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I. BASIC GUIDELINES FOR NEW PROGRAM APPROVALS

A. Introduction

The academic programs offered by the City University of New York represent a broad and diverse spectrum of educational opportunities provided to tens of thousands of students at every degree level. Currently, the University offers nearly 2,049 degree-granting programs. As of this writing, 65 programs are offered at the doctoral level and 646 at the master’s level. There are 687 baccalaureate programs and 259 associate degree programs. In addition, there are more than 340 certificate programs from the pre-associate to the post-graduate levels. The University’s vast curricular offerings are a tribute to the immeasurable talents of its faculty.

The University takes justifiable pride in its established academic programs, but it cannot afford complacency. The ongoing development of new academic programs is vital to the University, its students and the communities it serves. Academic programs shape the intellectual efforts of both faculty and students, and they reflect each college’s mission and goals.

As mandated by the Board Bylaws, the development of new academic programs is the prerogative of the faculty on each campus. Faculty expertise provides the best guarantee that the education process will be dynamic and that the colleges will grow and change to meet society’s challenges and students’ needs.

While the faculty has the responsibility for initiating new academic programs and revisions to existing programs, the college administration, led by the President and the Chief Academic Officer, also plays a key role in academic program development. The college administration is responsible for creating an environment that provides for ongoing review, constructive change, and appropriate additions to the college curriculum. It is through this collaboration that the college’s unique mission and goals are fulfilled.

The University’s process of program approval is designed to maintain the highest standards of excellence. The following guidelines are meant to serve as a concise reference for new program planning, development, and approval. They are intended to promote the efficient processing of proposals from the colleges to the University’s central administration and Board of Trustees, through final approval by the New York State Board of Regents.

Before any new program can be offered at the University it must undergo qualitative reviews and receive approval from appropriate governing bodies at three levels:

- the College;
- the Board of Trustees (BOT);
- the New York State Education Department (SED).

As a result, the entire process of program approval is often a lengthy one; up to two years may elapse between the time a program is first proposed by a college’s faculty and its registration by SED. The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) is committed to facilitating this process and moving each proposed program toward its final goal as quickly as possible. To that end, this document sets forth information on
general evaluation criteria; the letter of intent (content and procedure); and the final proposal (content and procedure).

B. General Evaluation Criteria

The criteria used to evaluate a program proposal will vary depending upon the program itself and are also determined by the role of each governing body reviewing the proposal. Nevertheless, certain criteria should apply to the review of all academic programs.

By the time a program is recommended for approval by OAA to the Board Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research (CAPPR), it will have been evaluated according to the following standards:

- Academic quality;
- Justification of needs (to include societal needs in terms of regional, state and national needs; career opportunities for graduates; and student interest);
- Relationship to other programs at CUNY (e.g. possible duplication);
- Relationship to other campus programs and to college and University missions;
- Resources available to implement the program;
- Conformity with the standards of accrediting agencies (necessary for the professions);
- Conformity with the regulations of the SED.

C. The Letter Of Intent

The primary purpose of the Letter of Intent (LOI) is to notify the University community of the College’s plan to offer the proposed program. Distribution of the LOI among the University’s constituent colleges provides opportunity for comment on the proposed program’s academic and financial feasibility. The colleges are encouraged to offer advice for improving and ensuring the proposed program’s academic rigor, suggestions for collaborative arrangements, or other information that might be useful.

Generally, the LOI should be between 10 and 15 pages and should encapsulate the final proposal. Indeed, the proposed program should be relatively advanced in the planning process before the LOI is submitted to OAA.

Content of the Letter of Intent

The Letter of Intent must be informative, clear, and concise. Detailed information should be reserved for the later proposal. Here, basic information is essential.

The LOI’s title page should include:

- the college name;
- the name of the department(s) sponsoring the program;
• the official name of the program;
• the degree or certificate to be awarded;
• the anticipated date for implementation of the program; and
• the date of College governance approval (please include as well the name of the appropriate governance body or bodies).

The narrative should follow a simple outline:

1. **Purpose and Goals:** Describe the program’s purpose in a succinct statement. Remember that the audience for the LOI may not possess expertise in the particular field of study. Include an explicit statement of how the program meets students’ educational goals and career objectives. This section should also briefly present the rationale for the program. Issues that might be addressed include: national or local educational trends; faculty interest and commitment; the program’s relation to existing departmental or college offerings; or other compelling factors.

