Guidelines for Development and Approval of New Academic Programs

&

Changes or Additions to Existing Academic Programs

Including:

New Degree

New Stand-Alone Certificate (Drawn from More Than One Program)

New Concentration

Change of More Than 33% of Program Coursework

Change in Program Modality

Offer Program Off-Campus

New Certificate (Drawn from One Program)

Directed Technology Certificate

Cooperative Degree

Closed Site Program

Change in Name of Existing Program

New Track in Masters or PBC in Professional Studies

Suspend or Discontinue Program

The following program types are not covered by these guidelines:

New Minors

New Tracks in non-MPS programs

UMBC

May 2024

For questions, contact Beth Wells, Director of Academic Administration, bwells@umbc.edu, x58907

Edited: 2024, May 03 (YMRH)

Table of Contents **Page**

What is Covered by These Guidelines and what is Not?

The guidelines in this packet cover all the types of new programs and changes or additions to existing programs listed on the cover page. When using this document to develop a proposal, be sure to use the section of the guidelines that applies to the particular type of new program or addition/change to an existing program that is correct for your situation.

The only types of new programs that are not covered by these guidelines are new minors and new tracks as defined by MHEC (except that new tracks within the Master's and Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Professional Studies are included in these guidelines). Following are the MHEC definitions of a track:

> *Undergraduate level:*
>
> If the program entails a sequential arrangement of courses and includes 24 credits or more, it is a concentration--not a track--and the guidelines herein for a new concentration apply.
>
> *Master's level:*
>
> If the program entails a sequential arrangement of courses and includes 12 credits or more, it is a concentration--not a track--and the guidelines herein for a new concentration apply.
>
> *Doctoral level:*
>
> If the program entails a sequential arrangement of courses and includes 18 credits or more, it is a concentration--not a track--and the guidelines herein for a new concentration apply.

To access the guidelines for approval of a non-Professional Studies track or a minor, contact the Undergraduate Council (UGC) at https://ugc.umbc.edu/ugc-request-forms/ or Graduate Council at x58142.

First step for most types of proposals covered by these guidelines: The Program Concept Group

For new programs and actions on existing programs listed below, the first step is to develop and submit a *Program Concept* to be reviewed by the Program Concept Group (PCG).

New Degree

New Certificate (Drawn from More Than One Program)

Change in Program Modality

Offer Program Off Campus

New Certificate (Drawn from One Program)

Directed Technology Certificate

Cooperative Degree

Closed Site Program

Change in Name of Existing Program

New Track in Masters or PBC in Professional Studies

The following types of new programs or actions do not require review by the *Program Concept Group*.

New Concentration

Change of More Than 33% of Program Coursework

Program Suspension or Discontinuation

The PCG is composed of UMBC's senior academic leaders and representatives of faculty governance, including the president of the Faculty Senate and the chair of the Academic Planning and Budget Committee. The PCG meets online as needed when program concepts are received. (In special cases, a member may request an in-person meeting.)

The PCG reviews a very brief written description of the concept of the new program or program action, along with basic information on projected enrollments and costs (if any), to determine the feasibility and match of the concept to UMBC's mission and goals. A determination is made whether to approve the concept for development into a full proposal.

Detailed instructions for developing the required concept paper for submission to the PCG can be found in Appendix 1.

When a program concept has been approved by the PCG for development, the Provost's Office sends to the lead faculty or staff **Instructions and Next Steps: Development of New Program Proposal.** This document outlines the level and kind of proposal and review that will be required for the TYPE of new program or action on existing program being proposed. It also requests additional information from the program developer that must be submitted before the full proposal can be reviewed for approval. **If you are developing a proposal and have not received these instructions following approval of the concept by the PCG, be sure to contact Beth Wells at x 58907 or bwells@umbc.edu before proceeding.**

What are the Different TYPES of Proposals?

For the purpose of organizing these guidelines and advising faculty and staff on the instructions to follow in developing the proposal, UMBC has designated proposal TYPES that correspond to the particular requirements that must be met in the development of different kinds of proposals. The chart below also shows for each TYPE of proposal the kind of on-campus review required and the kind of review (if any) required by USM and MHEC.

