
12	PERSONAL & CULINARY SERVICES	39	THEOLOGY & RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS
13	EDUCATION	40	PHYSICAL SCIENCES
14	ENGINEERING	41	SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES/TECHNICIANS
15	ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES/ TECHNICIANS	42	PSYCHOLOGY
16	FOREIGN LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, & LINGUISTICS	43	SECURITY & PROTECTIVE SERVICES
19	FAMILY & CONSUMER SCIENCES/HUMAN SCIENCES	44	PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION & SOCIAL SERVICE PROFESSIONS
21	TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION/INDUSTRIAL ARTS	45	SOCIAL SCIENCES
22	LEGAL PROFESSIONS & STUDIES	46	CONSTRUCTION TRADES
23	ENGLISH LANGUAGE & LITERATURE/LETTERS	47	MECHANIC & REPAIR TECHNOLOGIES/TECHNICIANS
24	LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES, GENERAL STUDIES & HUMANITIES	48	PRECISION PRODUCTION
25	LIBRARY SCIENCE	49	TRANSPORTATION & MATERIALS MOVING
26	BIOLOGICAL & BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES	50	VISUAL & PERFORMING ARTS
27	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	51	HEALTH PROFESSIONS & RELATED CLINICAL SCIENCES
28	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (JROTC, ROTC)	52	BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT, MARKETING, & RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES
29	MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES	54	HISTORY
30	MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES	60	DENTAL, MEDICAL & VETERINARY RESIDENCY PROGRAMS
31	PARKS, RECREATION, LEISURE & FITNESS STUDIES		

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Degree Programs, Support Areas, and Degree Titles

(Approved October 1986)

The terms used to describe authorized degree programs can be confusing. Different terms, concentration, track, option, emphasis, specialization, major, are used by universities to designate degree programs. This document helps institutions determine what a degree program is, what it is not, and how to tell the difference.

The term *degree program* is defined in legislation (Texas Education Code, Section 61.003) and is explicated in the Coordinating Board's 1979 *Guidelines for Recognition and Classification of Courses and Degree Program Offerings*. These guidelines specify use of the taxonomy employed by the Department of Education for its national higher education data system, currently, *A Classification of Instructional Programs* (CIP) adapted for Texas. The Texas CIP taxonomy is used to identify courses, degree programs, declared majors and degrees awarded. Declared majors and degrees awarded must be reported separately for each authorized degree program.

A degree program is "any grouping of subject matter courses which, when satisfactorily completed by a student, will entitle him/her to a degree from a public senior college or University or medical or dental unit."

Course groupings are considered to be degree programs if they are substantially the same as those for a degree in a similar discipline at the institution or in the same discipline specialty (as identified by Texas CIP classification) at similar institutions. Therefore,

- It is the grouping of courses within the curriculum that designates a degree program concentration, major, track, option, or specialization.
- Authority for a degree program justifies all the courses required for the discipline specialty and some additional courses to provide flexibility within the specialty.
- Modification of an existing degree program to the extent that its Texas CIP classification no longer applies constitutes creation of a *new* degree program which must be approved before it is offered or publicized.

A support area is a grouping of courses for which an institution does not have degree authority. The number of courses in a support area is limited to fewer than would provide a degree program in that specialty at that level. Support areas may include a single discipline, a subcategory of an approved degree program, or a component of a multi-disciplinary specialty.

- For example, an institution may be authorized to offer a degree program in Psychology, but have only support area authority in Experimental, Counseling, and Clinical Psychology. The number of courses authorized in each of the latter three areas would be less than the semester credit hour requirements for a degree program in one.
- To avoid confusion, approved degree programs and support areas should not be described in the same terms.
- Curriculum displays provided for support areas, must not suggest authorized degree programs.
- An institution may use any term to denote support areas, but must clearly describe the extent of the groupings of courses that may be taken by a student.

A *degree title* is the name of the degree and discipline under which one or more degree programs may be offered.

A degree title usually consists of the degree designation and discipline specialty. For example, an institution may offer degree programs in Experimental Psychology, Counseling Psychology, and Clinical Psychology under the single degree title "Master of Science with major in Psychology."

The degree designation is "Master of Science" or "MS." Each of the three degree programs would require Coordinating Board approval and separate identification in the official degree program inventory before they could be offered or advertised.

- Modification of an authorized degree title requires Coordinating Board approval before it may be publicized.
- Minor modifications which do not alter the content or nature of degree programs may be approved by the Coordinating Board staff upon application from an institution.

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Universities Division**

Timelines for Review of Proposals for New Degree Programs and Administrative Changes

All non-doctoral proposals submitted in complete form and received before a regular quarterly Board meeting will be considered as soon as possible but no later than the third regular, quarterly meeting following that meeting. Doctoral proposals will be considered within four regular quarterly meetings following the first meeting after they are submitted. Consideration may result in approval, denial, or referral of the proposal back to the institution. Table 1 provides the current time lines for Board consideration of non-doctoral and doctoral proposals.

Table 1

If proposal is received before the Board meeting in:	<u>Non-Doctoral</u> proposals must be considered on or before the Board meeting in:	<u>Doctoral</u> proposals must be considered on or before the Board meeting in:
January 2007	October 2007	January 2008
April 2007	January 2008	April 2008
July 2007	April 2008	July 2008
October 2007	July 2008	October 2008
January 2008	October 2008	January 2009
April 2008	January 2009	April 2009
July 2008	April 2009	July 2009
October 2008	July 2009	October 2009
January 2009	October 2009	January 2010
April 2009	January 2010	April 2010
July 2009	April 2010	July 2010
October 2009	July 2010	October 2010

* For these timelines to be effective, proposals must contain all of the information necessary for staff to prepare a thorough analysis.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Principles, Conditions, Procedures and Timetables for Course Review

(Accepted by Coordinating Board July 23, 1982)

In July 1982 the Coordinating Board's Task Force on Course Review recommended and the Board accepted the following "self-regulating guidelines" for course review. The guidelines are designed to accomplish the following:

First, by upholding the traditional prerogative of faculty to administer changes within their own degree programs, the new procedures will help insure the academic integrity of curricular development. Second, by returning more autonomy to those most immediately involved in and responsible for course inventory changes, the new procedures will help expedite the now time-consuming, inefficient process. At the same time, the proposed guidelines will allow the Coordinating Board staff to fulfill its legal mandate to insure that degree programs are authorized and offered in accord with such established criteria as quality, role and scope, and need. The guidelines are designed, therefore, to prevent unauthorized expansion of courses outside authorized programs; they will allow for a desired measure of comparability of degree programs and course offerings and will promote "truth in advertising" by demanding that all institutions produce accurate, up-to-date catalogs and course inventories.

I. Principles

The following principles constitute the foundation of the course review process:

- A. Institutions may add, change, and delete courses within already authorized degree programs. All such course actions within already authorized degree programs must be reported annually to the Coordinating Board for audit. Automatic and immediate approval will be assumed unless otherwise indicated by the Coordinating Board staff.
- B. Any courses untaught as an organized class for three consecutive years will be automatically deleted from the course inventory in the absence of justification for retention. The Coordinating Board will furnish annual records of untaught courses to help each institution keep its course inventory updated.
- C. Any particular special topics course successfully taught three times within the five-year period must be assigned a regular course number and are reported as a new course for an annual audit (if in an authorized degree program) or submitted for prior approval of the Coordinating Board (if in a support area).
- D. Upper-division institutions can generally offer only upper-level courses and community colleges must offer only lower-level courses.