2. **Need and Justification:** Relevant needs include those of students, the college, the university, the community, the economy, and the nation. All statements about demand and interest need to include supporting evidence, with an indication of the source. Sometimes LOIs and proposals offer abundant statistics on an important social issue without linking it to the proposed curriculum and possible career outcomes for students. This practice does not strengthen the proposal and is best avoided. The importance of the field does not yet in itself demonstrate a need for a specific undergraduate degree in that area, particularly at the associate level, as many employers prefer students to receive a broad liberal arts education in the first two years of study.

Not every need will pertain to all LOIs. For example, an LOI for a program that is vocationally or professionally oriented should provide an overview of post-completion employment opportunities (with job titles). The overview should be supported by data from sources such as the US Department of Labor or appropriate professional organizations, and/or sample entry-level job postings. The job postings must be directly relevant to the curriculum proposed and should not include specific additional requirements (e.g. knowledge of legal regulations or familiarity with a professional software) that are not covered by the proposed curriculum. As future employment is a goal of most of our students, inclusion of similar information is encouraged for liberal arts programs. Inclusion of this information will be considered as strengthening the proposal. In the absence of such information for liberal arts programs, information indicating student demand for the curriculum should be included.

3. **Student Interest/Enrollment:** Explain the evidence for student interest in the program and the sources for potential enrollments. Some examples of measuring student interest are student surveys; demographics of prospective students; increased enrollment in individual courses in the field of study or participation in related co-curricular clubs and activities and campus-wide shifts in topical interests. When a student survey has been conducted, please remember to include a blank copy of the survey instrument. Provide a numerical estimate of enrollments anticipated for each of the first five years of the program’s existence. Present projected enrollment in a table showing how many students will attend full-time and how many part-time. The anticipated attrition rate should also be indicated, along with a discussion as to how it was determined. Discuss the factors that produced the estimates including student interest, employment
trends and needs, and/or enrollment(s) in similar programs at the College or at other campuses within the University.

Similar programs already in place at other campuses of the University should be identified. If duplication issues exist, provide an explanation for going forward despite such duplication. A college administration that is proposing a duplicate program is advised to begin discussions early with the college(s) already offering the other program(s).

Clearly indicate any special admission requirements. Describe any steps the College intends to take to prepare students to qualify for admission. Specific groups such as local union members or specially prepared students from “feeder” schools should be identified.

4. **Curriculum**: Present and discuss a rationale for the curriculum. Include the complete curricular design, listing all course titles with credit requirements and indicating new courses (which must be accompanied by descriptions). Identify any relevant accrediting or licensure requirements. Indicate any non-course requirements, such as a thesis or comprehensive exam.

5. **Articulation agreements**: With the exception of A.A.S. degree programs that do not have parallel or related programs at senior colleges, articulation agreements are required for all undergraduate programs. For two-year transfer programs and all four-year programs, the LOI should contain information on the articulation agreement(s) in planning. Articulation agreements between the college and private institutions are encouraged but not required. The full proposal must include a signed articulation agreement before it may be presented to the BOT. It is strongly recommended that the community colleges reach out to the intended receiver college before the LOI is formally submitted. Discussions with other colleges regarding articulation agreements should take place before the LOI is submitted and should be mentioned within that document.

6. **Faculty**: Describe current full-time faculty available to teach in the program. Specify the number of new full-time faculty that will be needed to implement the program and also the anticipated number of adjunct faculty that may be required. Be sure to account for how the department will staff its existing offerings when the program is instituted. Proposals for new programs that draw full-time faculty away from established programs are not viewed favorably.

7. **Cost Assessment**: While all new programs incur expenditures, it is expected that they will also generate revenue. A new program’s financial impact on its college is often gauged by comparing the anticipated costs with the anticipated revenue. Each LOI should include a table showing the anticipated cumulative costs and anticipated revenues for the new program during the program’s first five years. Provide a narrative to accompany this table that indicates the source of funding to pay for the costs, including the reallocation of funds. Explain how the college will ensure that these funds remain available for at least the first five years of the program’s existence.

**Procedure**

Once the LOI has been approved by the appropriate College governance body, the following steps must be taken:
1. Three hard copies of the document along with an electronic copy must be submitted with a cover letter signed by the President of the College, addressed to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and University Provost (EVCP), with a copy to the University Director of Program Review, Articulation and Transfer.