Proposal Type	Category of Program Action	Campus Approval	USM Review	MHEC Review	Location of Proposal Instructions
A	~~New degree ~~New Stand-Alone Certificate[1]	Full	Yes	Full, with 30-day Public Review	Appendix 2 Page 11
B	Substantial Change Existing Program: ~~New Concentration[2] ~~Change of more than 33% of Existing Program Coursework	Full	Yes	Full, with 30-day Public Review	Appendix 3 Page 19
C	Off-Campus Delivery of Program	Full	Yes	Full, with 30-day Public Review	Appendix 4 Page 20
D	Certificate at Grad or Undergrad Level, Exclusively within Existing Degree	Full	Yes	Administrative	Appendix 5 Page 22
E	Directed Technology Certificate	Full	Notice	Administrative	Appendix 6 Page 25

[1] There are two kinds of Undergraduate or Graduate Certificates, those that are developed exclusively from the coursework of one existing degree program, and those that are "Stand-Alone Certificates," drawn from the coursework of two or more existing degrees. In either case, if any new courses are to be included in a proposed certificate, those new courses must be approved by either UGC or Graduate Council before the proposal for the certificate is submitted to faculty governance for approval. The new courses must also be included in the online description of the related degree program before the proposal is submitted for approval by MHEC.

[2] Sequential arrangement of courses within program: at undergraduate level, 24 credits or more; at master's level, 12 credits or more; at doctoral level, 18 credits or more.

Proposal Type	Category of Program Action	Campus Approval	USM Approv.	MHEC Approv.	Location of Proposal Instructions
F	Cooperative Degree ~~Joint Degree Program, Single Diploma from Both Schools	Full	Yes	Full, with 30-day Public Review	Appendix 7 Page 26
	~~Primary Degree Degree One School, with Responsibility for 2/3 of curriculum	Full, when UMBC is Primary & Grants Degree When UMBC is secondary partner, no UMBC proposal is needed; proposal is prepared and submitted by primary school			
G	Closed Site Program	Full	Notice	Notice	Appendix 8 Page 27
H	Name Change of Existing Program	Full	Notice	Administrative	Appendix 9 Page 28
I	New Track MPS/PBC	Full	Notice	None	Appendix 10 Page 29
J	Change in Program Modality (e.g., F2F to Online)	Full	Notice	Administrative	Appendix 11 Page 30
K	Suspension or Discontinuation of Program or Modality	Notice	Notice	Notice	Appendix 12 Page 31

Proposal Development

Narrative

Using the chart of program types above, identify the TYPE of program you are developing and the appendix in which instructions for the proposal are located. Consult with Beth Wells in advance, as needed, to discuss any questions you may have about which TYPE of proposal you need and also during development of the draft. The narrative portion of the program proposal must not exceed 10 pages, and the pages must be numbered. Do not skip any section listed in the guidelines for your program TYPE; rather, include the section heading and write "not applicable." For sections of the proposal that require description of the assessed market need or demand for the program, UMBC will assist faculty, as needed, with market analysis.

Budget

The instructions in the appendix for each TYPE of proposal also indicate whether a budget is required as part of the proposal, and if so, what kind of budget. UMBC will assist faculty in development of any required budget.

Informal review

When a draft of the proposal is ready, send it to Beth Wells for informal review and feedback.

Estimating the timeline from proposal development through final approval

In general, for a new degree program (TYPE A), substantive change to existing degree program (TYPE B), off-campus delivery of program (TYPE C), or cooperative degree program for which UMBC is the primary institution (TYPE F) that is planned to be available for student enrollment in the fall semester, it is best to complete the Program Concept Group review process no later than 20 months prior to offering the program for fall enrollment; to have the full proposal developed and ready to be submitted for formal review on campus by March (i.e., 18 months in advance of enrollment); and for the proposal to be approved on campus and ready for submission to MHEC/USM by October (i.e., 11 months prior to enrollment), to allow adequate time for MHEC's extensive review. Once final approval comes, this also allows time for UMBC to market the program and recruit and enroll students by the targeted fall enrollment date.