II. Conditions

The Coordinating Board staff and each institution must agree that all degree and certificate programs for an institution are accurately and consistently identified and that all support areas, both outside the subject matter fields of authorized programs and also within the disciplines of broadly authorized programs, are properly identified. They must agree that all course offerings in these authorized programs and support areas are within Coordinating Board guidelines and that the subject matter content coding of all courses is consistent with statewide coding applications.

- A. Within Authorized Degree or Certificate Programs. Course inventory updates within the agreed upon degree and certificate programs should be submitted in a single group as early as practicable, but not later than August 15. Because all relevant data for fall courses must be entered on the Coordinating Board computer file before the Fall Class Report (CBM-004) is run on November 1 of each academic year, the August 15 date is necessary to allow time for processing. Institutions may assume that all course actions will be automatically approved for funding for the following academic year. Institutions can proceed with confidence in publications, scheduling, and other planning with regard to these courses. Institutions may submit appropriate data on computer tape if they so desire.

During the academic year for which courses have been automatically approved, the Coordinating Board staff will review and analyze the course inventory of each institution in relation to authorized degree and certificate programs in support areas. If this analysis indicates some lack of clarity regarding program authority or course offerings which exceed Coordinating Board guidelines, the institution will be asked to provide additional information and justification.

- B. Within Support Areas. Course inventory updates within agreed upon support areas should be submitted in a single group as early as possible within the fiscal year prior to implementation. The Coordinating Board staff will provide a definitive response within 45 to 60 days after receipt of the appropriate forms. Institutions must not assume the requested course actions are approved until notification by the Coordinating Board staff.

Emergency situations which arise outside these recommended timetables will be considered by the staff on a case-by-case basis. Neither timetable will apply when the Coordinating Board approves new degree or certificate programs and/or administrative changes. Approved course inventory changes in relation to newly authorized degree programs may be submitted and entered on the computer file immediately following state authorization of the new program.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Format for Substantive Degree Program Requests

I. Program Administration

- A. Describe how the program would be administered.
 - 1. Indicate name and title of person(s) who would be responsible for curriculum development and on-going review.
 - 2. Describe responsibilities for student advisement and supervision.
 - 3. If the program would be administered by more than one administrative unit, what factors make this desirable?
- B. If some non-academic administrative units, e.g., "institute" or "center" would be involved in administering the program, describe the relationships.
- C. If a new organizational unit would be created or an existing organizational entity modified as a result of this program, identify and describe the anticipated result.
(Reference: "Format for Administrative Change Request," Fall 1992.)

II. Program Description

- A. Educational Objectives
 - 1. Describe the educational objectives of the program.
(Include reference to the preparation of students for licensure or certification appropriate and any special outcomes or competencies which the program would provide that are not available from existing degree programs.)
 - 2. If the program design includes multiple curricula (concentrations, emphases, options, specializations, tracks), describe the educational objectives of each.
(Each of these curricula including Texas CIP code must be identified on the title page. Reference: "Guidelines for Recognition and Classification of Courses and Degree Program Offerings," adopted July 20, 1979 and revised to conform to new CIP codes, Fall 1992).
- B. Admission Standards
 - 1. State admission requirements for the program. (If there are different categories of admission, e.g., unconditional or probationary, describe each.)

C. Degree Requirements

1. In tabular form, indicate the semester credit hour (SCH) requirements in each of the following categories applicable to the proposed program; include the total SCH requirement for the degree:
 - a. Foundation courses
 - (1) for undergraduate programs, general education/core curriculum;
 - (2) for graduate programs, prerequisite/leveling courses;
 - b. Courses required of all students in the proposed program;
 - c. Elective courses prescribed for those students;
 - d. Courses freely elected by students;
 - e. Other, specify.
2. Identify and describe special requirements for the program, e.g. clinical, field experience, internship, practicum, thesis, etc.
3. If transfer students would be admitted to the program, list articulation agreements completed, in negotiation, or planned.

D. Curriculum

1. Identify by prefix, number, title, and description (including prerequisites) courses to be required or elected in the proposed program.
(Identify with an asterisk (*) courses added during the last three academic years, and with two asterisks (**) courses to be added if the program is authorized).
2. If the program design includes multiple curricula (concentrations, emphases, options, specializations, tracks, or related items), identify courses unique to each alternative.
3. Provide a semester-by-semester projection for the offering of the required and prescribed courses during the first five years.
4. Describe arrangements that would serve non-traditional students, e.g., non-traditionally scheduled classes, delivery of instruction by telecommunications and/or off-campus instruction sites, library services, student advisement, and related items if applicable.

5. If the general education/core curriculum component of the proposed program differs from that required for all or most other undergraduate programs at the institution, indicate how and why.

E. Supporting Fields

1. Identify existing degree programs and non-degree supporting fields that would complement the proposed program; describe the relationship of each to the proposed program.
2. If the existing programs or supporting fields would require updating or expansion because of the new program, explain how and why.

F. Effect on Existing Programs

1. Describe how existing courses would be affected by enrollments generated in the proposed program, include information on, but not limited to, the potential needs for additional sections or increased class sizes, the faculty, library resources, equipment, supplies, and/or space.
2. For a graduate program, describe how related undergraduate programs would be affected by enrollments in the proposed program, include changes anticipated in the rank and/or credentials of faculty teaching in the undergraduate program, and use of graduate student teaching assistants, graduate assistants, and assistant instructors, etc. and their credentials. Provide evidence that faculty (full-time, part-time, or Teaching Assistants) in the proposed program or who would replace current faculty reassigned to the proposed program, would meet Southern Association of Colleges and Schools *minimum* standards for credentials and experience.

G. Accreditation

1. If there is a professional program accreditation procedure in this field, attach current standards.
2. State intention regarding accreditation.

III. **Evaluation**

- A. Describe procedures for evaluation of the program and its effectiveness in the first five years of the program, including admission and retention rates, *program* outcomes assessments, placement of graduates, changes of job market need/demand, ex-student/graduate surveys, or other procedures. How would evaluations be carried out?

IV. Program Need/Demand

- A. Identify similar programs at:
 - 1. Texas public and independent universities; or
 - 2. Out-of-state institutions if the proposed program would be unique in Texas.
- B. Describe justification for the proposed program in terms of the following, as applicable:
 - 1. Local, regional, state, national, and international needs.

NOTE: State need is the preeminent criterion for consideration of new degree programs (Reference: Coordinating Board "Standards for Consideration of New Doctoral Program Requests," July 1982 and revised fall 1992).

- 2. The long-range academic plan of the institution.
- 3. Demands from prospective students.
- 4. Job market needs (identify specific potential employers and supply names, addresses and phone numbers where possible).
- 5. Educational and cultural needs of the community.

V. Program Potential

- A. Estimate the cumulative headcount and full time equivalent (FTE) enrollment for each of the first five years (majors only, considering expected attrition and graduation) and indicate the number expected to be *new* to the institution each year.
- B. Explain assumptions used in making these estimates.

VI. **Resources**

A. Personnel

1. Describe any personnel additions or changes in the *past* three years made in anticipation of the program.
2. Indicate for the first five years the cumulative number of FTE personnel who would be involved in delivery of the program in each of the following categories:
 - a. released time for administration and other services,
 - b. full-time faculty,
 - c. part-time faculty,
 - d. graduate student assistants,
 - e. clerical/support staff, and
 - f. others, specify.
3. List *current* faculty members, indicating highest earned degree/institution, field of study, current teaching and research assignments, dates of appointment, and anticipated contribution to the program. Specify course(s) each faculty member would teach.
4. If current faculty would be teaching new courses, how would their teaching assignments change and how would their current assignments be accommodated?
5. List all *new* positions (faculty, graduate assistants, clerical/support, etc.) required during the first five years of the program and indicate whether the positions would be additions or reassignments. If reassignment, indicate the source.
6. Describe qualifications that would be sought in new faculty, indicate the expected level of appointment and anticipated contributions to the program (including research grants, contract resources, etc.).