2. The LOI will be acknowledged and circulated to the Presidents of the CUNY colleges with a request for written comments to be returned to the OAA within 30 days (except during summer session or intersession). The Presidents should also send copies of their comments directly to the President who submitted the LOI.

3. Graduate program development includes a review by the Graduate Advisory Council (GAC). Chaired by the Provost of the Graduate School and University Center, the GAC is comprised of the deans of graduate studies or other appropriate administrators from the University’s colleges that offer graduate-level programs. The Council’s purpose is advisory only; it has no authority to approve or disapprove program proposals. GAC will review draft proposals only after the LOI has been approved by the EVCP following the circulation to the campuses. (Please note that Letters of Intent for doctoral programs require a further level of review at this stage. They are presented to CAPPR and then to the full Board for approval.)

4. The University Director of Program Review, Articulation and Transfer and other appropriate OAA staff will review all comments from the colleges and consult with the EVCP concerning the proposed program. In certain circumstances an outside review may be solicited.

5. When all reviews are completed, the EVCP will send a formal response to the President either authorizing the College to proceed with the development of the program proposal or requesting further information and discussion.

6. In order to facilitate the development of the proposal, the Provost and appropriate faculty may be invited to meet with members of the OAA staff. Full proposals must be received within two years from the date of the letter authorizing the college to proceed with the development of the proposal. After two years, the EVCP may request that a new LOI be circulated if the College wishes to proceed with the program.

D. The Proposal

Approval of the LOI authorizes the college to proceed with the development of a comprehensive proposal. As noted above, the College has two years following the approval of the LOI in which to develop the proposal and may, at any point during this period, consult with OAA staff. Experience suggests that almost all proposals require some discussion with OAA before submission and some revision before they are ready for presentation to the Board of Trustees. Generally, the proposal addresses the same issues as those outlined in the LOI, but in greater detail and with documentation. The final proposal should not exceed 25 pages, excluding appendices. A checklist reviewing the proposal components can be found in Section IV of this Handbook.
The audience for the proposal includes: the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and University Provost; the Associate University Provost; the University Director of Program Review, Articulation and Transfer; staff members of the Office of Academic Affairs; staff members of the University Budget Office; the members of the Board Committee on Academic Policy, Program and Research; and ultimately, staff at the New York State Education Department. Thus, the document should provide a comprehensive justification for implementing a new academic program at the University and must delineate a plan that is carefully focused and well-defined in terms of the College’s and the University’s needs and goals.

Contents of the Final Proposal

The proposal’s title page must include:

- the college name;
- the name of the department(s) sponsoring the program;
- the official name of the program;
- the degree or certificate to be awarded;
- the anticipated date for implementation of the program;
- the date of College governance approval (please include as well the name of the appropriate governance body);
- the signature of the Chief Academic Officer, which certifies the date of College governance approval;
- the name, title, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address for the proposal’s chief contact person.

Please consult Section VI of this Handbook for an OAA template of a sample title page.

The proposal’s second page should comprise the table of contents, indicating the narrative portion of the proposal as well as the appendices. All pages must be sequentially numbered throughout. The program proposal is going to be reviewed by many parties. It should be presented in a way that facilitates finding key elements. Please consult Section VI of this Handbook for an OAA template of a sample table of contents, including a model for presenting documentation in appendices.

An abstract of the proposal (approximately 250 words) must also be included, and will inform the resolution presented to the Board for approval.

Main components of the narrative should follow this outline:

1. Purpose and Goals: Begin this section with a clear statement of the program’s purpose. Include an explicit statement of how the program meets students’ educational goals and career objectives. Also describe national or local educational trends, and discuss the faculty’s expertise and commitment. Address the effect the establishment of the proposed program will have on the college; the relationship of the program to the mission of the college (specifically, the program’s relationship to the college’s priorities); and the extent to which the proposed program complements existing programs at the college. The potential quality of the proposed program in relation to comparable programs within and outside CUNY should be discussed as well.
2. Need and Justification: In the first part of this section, the proposal should consider the needs of the students, the college, and the community. Will the program, for example, contribute to specific state and societal needs? For proposals with professional or vocational orientation, please discuss employment opportunities and include specific job titles with salary ranges. Any relevant local demand for individuals possessing the knowledge, skills, and credentials conferred by the program may also be referenced. As future employment is a goal of most of our students, inclusion of similar information is encouraged for liberal arts programs. Inclusion of this information will be considered as strengthening the proposal. In the absence of such information for liberal arts programs, information indicating student demand for the curriculum should be included, along with letters of support from graduate or professional programs for which the proposed curriculum would prepare students. The more specific the information that documents the need and employment prospects for graduates of the proposed program, the more credible the proposal will be. Brief excerpts from articles and letters may be cited. Letters of support from prospective employers or experts may be included in an appendix. The second part of this section should reference similar programs that already exist at CUNY and at other local colleges. Any issues of overlap and duplication must be addressed straightforwardly. Duplication concerns from fellow CUNY colleges should be resolved before the final proposal is presented.

3. Student Interest/Enrollment: What is the present and projected student demand? A numerical table projecting enrollments, both full and part-time, for the first five years of the program’s existence must be included (see page 79). State clearly the underlying assumptions about sources of potential students that led to these projections. Indicate the anticipated rate of attrition and state the underlying assumptions for this conclusion. Sources for projected students should be described in specific terms, with special attention to programs on the campus and at nearby units of CUNY that might send students to the program. Standards required of students seeking admission to the program must be spelled out in detail. Also include: the selection process for admitting students; arrangements for advising and counseling students; and any special support services that will encourage timely completion of the program.

4. Curriculum: In your narrative, provide an overview of the curriculum and statement of the intellectual rationale for the proposed curricular design. Articulate which courses are required; which concentrations, if any, are available; the type of electives; the number of credits for each course; the total number of credits in the program and any non-course requirements such as a thesis; comprehensive or language exam or clinical experience.

If an undergraduate program requires more than 60/120 credits, a waiver must be requested of the Executive Vice Chancellor. Using the required SED form in Section VI of this handbook, provide a sample semester-by-semester sequence of a typical program. Complete course descriptions for all courses required in the major and complete course syllabi for all new courses must be included as noted in the OAA template for the Table of Contents.

The second part of this section must address the articulation needs of the proposed program (please consult Section II of this Handbook for guidelines on preparing CUNY articulation agreements). The discussions begun before the drafting of the Letter of Intent should have resulted in one or more
articulation agreements, at least one of which should be with another CUNY college. Describe these articulation agreements in this section. **Copies of completed and signed articulation agreements must be included in an appendix.**

5) **Cost Assessment:** Because a comprehensive assessment is needed to delineate all anticipated costs, it is suggested that these be addressed in separate categories as follows:

   A. **FACULTY:** Briefly summarize the qualifications of available full-time faculty who will teach the required courses for the proposed program and indicate which courses can be taught by each faculty member. Complete the required SED form, a copy of which is included in this Handbook. Specify the number of new full-time faculty that will be needed to offer the program. In addition, indicate whether adjuncts are needed to teach the proposed program and justify the use of adjuncts rather than full-time faculty. Please note that reliance on adjuncts for staffing new programs is strongly discouraged. It is also important to recognize that the use of existing full-time faculty to teach in the new program will affect existing programs. Explain how full-time faculty who will teach in the new program will be replaced in existing programs. Are there any replacement costs for full-time faculty or any release time needs, such as for a Program Director? Indicate any other support staff such as College Laboratory Technicians, College Assistants, etc. needed to offer the proposed program and justify the need for hiring such persons. *Curricula Vitae* of faculty who will teach in the program should be available upon request and no longer need to be included in an appendix.

   B. **FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT:** It will be necessary to consult with the college’s Vice President for Finance and Administration to accurately prepare this segment of the proposal. Describe any special space needs for the program, including the availability of computer centers or laboratories. If space will have to be added, leased, or renovated, estimate the costs of providing and maintaining such space and indicate the source of funding. Any special equipment needed to offer the program must be listed with estimated costs and funding sources.

   C. **LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS:** It will be necessary to consult with the College’s Chief Librarian to accurately prepare this segment of the proposal. Describe the library resources presently available to support the proposed program and then discuss any additional library needs that the program will create. Estimate the total annual costs for upgrading library support to offer the program. Address any needs for other instructional materials such as computer software, audio-visual materials, and subscription database.