For all other proposal TYPES, the length of time that will be required to earn approval of the proposal on and off campus once it has been developed will vary based on the TYPE of proposal, the kind and level of on-campus and off-campus review that is required, and the time of year the proposal is ready for review. It is strongly advised that program developers for all TYPES of programs seek a consultation with Beth Wells as soon as possible to get a realistic estimate of how long full and final approval may take and the steps that will be entailed in the review process.

Proposal Submission and Review

Once a final version of the proposal is ready, submit it to Beth Wells, who will start the formal review and submit it through UMBC's electronic system for proposal review. Depending on the proposal, it may be reviewed by leaders in the following roles.

- Department chair
- Dean(s)
- Vice President for Administration & Finance
- Academic Planning and Budget Committee (APB)
- Undergraduate Council (UGC) or Graduate Council
- Faculty Senate
- Provost
- President

Depending on the type of proposal, it may also be reviewed by:

- Board of Regents, University System of Maryland (USM)
- Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC)

Implementation

All new programs and all changes to existing programs must complete their respective required approval processes before they can be marketed or implemented for student enrollment. The Provost's Office oversees a separate implementation process once any program proposal has been fully approved.

Marketing

Marketing for the new or revised program may not begin until all required approvals have been received.

Appendix 1. Instructions for development of the Concept for the Program Concept Group[3]

- Describe the program concept in no more than one to two pages, including brief descriptions of the following elements:
    - Proposed name of program
    - Sponsoring department(s)
    - Description of the need for the program and educational objectives
    - Description of the target audience and market demand
    - Proposed curriculum
    - Resources needed
    - Faculty oversight

- On a third page, document the anticipated enrollments and resource needs as shown below. At this stage, what is being developed and reviewed is a program *concept*. Faculty are asked to provide the best available estimates in the following categories for review by the Program Concept Group. It is understood that only after a program concept is approved for development into a full program proposal will faculty and staff invest more time in market research, enrollment projections, and detailed budget preparation.

    - **Enrollments**

        Conservatively estimate enrollments based on currently available information.

        Year 1: ___ students: (___ new + ___ current students changing to this major)

        Year 2: ___ students: (___ new + ___ current students changing to this major)

        Year 3: ___ students: (___ new + ___ current students changing to this major)

        Year 4: ___ students: (___ new + ___ current students changing to this major)

        Year 5: ___ students: (___ new)

    - **Resource Needs**

        Estimate resource needs based on currently available information.

        - $_____ (salary plus benefits) for faculty in year (s) _____
        - $_____ for _____ part-time instructors in year (s) _____
        - $_____ (salary plus benefits) for staff in year (s) _____

[3] Submission of a concept paper to the Program Concept Group is required for all types of programs except Type B (substantial modification of an existing degree) and Type K (suspension or discontinuation of a program).

- Operating budget: $_____/year, including:
    - Library/Media Budget: $_____/year
    - $ _____ for marketing in year (s) _____
    - Other: $_____ for _____ in year(s) _____

- **Totals:**

  Recurring costs = $_____/yr.

  One-time costs = $_____

- Send the three-page concept paper, including narrative and resource needs, to Beth Wells

- Academic Affairs will review the concept and work with the faculty proposing it to ensure that:
    - There are data to support the need for the proposed new program
    - There are data to document market demand for the graduates
    - Any cross-departmental collaborations needed have been established to mutual satisfaction of the faculties and departments involved
    - An environmental scan has been done to identify and address potential program duplication, per MHEC

- Once the concept and concept paper have been reviewed and approved by Academic Affairs, they will send it to the Program Concept Group for review. Discussion of it will be conducted in an email group, on which the faculty who have proposed the concept will be copied, so they can respond to any questions.

Sample
Concept Paper

Appendix 2. Instructions for Preparing Type A Proposal

These instructions are for developing a proposal for:

- **A new degree program**
- **A new stand-alone certificate[4], which draws courses from more than one existing degree program**

(The instructions for a certificate developed exclusively from the courses of just one existing degree—a Type D proposal--are found in Appendix 5.)