7. For graduate programs:
 - a. Describe departmental faculty policy regarding chairing or serving on thesis/dissertation committees and number of students supervised at one time.
 - b. Identify faculty who would supervise theses, dissertations, and internships; provide examples of their ongoing research projects and scholarly publications.
- B. Library
 1. List any library holdings added in the *past* three years in anticipation of the program.
 2. Describe library holdings relevant to the proposed program, noting strengths and weaknesses. If there are guidelines for the discipline, do current holdings meet or exceed standards? Describe planned actions that would maintain strengths and/or remedy weaknesses.
 3. Describe cooperative library arrangements that would be available to students in this program.
 4. Provide library director's assessment of library resources necessary for the proposed program.
- C. Equipment
 1. List any equipment acquired in the *past* three years in anticipation of the program.
 2. Itemize expenditures projected during each of the first five years for equipment and supplies specifically for the proposed program.
- D. Facilities
 1. Describe any facility added or modified in the *past* three years in anticipation of the program.
 2. Describe the availability and adequacy of existing facilities that would be used for the proposed program.

3. Describe planned alteration or renovation of existing facilities needed for the program; estimate dates of availability and display estimated cost in Item VII.
4. Describe planned new facilities needed for the program; estimate dates of availability and display estimated cost in Item VII.

VII. **Costs**

On the attached forms, provide estimates of new costs to the institution related to the proposed program(s) and provide information regarding sources of the funding that would defray those costs.

NOTE: Proposals for new programs and administrative units must be accompanied by (a) a statement certifying the adequacy of funding, or (b) a statement regarding the need for funds not yet available to the institution. The statement must be from the chief administrative officer of the requesting institution.

Policy on Adequate Financing, Coordinating Board, January 1992.

VIII. **Additional Guidelines Helpful for the Coordinating Board in Evaluating a Program Request.**

NOTE: See additional Coordinating Board criteria for doctoral program review:

- Standards for Consideration of New Doctoral Program Requests, adopted July 1982, updated Fall 1992.
- Distinctions between EdD and PhD Programs in Education, July 1990.
- Guidelines for Developing Cooperative Doctoral Programs.
- Standards for EdD Programs in Educational Administration/Leadership.
- Degree Programs, Support Areas, and Degree Titles, October 1986.
- Guidelines for Recognition and Classification of Courses and Degree Program Offerings.
- Provide Title Page based on attached model.
- Sequence and number responses as indicated in attached format.
- Forward **three** copies of the completed proposal for baccalaureate and master's proposals, and **five** copies of the completed proposal for doctoral proposals, to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Universities Division, P.O. Box 12780, Austin, Texas 78711.
- Direct questions concerning the request format to the Division of Universities, (512) 427-6200

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Certification of Adequacy of Financing Procedures

The Higher Education Coordinating Act (Section 13) states that "a new department, school, degree or certificate program approved by the Board may not be initiated by any institution of higher education until the Board shall make a written finding that the department, school, or degree or certificate program is adequately financed by legislative appropriation, by funds allocated by the Board, or funds from other sources."

To carry out the statute, the Coordinating Board requires that:

- I. Each request submitted to the Coordinating Board for a new department, school, degree, or certificate program must be accompanied by one of the following:
 - A. A statement regarding the adequacy of financing from the chief executive officer of the requesting institution; or
 - B. A statement regarding the need for funds not yet available from special legislative appropriations or funds from other sources.

- II. The sources of funds shall be identified in writing as:
 - A. Specific legislative appropriations to start a new program for which funds from other sources are not available;
 - B. Funds appropriated by the Legislature for an existing academic program but which are now declared by the institution to be available for the new degree program; and
 - C. Funds from sources other than legislative appropriations. The specific sources of those funds and the length of time they will be available to support the new program must be stated.

- III. The request for a new department, school, degree, or certificate program must also include a statement substantiating that the request will not reduce the effectiveness or quality of existing programs, departments, or schools.

- IV. All information and certification of the adequacy of financing for requests for new degree programs and academic administrative changes should be submitted by the institution as part of the original proposal. The ability of the institution to provide financial support for the proposed addition or change will be reviewed at the same time as all other criteria. When appropriate, the Board will consider approval and authorization to implement at the same meeting.
- V. For proposals from universities, the Universities Division has the responsibility for reviewing the institutional statement of adequacy of financing.
- VI. Upon certification of the adequacy of financing by the Coordinating Board, authority to initiate the new program shall be granted.
- VII. The staff will recommend approval of authorization to implement a new degree program or administrative change only when one or more of the following conditions are met:

- 1. New costs will be fully met from the reallocation of formula generated income resulting from the formal reduction or termination of an existing program or programs. The reallocation will be equal to or greater than the formula income for the new program.

NOTE: When approval is contingent upon termination of other degree programs by the requesting institution, terminations must be approved by the governing board before the Coordinating Board's final approval to implement takes effect.

- 2. The institution can demonstrate that it has no low productivity academic programs or has formally acted to terminate them. For this purpose, low productivity academic programs are defined as follows:

Level	Graduates Last Three Years
Undergraduate	9
Master/Specialist	6
Doctoral	3

- 3. New costs will be fully met during the first two years by non-formula sources, such as private contributions (funds in hand) or government grants that will be dedicated to the proposed new program; available University funds; or other state support for new programs. At least 50 percent of the new costs must be met with funds from non-formula sources for three years.

4. The Coordinating Board determines that the closure of programs of some campuses result in sufficient savings to the state to offset new costs and justify approval of a new program on another campus.
5. Consolidations of existing degree programs will result in net savings and enhance program quality.
6. Proposed program or administrative name changes are not intended or likely to draw additional students to a campus.
7. Program administration is to be transferred from one college to another within a University, with no new costs or mission implications.
8. Consolidation of academic administrative units will result in zero cost or net savings to the institution.

VIII. When all or part of the costs to the institution to implement the new program are proposed to be covered by reductions in existing programs and/or reallocations of existing resources, the following guidelines will apply:

1. A reduction or phase-out of an existing program must reduce demand on formula funds through a calculated estimate of the number of students who will no longer be in the program multiplied by the appropriate formula rates and multiplied by SCHs for the program.
2. Institutions may claim reductions and phase-outs of programs over a total of three years. (Example: For a new program that would be implemented in the fall of 1992, reductions that decrease formula demand beginning with the fall 1989 semester may be counted.)
3. Coordinating Board staff will work with institutions to maintain an accurate and on-going accounting of the reductions and phase-outs that would be used to certify financial adequacy of proposed new programs.
4. The specific sources of all reallocations of existing resources must be clearly documented. All non-formula generated funds must be funds in hand.

COSTS TO THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROGRAM/ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE

Note: Use this chart to indicate the dollar costs to the institution that are anticipated from the change requested.