   D. **BUDGET TABLES:** Spreadsheets outlining the proposed program expenditures and revenues must be included. There are separate Revenue tables for senior colleges and community colleges. Copies of the tables can be found in section VI. Please note that "Revenues" cannot be left as "zero" or "not applicable." Revenues are calculated on the basis of student enrollment, taking into account tuition and state allocation.

6) **Evaluation:**
A. INTERNAL EVALUATION AND OUTCOMES: Explain how the quality of the proposed program will be monitored during the first five years of the program’s existence. Include a discussion of the desired outcomes for students and for the program. Indicate the measures that will be used to assess these outcomes. State the criteria that will be examined, such as student achievement of specific educational goals, placement of graduates, and faculty performance. Specify which departmental and college officials will participate in the process.

B. EXTERNAL EVALUATION: This section is only required of all graduate program proposals. The SED mandates that all new master’s degree programs be evaluated by one expert in the subject area who is from a college or university outside the New York metropolitan area. New doctoral programs need two evaluations from outside experts in the field. CUNY, however, requires two outside evaluations for both new master’s and new doctoral programs. In addition, all new graduate programs except programs in Education are reviewed by the GAC. In special circumstances, the EVCP may solicit an outside evaluation for an undergraduate program. The evaluators’ names, positions, and institutional affiliations should be identified in this section. The Evaluation report form is located on page 121.

7) Procedure

A. Like the LOI, the full proposal must be approved by appropriate college governance bodies. This includes approvals of any new courses required to launch the program. Four copies of the proposal, with a cover letter from the college President or Provost, should then be forwarded to the EVCP, with a copy to the University Director of Program Review, Articulation and Transfer. Receipt of the proposal will be acknowledged promptly.

B. The proposal will be reviewed by appropriate staff in the OAA. Usually, this review is completed within 30 business days, and any issues or concerns that require clarification are communicated to the college in an expeditious manner.

C. After any necessary revisions have been completed, the OAA staff returns the final proposal to the EVCP with a recommendation that it be presented to CAPPR for approval. Please Note: Colleges should not expect new draft proposals submitted shortly before the CAPPR deadline to be included on the agenda for the next meeting. In most cases, this is unrealistic. Colleges should allow sufficient time for the OAA to review the proposal carefully and for the colleges to implement any necessary revisions. The OAA will not recommend to the EVCP any proposals deemed incomplete or unfinished.

Should there be special reasons for concern about a proposal being ready in time for a particular CAPPR meeting the proposing college should consult with the OAA staff as early as possible in the process. The EVCP will make the final decision as to whether to recommend the proposal to CAPPR. The college will be notified in writing when the proposal is placed on the CAPPR agenda. At that time the college will be responsible for providing 55 hard copies of the final
version (double-sided and stapled but not bound) along with an electronic version. OAA staff will notify the college when to send these copies. (The number of paper copies needed may be reduced in the future as a digitized distribution is implemented).

D. The President and/or Chief Academic Officer will be expected to attend the CAPPR meeting during which the EVCP presents the proposal and should be prepared to answer any questions that may arise. Faculty involved with the proposal may accompany the President/Provost and may also answer questions.

E. If CAPPR approves the proposal, a resolution incorporating that approval is placed on the calendar for the next Board of Trustees meeting. Once the Board has approved the program, the EVCP sends a copy of the proposal with a letter requesting registration of the program to the State Education Department.

F. The Regents of the State of New York have the legal responsibility to direct and coordinate the development of the post-secondary education system of the state. The SED is the administrative agent of the Regents and is responsible for educational planning and program registration in compliance with established State statutes, Regents’ Rules, and the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education. The SED review may take from three to six months or more, although in many cases this process takes less time. During its review the SED may request further information and, if this occurs, the College will be notified accordingly.

G. Section 52.1 of the Commissioner’s Regulations, issued under the authority of section 207 of the Education Law, requires that every curriculum in institutions of post-secondary education be registered. New programs may not be advertised nor enroll students until the College has received notification of registration from the State Education Department. At registration, the SED will assign each new program a unique five-digit NYSED program code and will add the program to the State Inventory of Registered Degree Programs. SED will also assign the official Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) code. A HEGIS code refers to a program’s academic area and does not uniquely identify a program. The proposing college may suggest a proper HEGIS code but final assigning authority rests with SED. The list of correct HEGIS codes is available on page 63.