Articulation agreements

NOTE: A proposal for a new Bachelor's degree, or a proposal for a substantial modification to an existing Bachelor's degree (including a new concentration or changing more than 33% of the undergraduate degree curriculum) requires inclusion of a provisionally signed articulation agreement with at least one community college at the time the proposal is submitted to MHEC. The fully-executed articulation agreement is due to MHEC within 30 days of its approval of the program. In the alternative, if there is an existing articulation agreement for this specific program, then a modification of the agreement will suffice. Instructions for developing the proposal itself are included below. To begin work on the required articulation agreement, contact Dale Bittinger, *Assistant Vice Provost for Strategic Undergraduate Engagement, Partnerships, and Pathways,* at bittinge@umbc.edu.

Sample
Type A & B proposal:
Graduate program

Sample
Type A & B proposal:
Undergraduate program

BUDGET:

TYPE A proposals require two different budgets to be developed, a UMBC budget and an MHEC budget.

UMBC budget:

Trisha Wells, Assistant Vice Provost for Administration & Finance in the Division of Professional Studies, provides technical support to faculty developing new program proposals that require a

[4] There are two kinds of Undergraduate or Graduate Certificates, those that are developed exclusively from the coursework of one existing degree program, and those that are "Stand-Alone Certificates," drawn from the coursework of more than one existing degree. In either case, if any new courses are to be included in a proposed certificate, those new courses must be approved by either UGC or Graduate Council before the proposal for the certificate is submitted to faculty governance for approval. The new courses must also be included in the online description of the related degree program before the proposal is submitted for approval by MHEC.

UMBC budget. Beth Wells will request assistance from Trisha on the UMBC budget for faculty developing a TYPE A proposal.

MHEC budget:

The required format for the MHEC budget is embedded as links in the instructions below as Table 1: Resources and Rationale and Table 2: Expenditures and Rationale. Trisha Wells, Assistant Vice Provost for Administration & Finance in the Division of Professional Studies, provides technical support to faculty developing new program proposals that require a MHEC budget. Beth Wells will request assistance from Trisha on the MHEC budget for faculty developing a TYPE A proposal.

When the proposal is completed, both required budgets should be included in the packet.

NARRATIVE:

Instructions for developing the narrative of a TYPE A proposal are shown below.

A. Centrality to Institutional Mission and Planning Priorities:

1. Provide a description of the program, including each area of concentration (if applicable), and how it relates to the institution's approved mission. https://about.umbc.edu/mission-and-vision/
2. Explain how the proposed program supports the institution's strategic goals and provide evidence that affirms it is an institutional priority. https://planning.umbc.edu/strategic-plan/
3. Provide a brief narrative of how the proposed program will be adequately funded for at least the first five years of program implementation. (Additional related information is required in section L.)
4. Provide a description of the institution's a commitment to:

    a) ongoing administrative, financial, and technical support of the proposed program

    b) continuation of the program for a period of time sufficient to allow enrolled students to complete the program.

B. Critical and Compelling Regional or Statewide Need as Identified in the State Plan:

1. Demonstrate demand and need for the program in terms of meeting present and future needs of the region and the State based on one or more of the following:

    a) The need for the advancement and evolution of knowledge

    b) Societal needs, including expanding educational opportunities and choices for minority and educationally disadvantaged students at institutions of higher education

c) Occupational and professional needs relative to upgrading vocational/technical skills or meeting job market requirements; and

d) The need to strengthen and expand the capacity of historically black institutions to provide high quality and unique educational programs

The Commission recognizes and supports the tradition of liberal arts education and the need for programs that offer individual and societal benefits independent of manpower or market demand considerations. These programs provide immeasurable returns to the State in part by instilling in citizens a capacity for advanced learning and an understanding of the fundamentals of civilization.

2. Provide evidence that the perceived need is consistent with the 2022 Maryland State Plan for Higher Education.

   https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:cd53b778-fe5c-37e9-84ae-1b8f93223c0b

See also Appendix 13., **Long-Term Goals of the Maryland Higher Education Commission**, for additional information that may be included in discussion of how the proposed new program meets State needs.