<u>Cost Category</u>	<u>Cost Sub-Category</u>	<u>Before Approval Year*</u>	<u>1st Year</u>	<u>2nd Year</u>	<u>3rd Year</u>	<u>4th Year</u>	<u>5th Year</u>	<u>TOTALS</u>
Faculty Salaries	(New)							
	(Reallocated)							
Program Administration	(New)							
	(Reassignments)							
Graduate Assistants	(New)							
	(Reallocated)							
Clerical/Staff	(New)							
	(Reallocated)							
Supplies & Materials								
Library & IT Resources**								
Equipment								
Facilities								
Other (Identify)								
<u>TOTALS</u>								

* Include costs incurred for three years before the proposal is approved by the Board (e.g., new faculty, library resources, equipment, facilities remodeling, etc.).

** IT = Instructional Technology

Explanations: _____

ANTICIPATED SOURCES OF FUNDING

Note: Use this chart to indicate the dollar amounts anticipated from various sources. Use the reverse side of this form to specify as completely as possible each non-formula funding source.

<u>Funding Category</u>	<u>1st Year</u>	<u>2nd Year</u>	<u>3rd Year</u>	<u>4th Year</u>	<u>5th Year</u>	<u>TOTALS</u>
I. Formula Income*						
II. Other State Funding*						
III. Reallocation of Existing Resources*						
IV. Federal Funding* (In-hand only)						
V. Other Funding*						
<u>TOTALS</u>						

*For more information, please refer to the accompanying *Anticipated Sources of Funding: Explanatory Notes and Examples*.

NON-FORMULA SOURCES OF FUNDING

Note: Use this form to specify as completely as possible each of the non-formula funding sources for the dollar amounts listed on the reverse side of this form.

<u>Funding Category</u>	<u>Non-Formula Funding Sources</u>
II. Other State Funding*	#1
	#2
III. Reallocation of Existing Resources*	#1
	#2
IV. Federal Funding*	#1
	#2
V. Other Funding*	#1
	#2

*For more information, please refer to the accompanying *Anticipated Sources of Funding: Explanatory Notes and Examples*.

Explanations: _____

ANTICIPATED SOURCES OF FUNDING: EXPLANATORY NOTES AND EXAMPLES

I. Formula Income

- A. The first two years of any new program should not draw upon formula income to pay for the program.

For each of Years 3 through 5, enter the smaller of:

1. the new formula income you estimate the program would generate, based on projected enrollments and formula funding rates; or
 2. half of the estimated program cost for that year.
- C. Because enrollments are uncertain and programs need institutional support during their start-up phase, it is the Coordinating Board's policy to require institutions to demonstrate that they can provide:
1. sufficient funds to support **all** the costs of the proposed program for the first two years (when no **new** formula funding will be generated); and
 2. half of the costs of the new program during years three through five from sources other than state formula funding.
- D. When estimating new formula income, institutions should take into account the fact that students switching programs do not generate additional formula funding to the institution. For example, if a new master's program has ten students, but five of them switched into the program from existing master's programs at the institution, only five of the students will generate new formula income to help defray the costs of the program.

II. Other State Funding

This category could include special item funding appropriated by the legislature, or other sources of funding from the state that do not include formula-generated funds (e.g., HEAF, PUF, etc.).

III. Reallocation of Existing Resources:

If faculty in existing, previously budgeted positions are to be partially or wholly reallocated to the new program, you should explain in the text of your proposal how the institution will fulfill the current teaching obligations of those faculty and include any faculty replacement costs as program costs in the budget.

IV. Federal Funding

Only federal monies from grants or other sources currently **in hand** may be included. Do not include federal funding sought but not secured. If anticipated federal funding is obtained, **at that time** it can be substituted for funds designated in other funding categories. Make note within the text of the proposal of any anticipated federal funding.

Other Funding

This category could include Auxiliary Enterprises, special endowment income, or other extramural funding.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Format for Substantive Administrative Change Request

(Approved fall 1992)

I. Change Request

- A. Describe the exact administrative change proposed.
- B. Explain in detail and project for five years the current administrative load under the present organizational structure and that which would be expected under the proposed structure. Explain the rationale for the projections. Cite number of the faculty, teaching assistants, research projects, majors, minors, etc. If the request calls for dividing an existing administrative unit, provide information relative to the projected size of the new unit as well as the size of the old unit.

II. Reason for Request

Provide a rationale for the proposed change including an assessment of its impact on the affected administrative unit(s) and on the institution as a whole.

III. Role and Mission

If the proposed administrative change alters the role and mission of the institution, explain the nature of the change in role and mission and provide a rationale.

IV. Accreditation

Describe any implications for accreditation or reaccreditation which the proposed administrative change may have. Include the following:

- A. Time requirements for the accreditation or reaccreditation.
- B. Basic criteria for the accreditation.
- C. The initial costs of the accreditation process.
- D. The subsequent annual costs to maintain accreditation.

V. Additional Proposals

If the institution expects approval of the proposed change to lead to additional or related proposals in other areas, explain what would be proposed and when such proposals would be anticipated.

VI. Resources

- A. Describe and project for five years any increases in personnel which would result from approval of the administrative change. Include administrators, faculty, graduate assistants, clerical and any others.
- B. Describe and project for five years any increases in salaries for administrators or other professional persons that would result from approval of the proposed change.
- C. Describe any expansion of the institution's course inventory that would result from approval of the proposed change.
- D. Describe any changes in facilities (additions, renovations or alterations) that would be required as a result of approval of the proposed change.
- E. Provide an itemization of new equipment that would be required during the next five years as a result of the proposed change.

VII. Costs

On the attached form, provide estimates of additional costs to the institution which would result from approval of the proposed administrative change. Also, provide sources of funding to cover these increased costs.

Notes

- 1. Provide Title Page based on attached model.
- 2. Sequence and number responses as indicated in attached format.
- 3. Submit organizational charts showing the present administrative scheme and the proposed administrative scheme.
- 4. Submit a letter certifying adequacy of funding.

Format for Substantive Administrative Change Request
Page Three

5. Forward *three* copies of the completed proposal to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Universities Division, P.O. Box 12788, Austin, Texas 78711.
6. Direct questions concerning the Request Format to the Division of Universities (512) 427-6200.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Format for Nonsubstantive Degree Program Requests

I. Reason for Request

- A. Provide a rationale for the request. Include information on program need/demand, including similar programs at Texas public and independent universities, demand from potential students, and job market needs.
- B. Include any historical or other documentation to support the request.

II. Program Description

- A. Provide a description of the program, including educational objectives, degree requirements, and curriculum requirements.

III. Relationship to Existing Authorized Programs

- A. Demonstrate the relationship between the proposed program and existing authorized programs.
- B. Describe how the proposed program would affect existing programs, including the potential effects on enrollment (e.g. the need for additional sections or increased class sizes, faculty, and library resources).

IV. Expected Enrollment

- A. Estimate the cumulative headcount and full time equivalent (FTE) enrollment for each of the first five years (majors only, considering expected attrition and graduation) and indicate the number expected to be new to the institution each year.
- B. Explain assumptions used in making these estimates.

V. Resources

- A. Provide descriptions of courses that have been implemented and new courses needed.