3. Reference relevant information from the USM strategic plan.
   https://www.usmd.edu/vision2030/

C. Quantifiable and Reliable Evidence and Documentation of Market Supply and Demand in the Region and State:

1. Describe potential industry or industries, employment opportunities, and expected level of entry (*ex: mid-level management*) for graduates of the proposed program.
2. Present data and analysis projecting market demand and the availability of openings in a job market to be served by the new program. Provide and cite data from the Bureau of Labor or O*NET Online for the following, with greatest emphasis on data from the State of Maryland.

   O*NET Online
   https://www.onetonline.org/

   Maryland
   http://www.dllr.state.md.us/lmi/iandoproj/maryland.shtml

   U.S.
   http://www.bls.gov/ooh/

3. Discuss and provide evidence of market surveys that clearly provide quantifiable and reliable data on the educational and training needs and the anticipated number of vacancies expected over the next 5 years.

4. Provide data showing the current and projected supply of prospective graduates.

D. Reasonableness of Program Duplication:

1. Identify similar programs in the State and/or same geographical area. Discuss similarities and differences between the proposed program and others in the same degree to be awarded.
2. Review and discuss differences and similarities with programs at:

    - University of Maryland College Park
    - University of Maryland Global Campus
    - Bowie State University
    - Coppin State University
    - Morgan State University
    - Johns Hopkins University
    - University of Baltimore
    - Towson University
    - Stevenson University
    - Loyola University Maryland
    - Notre Dame of Maryland University

3. In light of the analysis above, provide justification for the proposed new UMBC program.

E. Relevance to High-demand Programs at Historically Black Institutions (HBIs)

1. Discuss the program's potential impact on the implementation or maintenance of high-demand programs at HBI's. Discuss any similar program(s) at all four Maryland HBIs (MSU, BSU, CSU, UMES) and differentiate the proposed new UMBC program from each one.

F. Relevance to the identity of Historically Black Institutions (HBIs)

Discuss the program's potential impact on the uniqueness and institutional identities and missions of HBIs. Discuss any similar program(s) at all four Maryland HBIs (MSU, BSU, CSU, UMES) and make the case for why UMBC's proposed new program will cause no harm to the HBIs and their programs. Do not skip any HBI in Maryland. If any has a program that is in any way similar to our new proposal, explain clearly how ours does not duplicate theirs.

G. Adequacy of Curriculum Design, Program Modality, and Related Learning Outcomes

1. Describe how the proposed program was established and also describe the faculty who will oversee the program.

2. Outline educational objectives and learning outcomes appropriate to the rigor, breadth, and (modality) of the program.
3. Explain how the institution will:
    a) provide for assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes in the program
    b) document student achievement of learning outcomes in the program
4. Provide a list of courses with title, semester credit hours and course descriptions, along with a description of program requirements
5. Discuss how general education requirements will be met, if applicable. Use the following text:

    As stated on UMBC website (https://gened.umbc.edu), "UMBC's General Education Program provides students the opportunity to expand the life of the mind by developing life-long habits of thought and intellectual interests." The general education program (GEP) requirements (total of 37–45 credits) are distributed across six broad areas of academic inquiry:

    - English composition (3 credits), which lays the foundation for the writing, research, and critical thinking skills that students need to succeed and engage thoughtfully with complex issues
    - Arts and Humanities (9 credits). Students explore the human condition and its cultural expression, past and present and consider the ethical and value systems which form the basis of thought, artifacts and individual and collective life.
    - Social Sciences (9 credits). Students examine attitudes, beliefs and social behaviors of individuals, groups and institutions, and identify factors that influence them, both past and present.
    - Mathematics (3–4 credits). Students develop problem solving abilities, including analytical and logical reasoning skills that prepares them for an increasingly complex and technological world
    - Sciences (7–8 credits, including lab). Students obtain an understanding of the fundamental principles underlying modern scientific thought.
    - Culture (6–7 credits). Students examine the global nature of society in the 21st Century, the importance of inter-cultural communication and the need for modern citizens to broaden their horizons.
    - Language (0–4 credits). Students study languages beyond English, ranging from ancient to modern, representing most major language groups of the world.
6. Identify any specialized accreditation or graduate certification requirements for this program and its students.
7. If contracting with another institution or non-collegiate organization, provide a copy of the written contract.
8. Provide assurance and any appropriate evidence that the proposed program will provide students with clear, complete, and timely information on the curriculum, course and degree requirements, nature of faculty/student interaction, assumptions about technology competence and skills, technical

equipment requirements, learning management system, availability of academic support services and financial aid resources, and costs and payment policies.

9. Provide assurance and any appropriate evidence that advertising, recruiting, and admissions materials will clearly and accurately represent the proposed program and the services available.

10. This section must show every element of the 120 (or, in some special cases, more) credits in the program, including GERs, core courses, specialty courses, electives, etc. A chart that shows all these elements—in addition to descriptions of them—is required for MHEC's purposes.

    Note that MHEC's definition of an undergraduate major is:

    (a) A minimum of 30 semester credit hours, 1/2 of which must be upper-divisional credit, in one field or in an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary field; and

    (b) A coherent, sequential, and integrated program of study-in-depth which is intended to provide:

    (i) A body of knowledge;

    (ii) Methods of study; and

    (iii) Practice appropriate to a subject area.

    Follow this example from a new Language and Cultural Studies concentration in the BA in MLL:

    Requirements to complete the degree in Modern Languages and Linguistics with the language and cultural studies concentration:

Total number of credits in concentration:		39 credits
• Number of MLL core-courses credits:	12 credits	
• Number of language-related credits:	12 credits	
• Number of language/culture-related credits:	15 credits	
University requirements not included in concentration (GEP):		29–32 credits
University upper-level requirements not included in concentration:		15–24 credits
University general other electives		28–34 credits
Total number of credits in the whole degree:		**120 credits**

H. Adequacy of Articulation

1. If applicable, discuss how the program supports articulation with programs at partner institutions. Provide all relevant articulation agreements.

I. Adequacy of Faculty Resources

1. Provide a brief narrative demonstrating the quality of program faculty. Document that at least 50% of the credits in the program will be taught by full-time faculty.

   Include a chart of faculty members that includes for each one:

   - appointment type
   - terminal degree title and field
   - academic title/rank
   - status (full-time, part-time, adjunct), and
   - course(s) each faulty member will teach (in this program).

Follow this example from the PBC in Data Science Informatics from the IS Department for the chart:

Faculty	Title (status)	Education	Field of Specialization	Courses Taught
Dr. Michael Brown	Professor of the Practice GPD (Full time)	Ph.D., Computer Science, Nova Southeastern University	Computer Science, Data Science	• IS 675 Data Science
Dr. Augusto Casas	Lecturer (Full time)	Ph.D., Information Systems, Nova Southeastern University	Data Science and Cybersecurity	• IS 633 Database Management Systems • IS 678 Data Analytics in Cybersecurity
Dr. Vandana Janeja	Professor and Chair (Full time)	Ph.D., Information Technology, Rutgers University	Data Science, Cybersecurity	• IS 678 Data Analytics in Cybersecurity
Dr. Aryya Gangopadhyay	Professor (Full time)	Ph.D., Information Technology, Rutgers University	Data Science, Cybersecurity	• IS 675 Data Science
Dr. Zhiyuan Chen	Professor Associate Chair (Full time)	Ph.D., Computer Science, Cornell	Data Science, Privacy, Anonymization	• IS 633 Database Management Systems
Dr. George Karabatis	Professor (Full time)	Ph.D., Computer Science, University of Houston	Data Science, Cybersecurity, Systems Integration	• IS 676 Information Integration

2. Demonstrate how the institution will provide ongoing pedagogy training for faculty in evidenced-based best practices, including training in:

    a) Pedagogy that meets the needs of the students
    b) The learning management system
    c) Evidenced-based best practices for distance education, if distance education is offered. (Distance education is defined by MHEC as a program for which all of the required coursework may be completed online.)