Format for Nonsubstantive Degree Program Requests
Page Two

1. List and describe courses implemented within the last three years that would be included in the new program curriculum.
 2. List and describe new courses not yet implemented for the program.
- B. Describe faculty resources and faculty requirements if any.
1. List current faculty members, indicating highest earned degree/institution, field of study, current teaching and research assignments, dates of appointment, and anticipated contribution to the program. Specify course(s) each faculty member would teach.
 2. If current faculty would be teaching new courses, how would their teaching assignments change, and how would their current assignments be accommodated?
 3. List all new positions (faculty, graduate assistants, clerical/support, etc.) required during the first five years of the program and indicate whether the positions would be additions or reassignments. If reassignment, indicate the source.
- C. Describe status of equipment with regard to this request.
1. Itemize expenditures during each of the last three years for equipment and supplies specifically for the proposed program.
- D. Describe status of facilities with regard to this request. Include any alterations or renovations of existing facilities made during that three years that would be used for the new program.
- E. Provide library staff's assessment of library resources necessary for the proposed program, if applicable.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Format for Nonsubstantive Administrative Change Requests

(Approved fall 1992)

- I. Describe briefly the change requested.
- II. Provide a rationale for the proposed change.
- III. Include an assessment of its effect on the administrative unit(s) involved and on the institution as a whole. If a unit is being renamed, will program names need to be changed? If so, submit a separate nonsubstantive program request for each change.
- IV. Summarize implications for classes, distribution of personnel, availability of facilities, and availability of equipment.
- V. Give information regarding any additional costs or savings.

Notes

1. Provide Title Page based on attached model.
2. Sequence and number responses as indicated in attached format.
3. Submit organizational charts showing the present administrative scheme and the proposed administrative scheme.
4. Forward three copies of the completed proposal to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Universities Division, P.O. Box 12788, Austin, Texas 78711.
5. Direct questions concerning the Request Format to the Universities Division, (512) 427-6200.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Periodic Review of Existing Programs

In January 1980, the Coordinating Board announced its intent to undertake a systematic review of all existing degree programs in Texas public senior colleges and universities. The Board directed its staff to develop, with the advice and assistance of the colleges and universities, procedures and criteria for these statewide program reviews, beginning with reviews of doctoral-level programs. In 1989, the 71st Texas Legislature directed the Coordinating Board to develop a schedule for the creation and periodic review of role and mission statements and tables of programs for all Texas public universities. Within the context of statewide planning for higher education, each University has a prescribed role and mission which serves as a framework for the purpose and objectives of a given program within the University. It is important, therefore, that each program evaluated through the statewide academic program review be seen in relationship to the role and mission for each University. The Board's statutory responsibility for these reviews is set forth in the Texas Education Code, Sec. 61.051(e).

The general purposes of the reviews are to encourage the periodic and systematic review and self-assessment by institutions of their academic programs and to assure that a level of quality is reached and maintained in program offerings; that a level of efficiency and cost effectiveness is maintained in program delivery; and that program offerings are responsive to the needs and resources of the state. Within this framework more specific purposes include evaluating program quality, program management, and program services within the University, the policy community, and the state; of assessing societal, institutional and student needs for the programs, including manpower needs for those programs which have specific career objectives; and of eliminating unnecessary program duplication.

The statewide program evaluation results assist the universities and the Coordinating Board in planning for the initiation, maintenance, consolidation, or elimination of programs in Texas public colleges and universities.

Outcomes of the review process may include: 1) the commendation of existing programs of high quality and service; 2) the recommendation of changes in the focus of a program; 3) probationary re-approval of programs; 4) the consolidation of programs; 5) the approval or disapproval of new programs; and 6) the termination of existing programs.

The Coordinating Board recognizes that all universities and their programs periodically undergo evaluations by the appropriate regional and professional accrediting associations which assess institutional and program quality according to prescribed standards. It is not the intent of the Coordinating Board to duplicate the efforts of such accrediting bodies. It is important, however, that the findings of such associations be considered in the statewide academic program review process. While the statewide review considers questions addressed by accrediting associations, it adds the perspectives of statewide planning, educational needs of Texas citizens, and societal and economic needs of the state for persons with certain skills, training, and expertise. The accreditation agencies may be interpreted as restricted to one institution or program within an institution, whereas the statewide academic program review attempts to evaluate programs across all public institutions in the state.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Guidelines for Institutional Self-Evaluation Instrument

(Approved fall 1992)

Statewide Review of Doctoral Programs

The Coordinating Board periodically reviews existing doctoral programs in selected subject disciplines. The intent of the Board is to assure that all doctoral programs in Texas public universities have or show clear potential for achieving high quality, efficiency and cost effectiveness, as well as meeting demonstrated need.

Each review includes institutional self-assessment and peer review by out-of-state consultants, in accordance with procedures and general criteria endorsed by the Coordinating Board. Consultant teams visit each program site to make observations of facilities and resources and to talk with administrators, faculty, students, graduates, and other persons who may be able to provide information relative to the program review.

This instrument has been designed to provide consultants with some of the background information essential to their evaluative tasks. It is critical to the review process that each item be addressed specifically and thoroughly. The response to each item should be numbered and arranged in the same sequence as the items in the instrument. Information concerning masters= level programs in the field under review should be included where appropriate. Information developed for other self-studies and supplemental information from those studies can be submitted for consultant review.

Direct questions to the Coordinating Board=s Universities Division at (512) 427-6200.

I. Program Objectives

- A. What are the principal objectives of the program? How have these objectives changed during the life of the program?
- B. Discuss any changes that are being considered in program objectives in the next five years.

II. Need

- A. Provide evidence of existing and future student demand for the program.
- B. Discuss regional, state, and national needs for the program's graduates.
- C. Discuss other needs for the program.

III. Program Structure and Curriculum

- A. List authorized programs related to the review.
- B. List all core courses required for authorized degree programs related to the review.
- C. Provide typical program outlines for students in authorized degree programs related to the review.
- D. State the principal requirements for program completion.
 - 1. Describe the following as appropriate and applicable:
 - a. approximate number of semester credit hours
 - b. admission to candidacy criteria
 - c. internship
 - d. language competency
 - e. research competency
 - f. dissertation or thesis
 - g. final oral examination
 - h. other, please specify
 - 2. Identify student opportunities for teaching, research, or other relevant experiences not addressed above.

IV. Faculty

- A. Provide a 2-3 page vita for each faculty member (including adjuncts) from within the department and from other departments with continuing teaching responsibilities central to the program. Indicate terminal degree, institution, year conferred, research specialty, and tenure status for each. List the most significant scholarly work for the past five years. Include a list of graduate courses each faculty member has taught for the past five years.

NOTE: Complete curriculum vitae for each faculty member should be available for consultant review during campus site visits.

- B. Describe standards for graduate faculty recruitment, retention, promotion, and tenure.
- C. What faculty changes have occurred in the program in the past five years?
- D. What faculty changes are anticipated during the next five years?

V. Students

- A. Describe student admission and selection policies and practices with reference to:
1. admissions criteria such as GRE scores, undergraduate grades, or other measures of student potential;
 2. principal feeder institutions; and
 3. authority and responsibility for the admissions process (roles of program faculty, office of admissions, and graduate school dean).
- B. Describe the types, levels, and duration of student financial assistance available to the program.
- C. In tabular form list the number of completed applications received for the program, the number accepted for admission, and the number of new enrollees during *each* of the past five years.
- D. In tabular form list for *each* of the past five years:

1. the total number of students enrolled;
 2. number of students completing the program; and
 3. student attrition: dismissals, withdrawals (passing and failing).
- E. List program enrollments and degrees conferred for the past five years by ethnicity and gender.
- F. What percent of new enrollments for each of the last five years was from out of state? What percent of new enrollments were foreign nationals? Of degrees conferred in the last five years, how many went to foreign nationals?
- G. Provide dissertation abstracts for all graduates in the last five years and give the name of the faculty supervisor in each case.
- H. List awards, honors, publications, and other forms of student achievement during the past five years.
- I. List the professional positions accepted by program graduates during the past five years, including postdoctoral positions, and also give the present positions (if different from initial positions) of these alumni.

VI. Administration and Management

- A. Describe the current administrative organization.
- B. Describe the formal and informal linkages with other programs and administrative units within the University (e.g., budgetary, academic, joint faculty appointments).
- C. Describe any formal and informal linkages with programs at other universities, state/federal agencies, or other public or private entities (e.g., internships, cooperative education).

VII. Resources and Financial Support

- A. Describe existing library holdings that support the program. How do faculty participate in determining the level of library funding? What plans, if any, are being made to improve or increase these holdings?

- B. Describe existing and planned physical facilities and major equipment that support the program (e.g., buildings, classrooms, laboratories, computer capabilities and services).
- C. Describe any extra-institutional physical and fiscal resources (shared, community, private, governmental, etc.). Be specific.
- D. How and to what extent is research supported in the program? List by source, duration, and funding level support for each faculty member and for student research.
- E. Provide operating budgets by category (salary, maintenance, travel, research, etc.) for the past five years for the department or other administrative unit offering the program. If the department offers more than one doctoral level program, estimate the total costs of the program under review and the resources available for it.
- F. How much money was provided the department in each of the last five years for library purchases?

VIII. Special Features of the Program

- A. Describe any institutes, centers, or other indicators of the special nature of the program at the University.
- B. Identify as appropriate any unique factors (location, resources, etc.) that make this program particularly appropriate for this University.

IX. Accreditation

- A. Discuss the accreditation status of the program. If it is accredited, include the name of the accrediting agency, date accredited, and term. If not accredited, outline any plans for attainment of accreditation.

X. Additional Comments

- A. Please provide any additional information or comments that should be considered.

XI. General Coordinating Board Guidelines

Statewide reviews of doctoral-level programs are conducted in accordance with general Board policy for such reviews as defined in the Coordinating Board's Statewide Review of Academic Programs. The intent of the Board is to assure that all doctoral programs in Texas public universities have, or show clear potential, for achieving dimensions of high quality, efficiency, cost effectiveness, and demonstrated need.

Statewide reviews of doctoral programs are conducted on an academic discipline-by-discipline basis. Each review is carried out in close consultation with the state's academic community and include institutional self-assessment and peer review by eminent out-of-state consultants, in accordance with procedures and general criteria endorsed by the Coordinating Board. Consideration of requests for new doctoral programs now pending before the Coordinating Board may be coupled with statewide reviews of existing graduate programs (doctoral and supporting master's) in the same discipline.

Institutions may continue to submit requests for new doctoral programs. If a statewide review in an academic discipline has been completed recently, a new doctoral request in that discipline may be considered without the necessity of repeating the statewide review.

XII. Procedures for Statewide Review of Doctoral Programs

The Commissioner of Higher Education appointed an Advisory Committee on Doctoral Program Review to share in the planning of procedures, criteria, and evaluative instruments for the review of existing doctoral programs in Texas public universities.

The recommended procedures listed below have been developed in accordance with Coordinating Board policy guidelines and include the cooperative efforts of the Coordinating Board staff, its advisory committee, administrators and faculty of Texas universities, and qualified out-of-state consultants.

Procedures for the statewide review of existing doctoral programs in Texas public universities utilize institutional self-assessment and peer review, and include the following steps:

Guidelines for Institutional Self-Evaluation Instrument
Page Seven

1. The advisory committee assisted the staff in developing instruments for institutional self-evaluation, based on the general criteria approved by the Coordinating Board. The proposed evaluative instruments were circulated to the institutions for review and comment and suggested modification.
2. The staff, in consultation with the advisory committee, defined the scope of each discipline to be reviewed, using the HEGIS classification scheme, adapting it as necessary to fit existing program structures.
3. The staff, in consultation with the advisory committee, established a sequence for the statewide review of programs, giving first priority to the disciplines in which there are doctoral requests pending with the Coordinating Board.
4. After selection of the discipline(s) to be reviewed, the staff meets with representatives of the involved institutions to explain the review process and develop a schedule for the proposed review. Institutions will identify a primary liaison person for information and logistics during the review process.
5. Institutions which have submitted proposals for new doctoral programs in the discipline under review will have an opportunity to update them.
6. Each institution with an existing doctoral program in the discipline under review will prepare and submit the requested self-evaluation information for consultant and Coordinating Board consideration. Institutions which recently have concluded self-studies or external reviews may draw upon them to respond to appropriate questions in the doctoral review or to supplement the requested information.
7. The staff, in consultation with the advisory committee and the institutions, will select consultant teams. Each involved institution will be asked to recommend prospective consultants for each statewide discipline review and will have the opportunity to veto, with cause, individuals as recommended.
8. The consultants will review institutional self-evaluation materials, visit the campuses, and prepare report(s) and recommendations to the Coordinating Board staff. They also will be asked to make comments regarding the review procedures. Faculty, students, graduates, and administrators will participate in the consultant visit to each campus. Costs for consultant fees and expenses will be borne by the Coordinating Board.
9. The Coordinating Board staff will send to each institution under review the consultants' report and recommendations on that institution and information on consultants= statewide recommendations that would directly affect the institution=s program. The institution will have the opportunity to prepare a written response to the consultants= report.

10. The staff will: a) analyze the consultants' reports and recommendations and the institutional responses, b) develop its tentative recommendations, and c) discuss its tentative recommendations with each affected institution.
11. The staff will present its final recommendations to the Board's Committee on Universities, as appropriate.
12. Each institution will have an opportunity for a public hearing before the Board's Committee on Universities in regard to recommended actions affecting its academic program as appropriate.
13. The Committee on Universities presents its recommendations to the Coordinating Board for final action.
14. The advisory committee will review periodically the statewide review process and make recommendations for any needed modifications.

XII. General Criteria for Evaluation of Doctoral Programs

In reviewing existing doctoral programs and requests for new programs, the staff, institutions, and consultants will give special consideration to indicators of quality, need, and cost effectiveness. Such indicators may include the following:

1. Program Goals

A statement of program goals and an indication of how the program goals relate to the mission of the University. Are the goals and objectives of the program clearly defined? Is the program achieving those objectives?

2. Curriculum

Are the curriculum, program structure, and instruction well designed and appropriate to the scientific and scholarly trends in the discipline? Are there appropriate linkage and support with related disciplines? Are there adequate opportunities for any necessary research components, assistantships, internships, or relevant student experiences?

3. Faculty Vitae

Description of all extramural support for research and creative activities, sources of support, and number of faculty engaged in funded research and creative activities.

Are members of the faculty and their qualifications appropriate to the disciplines being taught? Is there an appropriate balance of faculty involvement in teaching, research, and community service? Is there effective teaching, student advisement, faculty-student interaction? Is there evidence of stability in faculty staffing patterns?

4. Sources of Students and Graduate Placement

The number of student applications received, accepted, rejected, and actual enrollment of students each year for the past five years. Are there adequate student selection and retention criteria? Location of each of the program graduates' first and/or current position of employment after completing the degree (for each graduate during the past five years). Is there evidence of quality student achievement in the program? Is there evidence of professional success of program graduates?

5. Resources

Are there adequate facilities? Laboratory and computer equipment? Financial support? Library resources?

6. Program Administration and Management

Is there evidence that the program is efficiently and effectively managed? Is there any unnecessary proliferation of courses? Any unnecessary duplication of departmental effort? Has the administrative unit been able to commit resources to meet unfulfilled or emerging needs? How does this program articulate with other programs at the institution and with programs at other universities?