J. Adequacy of Library Resources

1. Describe the library resources available and/or the measures to be taken to ensure resources are adequate to support the proposed program. **If the program is to be implemented within existing institutional resources**, include a supportive statement by the President for library resources to meet the program's needs.

2. Contact the Director of the Albin O. Kuhn Library and Gallery or designee for consultation on what, if any, additional resources are needed in the library for the proposed new program.

K. Adequacy of Physical Facilities, Infrastructure and Instructional Equipment

1. Provide an assurance that physical facilities, infrastructure and instruction equipment are adequate to initiate the program, particularly as related to spaces for classrooms, staff and faculty offices, and laboratories for studies in the technologies and sciences. If the program is to be implemented within existing institutional resources, include a supportive statement by the President for adequate equipment and facilities to meet the program's needs.

2. Provide assurance and any appropriate evidence that the institution will ensure students enrolled in and faculty teaching in distance education will have adequate access to:

    a) An institutional electronic mailing system, and
    b) A learning management system that provides the necessary technological support for distance education

L. Adequacy of Financial Resources with Documentation

1. The UMBC budget should be developed first, in collaboration with Trisha Wells. Once that budget is completed, Trisha Wells will summarize the UMBC budget into the MHEC budget categories required in Table 1: Resources and Table 2: Expenditures (below).

2. Complete **Table 1: Resources and Narrative Rationale**. Provide finance data for the first five years of program implementation. Enter figures into each cell and provide a total for each year. Also provide a narrative rationale for each resource category. If resources have been or will be reallocated to support the proposed program, briefly discuss the sources of those funds.

   Put a zero in every empty cell in the Resources table.

3. Complete **Table 2: Program Expenditures and Narrative Rationale**. Provide finance data for the first five years of program implementation. Enter figures into each cell and provide a total for each year. Also provide a narrative rationale for each expenditure category.

   Put a zero in every empty cell in the Expenditures table.

   Be sure to footnote every budget table entry that may need explanation or clarification.

M. Adequacy of Provisions for Evaluation of Program

1. Discuss procedures for evaluating courses, faculty and student learning outcomes.
2. Explain how the institution will evaluate the proposed program's educational effectiveness, including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, student and faculty satisfaction, and cost-effectiveness.

N. Consistency with the State's Minority Student Achievement Goals

1. Discuss how the proposed program addresses minority student access & success, and the institution's cultural diversity goals and initiatives.

O. Relationship to Low Productivity Programs Identified by the Commission:

1. If the proposed program is directly related to an identified low productivity program, discuss how the fiscal resources (including faculty, administration, library resources and general operating expenses) may be redistributed to this program.

P. Adequacy of Distance Education Programs (defined as a program for which all required coursework may be completed online)

1. Provide affirmation and any appropriate evidence that the institution is eligible to provide Distance Education.
2. Provide assurance and any appropriate evidence that the institution complies with the C-RAC guidelines, particularly as it relates to the proposed program.

3. Provide assurance that students and faculty have adequate access to an electronic mailing system and a learning management system that provides the necessary technological support for distance education

Appendix 3. Instructions for Preparing Type B Proposal

These instructions are for developing a proposal for a substantial change to an existing program. Examples of substantial changes are:

- **New concentration[5]**
- **Change of more than 33% of existing program coursework**

Follow the instructions for a Type A proposal found in Appendix 2.

Sample
Type A & B proposal:
Undergraduate program

Sample
Type A & B proposal:
Graduate program

[5] Sequential arrangement of courses within program: at undergraduate level, 24 credits or more; at master's level, 12 credits or more; at doctoral level, 18 credits or more. If the set of courses meets this MHEC definition, it must be called a concentration and submitted for approval.

Appendix 4. Instructions for preparing Type C proposal

These instructions are for developing a proposal to offer <u>any</u> program off campus, including at a Regional Higher Education Center (RHEC). If this will be a brand-new program for UMBC to offer, first, follow all the instructions in Appendix 2 for a Type A proposal. Add to that information the elements listed below for offering a program off campus. If the program is currently offered at the main campus, follow the instructions beginning at B below.

BUDGET:
Include a two-year budget and narrative.