7. Program Priority

How central is the program to the role and mission of the university? How does the institution assess and evaluate program priority? What is the priority of the program within the state university system? What are the comparative advantages of the institution for offering the program?

8. Need

What are the societal needs of the nation, state, or region for the program? What magnitude of student demand is there for the program? How well is student demand being served? How productive are existing programs? Is the quality

satisfactory? What are the range and variety of existing and future employment opportunities for graduates of the program?

9. Cost Effectiveness

How cost effective and efficient are the program and its administrative unit? What sources and levels of support are available from state, federal, private sources, research grants, endowments, etc.? Is there adequate financial assistance for students?

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Guidelines for Developing Cooperative Doctoral Programs

(Approved August 1992)

STEP 1: THECB approval in accordance with existing Board rules (Sections 5.151- 5.152)

- A. *The Coordinating Board will determine whether the doctoral-degree-granting institution (DGI) is prepared to implement a cooperative program or add an additional cooperative program.*
- B. Doctoral-level courses may be offered by the DGI on the cooperating institution=s (CI) campus.
- C. The CI may offer only those courses previously approved for other programs: e.g., master's level courses in education, business, social sciences, or other disciplines.
- D. The DGI has full responsibility for maintaining the quality of the program, including but not limited to the *admission and* advisement of students, selecting CI courses to be used in the program, assuring adequate library resources and equipment, selecting CI faculty to deliver instruction, monitoring internships, and supervising student research.
- E. The chair and a majority of the members of each dissertation committee must be DGI faculty.
- F. Students may satisfy residency requirements on either campus.
- G. Degrees must be awarded by and in the name of the DGI, with notation of cooperative administration.
- H. *The DGI must demonstrate adequate resources to initiate the cooperative program.*
- I. No change in the role & mission of the CI is required.
- J. Cooperative programs may be terminated by the DGI, the CI, or the Coordinating Board.

STEP 2: THECB approval of the second level of cooperation

- A. Requires change in the role & mission of the CI. Approval is based on evidence of growing need in the CI service region, promise of continued quality, and development of expanded faculty and resource commitments.
- B. Limited numbers of doctoral-level courses in the major may be authorized by the THECB for the CI.
- C. The chair and a majority of the members of each dissertation committee must be DGI faculty.
- D. Degrees may be designated as "Cooperative Degrees" by the DGI and CI.
- E. Cooperative programs may be terminated by the DGI, the CI, or the Coordinating Board.

STEP 3: THECB authorization for the Cooperating Institution to grant degrees in its own name

- A. Requires final expansion of the role & mission of the CI.
- B. Results in independent degree-granting authority by the CI.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Distinctions Between EdD and PhD Programs in Education

(Approved July 1990)

Doctor of Education Degree

The Doctor of Education (EdD) is a professional degree designed to emphasize preparation for the highest levels of educational practice. It should prepare outstanding academic and administrative leaders in educational agencies at the campus, district, county, region, state, and national levels. To achieve this intent, the graduate of an EdD program should understand the legal, financial, and operational demands of his/her professional role, the historical precedents and contemporary developments that influence that role, the theory and research methodology that illuminate that role, and the professional skills and techniques needed to carry out that role effectively.

An EdD program in any subdivision of Education should require a well-defined, broad curriculum. This curriculum should include courses that would lead students to satisfy appropriate permanent professional certification and licensing requirements of the discipline. The program should include a residency at the degree-granting institution of at least two consecutive long semesters, two full summers and one long semester, or three full summers. The EdD candidate also should participate in, and be extensively evaluated in, an internship in an operational setting.

The dissertation may be appropriately related to the immediate operational program of the schools, either in an analysis and solution format or in an application of theory or research context. The professional degree in Education, as in other professions, should emphasize problem solving or applied research.

NOTE: See also "Standards for EdD Programs in Educational Administration/Leadership."

Doctor of Philosophy Degree

A PhD program in a subdivision of Education should be comparable to traditional theoretical and research doctorates in the Humanities, Sciences, and Social Sciences, and should prepare the student for scholarship and teaching. Students in a PhD program in Education should be expected to develop an extensive command of research literature and methodology, theory, advanced training techniques, and emerging developments in the specialization.

A PhD program may be broader in scope, less structured, and more individualized than an EdD program. Students should take a significant complement of courses outside of Education over and above those courses used to meet a language requirement or its equivalent.

Distinctions Between EdD and PhD Programs in Education

Page Two

Residency requirements for the PhD should include a minimum of two consecutive long semesters of study at the degree-granting institution. During this period, a minimum of nine semester hours should be completed each semester, and students should be discouraged from maintaining employment beyond a maximum of 20 hours per week.

The PhD is a research-based degree. The PhD dissertation, therefore, should have as its principal goal the demonstration of an ability to conduct independent research. The research design, sampling procedures, and methods of analysis should be congruent with the modes of inquiry used in the discipline or disciplines that relate to the study. The dissertation should be a report of independent research-generating knowledge with generalizable characteristics discussed in depth. Moreover, the dissertation should be of publishable quality and should make a *bona fide* contribution to emerging developments in the specialization.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Standards for EdD Programs in Educational Administration/Leadership

(Approved July 1990)

I. Recruitment/Admission

- A. Recruitment and admission should be characterized by systematic written plans and deliberate efforts to attract persons of high intelligence and exceptional interpersonal skills, successful educators, ethnic minorities and women.
- B. Standards of admission should be based on multiple sources of evidence of qualifications and should be high enough to insure that admission to the program is both competitive and comparable to doctoral programs in other disciplines.
- C. Students should not be permitted to take more than 12 semester credit hours (SCH) of graduate-level courses without being matriculated into some certification or degree program.

II. Curriculum

- A. The curriculum should include a designed, sequential core that is prerequisite to other course work. The core should include a professional knowledge base regarding societal and cultural influences on schooling, teaching and learning processes sensitive to individual differences, theories of organization and organizational change, methodologies of organizational studies and policy analysis, leadership and management processes and functions, policy studies including issues of law, politics, and economic dimensions of education, and moral and ethical dimensions of schooling in a pluralistic society. The core may overlap with the state's various administrator certification requirements, and may include some master's level courses.
- B. The total curriculum should have an identifiable and predominant applied focus that leads to a specific career goal.
- C. The final 30 SCH must be in courses provided exclusively for doctoral students and not available to masters= degrees or certification programs.
- D. The program should include a residency at the campus of at least two consecutive long semesters, two full summers and one long semester, or three full summers at the campus.

- E. Students should participate in, and be extensively evaluated in, an internship in an operational setting distinct from prior or concurrent work experience.
- F. The institution should have long-term formal relationships with school districts and other appropriate agencies to create partnership sites for clinical study, field experience, internships, and applied research.

III. Faculty and Classes

- A. Programs should involve a critical mass of full-time faculties with appointments in departments of each school in which administrators are educated. Faculty should exhibit excellence in scholarship and teaching in educational administration and sensitivity to the needs and concerns of practitioners.
- B. There must be at least five full-time faculty members engaged in doctoral-level educational administration/leadership teaching, counseling, and major research project supervision.
- C. Faculty experience and qualifications should be distributed among sub-specialties of educational administration/leadership.
- D. Major research project supervision should be distributed among faculty members.
- E. All educational administration/leadership faculties should be actively engaged in research, publication, and applied scholarly activities associated with their areas of specialization, including competitive, and/or peer-evaluated publication.
- F. Maximum student enrollment in a doctoral program may not exceed six students per faculty member.
- G. Class sizes should not exceed those for other doctoral programs.
- H. Faculty teaching loads should not exceed those for other doctoral programs.
- I. Programs should develop and maintain systematic efforts to assist all students in professional placement and career advancement.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

(Adopted July 23, 1982 and revised fall 1992)

Standards for Consideration of New Doctoral Program Requests

The Coordinating Board at its July 23, 1982 meeting reaffirmed its longstanding policy on single-doctorate institutions and clarified its standards for consideration of new doctoral program requests.

I. Non-Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions

Before any non-doctoral-level institution will be considered for a first doctoral-level degree, it must bear the burden of demonstrating to the Coordinating Board that it has achieved the highest attainable quality in a particular specialized field for which that institution is uniquely suited and for which there is marked promise of excellence, and that the strengths in this special field and of the institution generally would support a doctoral-level program at the school in that area of special strength.

Along with the documentation previously required by the Board, the requesting institution must provide evidence concerning the following:

- A. A request and justification for a change in Role and Mission and a justification of why the school should be entitled to award a doctoral degree.
- B. Justification of why the state of Texas and the higher education system of the state would need such an additional doctoral-level degree program.
- C. Demonstration that there would not be unnecessary duplication of a similar program or curriculum in other universities within Texas.
- D. Documentation that existing similar degrees in other Texas institutions, public and private, cannot accommodate additional students.
- E. Clear demonstration that this is the best qualified and most appropriate institution in the state to offer this particular new doctoral program.
- F. Explanation of the additional unusual factors that would justify a doctoral program and responses to other questions the Coordinating Board may present to the institution.
- G. Demonstration of the excellence, viability, and production of the institution=*s existing* programs.

II. **Single-Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions**

Any institution with a single doctoral program wishing to add an additional doctoral-level program must bear the burden of demonstrating to the Coordinating Board that it has moved beyond its previous status and should be authorized to offer an additional doctoral degree program. This move from a single doctorate classification will require extraordinarily strong justification. Along with the usual documentation, this will include:

- A. A request and justification for a change in Role and Mission and a justification of why the school should be entitled to award an additional doctoral degree.
- B. Justification of why the state of Texas and the higher education system of the state would need such an additional doctoral degree program.
- C. Demonstration that there would not be unnecessary duplication of a similar program or curriculum in other universities within Texas.
- D. Documentation that existing similar degrees in other Texas institutions, public and private, cannot accommodate additional students.
- E. Clear demonstration that this is the best qualified and most appropriate institution in the state to offer this particular new doctoral program.
- F. Explanation of the additional unusual factors that would justify an additional doctoral program and responses to other questions the Coordinating Board may present to the institution.
- G. Demonstration of the excellence, viability, and production of the institution=*s existing* doctoral program.

III. **Multiple-Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions**

Multiple-doctoral-degree granting institutions wishing to add an additional doctoral-level program must bear the burden of demonstrating to the Coordinating Board that the new program should be authorized. Along with the usual documentation, the institution must include the following:

- A. Justification of why the state of Texas and the higher education system of the state would need such an additional doctoral degree program.
- B. Demonstration that there would not be unnecessary duplication of a similar program or curriculum in other universities within Texas.

Standards for Consideration of New Doctoral Program Requests
Page Three

- C. Documentation that existing similar degrees in other Texas institutions, public and private, cannot accommodate additional students.
- D. Clear demonstration that this is the best qualified and most appropriate institution in the state to offer this particular new doctoral program.
- E. Explanation of the additional unusual factors that would justify an additional doctoral program and responses to other questions the Coordinating Board may present to the institution.
- F. Demonstration of the excellence, viability, and production of the institution=*s existing* doctoral programs.

The above criteria and requirements will be provided by the Coordinating Board staff to any review panel examining proposals for doctoral programs. The panel will be given the specific charge that the burden of proof for a new doctoral program rests with the institution. Failure to prove its case to a review committee, the staff, or the Board is alone sufficient basis for denial by the Board. The doctoral review committee does not bear responsibility to prove a case for a recommendation of denial.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Guidelines for Offering and State Funding of Remedial English/Reading/Writing Courses

(Amended April 1988)

The Coordinating Board amended its July 1979 guidelines for offering and receiving state funding for remedial English/Reading/Writing courses:

1. A senior college or university may be authorized to include in its course inventory a maximum of 12 semester credit hours of remedial course work, including (1) six credit hours of precollegiate mathematics, (2) three credit hours of precollegiate reading, and (3) three credit hours of precollegiate writing for which SCHs may be included in base period reporting.
2. Credit for a remedial course or courses should not be used to satisfy institutional degree requirements.
3. Courses in study skills, orientation to college study, improvement in learning, and other such courses may be included in an institution's course inventory, but no credit hours generated in these courses will be eligible for state funding.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Teacher Education

- I. In October, 1994, the Commissioner of Higher Education and the Commissioner of Public Education agreed to the following principles regarding limitations on courses offered for the preparation of public school teachers in accordance with SB 994 and HB 2885 of the Texas Legislature.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Texas Education Agency jointly and individually will consider proposals to exceed the limitation of 18 semester credit hours (SCH) in education in teacher education degree programs if the following are satisfied.

1. The institution participates in a designed Center for Professional Development and Technology.
2. The proposal is accompanied by certification from all academic deans and the academic vice president of the institution that the integrity of the academic degree is retained.
3. The program must not require more than 139 SCH for both the degree and initial certificate.
4. The proposal is for no more than a total of 24 SCH in education courses.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Teacher Education Field-Based Courses (TEF)

(Effective fall 1992)

I. Definition

Teacher Education Field-Based (TEF) Courses are those courses in which the primary activity is performance of some professional teacher activities by the university student while interacting with public school students and teachers, as well as with university faculty members in a school-related setting. The professional activities do not necessarily include teaching, but must include more than observation within a classroom. The interaction with students, teachers, and university faculty must be regular and frequent. Courses eligible to be TEF include those in the professional development sequence and in some instances in reading, early childhood, bilingual and special education.

II. Procedures for Gaining Recognition

Universities requesting review of courses for field-based funding should send a current course syllabus for each course to the Coordinating Board. The syllabus must clearly state the professional activities required of the student, the frequency and nature of the involvement of the student with faculty, and the procedures and standards used to evaluate the performance of the student.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Universities Division

Guidelines on Teacher Education

Post-Baccalaureate Certification Preparation

- I. Courses taken for post-baccalaureate initial (entry) certification may be for graduate credit and funding only if the courses and students meet the following criteria:
 - A. Courses taken for post-baccalaureate initial (entry) certification may be for graduate credit and funding if they have appropriate, specified undergraduate course prerequisites, and if they can also be shown to be significantly different in content, depth and breadth from these undergraduate counterparts. If prerequisite or leveling courses are required, they must be offered at the undergraduate level.
 - B. The number of professional development graduate credit hours required for post-baccalaureate initial (entry) certification may not exceed the number required in the undergraduate degree programs which include certification opportunities.
 - C. Enrollment in graduate courses required for post-baccalaureate initial (entry) certification must be restricted to qualified post-baccalaureate students eligible for admission to the post-baccalaureate teacher education program and to the institution as regular or special graduate students. Concurrent enrollment of post-baccalaureate and undergraduate students in these designated courses and classes is prohibited.
- II. For students who have already completed initial (entry) certification requirements and a baccalaureate degree, institutions may offer additional certification programs. Courses required for additional certification programs may be offered for master's level formula funding if they have appropriate, specified undergraduate course prerequisites, and if they can also be shown to be significantly different in content, depth and breadth from their undergraduate counterparts.