NARRATIVE:
A. Waiver of On-Campus Requirement.

(1) An off-campus program may be approved only if there is already an existing on-campus program unless a waiver of the on-campus requirement is approved by the Secretary pursuant to this section.

(2) The Secretary shall grant a waiver if the Secretary finds that the program:

(a) Meets the requirements of a new program under Education Article, §11-206, Annotated Code of Maryland, and the requirements of this chapter; and

(b) Will be offered at a regional higher education center.

(3) A program that receives a waiver under this section may not be approved at any location other than a regional higher education center unless it also is offered on-campus at the institution's principal location.

B. A program proposal for an off-campus program shall be submitted by the institution to the Commission and contain the following information regarding need and demand for extending the program and the impact the program may have on similar programs that may exist in the region:

(1) The title of the program and the degree or certificate to be awarded

(2) The resource requirements for the program and the source of funds and budget to support the program for the first 2 years of program implementation

(3) The need and demand for the program in terms of:

(a) Specific local, State, and national needs for graduates

(b) Job opportunities that are available to those who complete the program; and

(c) Evidence of market demand through supporting data, including results of surveys that have recently been conducted

(4) A description of the following, if a similar program is offered within the same geographical region of the State:

(a) Similarities or differences in the degree to be awarded

(b) Area of specialization; and

(c) Specific academic content of the program and total number of credits in degree

(5) A description of the method of instructional delivery, including distance education, on-site faculty, and the mix of full-time and part-time instructors; and

(6) A brief description of the academic oversight, quality control, and student services to be provided.

C. An institution offering an off-campus program shall provide for adequate and appropriate library resources within reasonable distance of the instructional site or through institution-sponsored electronic collections and databases.

D. Faculty

(1) Students shall be taught by qualified faculty with appropriate experience.

(2) At least 1/3 of the classes offered in an off-campus program shall be taught by full-time faculty of the parent institution.

E. An off-campus program shall:

(1) Be complete and coherent

(2) Provide for either real-time interaction or delayed interaction between faculty and students and among students

(3) Provide appropriate oversight of the program offered by qualified faculty from the parent institution; and

(4) Provide enrolled students with reasonable and adequate access to the range of academic and support services appropriate to support their learning, including academic advising, counseling, library and other learning resources, and financial aid

F. An institution has responsibility for:

(1) Evaluating the program's educational effectiveness, student learning outcomes, student retention, and student and faculty satisfaction; and

(2) Providing to faculty with professional development activities, appropriate training, and other support

Appendix 5. Instructions for Preparing Type D Proposal

These instructions are for developing a proposal for a graduate or undergraduate certificate for which the coursework is drawn exclusively from within one degree program.

Sample
Type D proposal

(The instructions for a certificate that draws courses from more than one existing degree—a Type A proposal--are found in Appendix 2.)

BUDGET:

No budget is required for a TYPE D proposal.

NARRATIVE:

Instructions for developing the narrative of the TYPE D proposal are shown below.

New Certificate in Existing Degree Programs

A program proposal for a new certificate in an existing degree program may be made in a brief, one-page document that:

(a) Explains the centrality of the proposed certificate program to the mission of the institution (See page 12 of these guidelines.)

(b) Provides evidence of the market demand for the proposed certificate program (See page 12 of these guidelines.)

(c) Sets out the curriculum design, specifically:

Describe how the proposed program was established and also describe the faculty who will oversee the program.

Outline educational objectives and learning outcomes appropriate to the rigor, breadth, and (modality) of the program.

Explain how the institution will:

a) provide for assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes in the program
b) document student achievement of learning outcomes in the program

Provide a list of courses with title, semester credit hours and course descriptions, along with a description of program requirements

(d) Shows that adequate faculty resources exist for the proposed certificate program, specifically:

Provide a brief narrative demonstrating the quality of program faculty. Document that at least 50% of the credits in the program will be taught by full-time faculty.

Include a chart of faculty members that includes for each one:

- appointment type
- terminal degree title and field
- academic title/rank
- status (full-time, part-time, adjunct), and
- course(s) each faulty member will teach (in this program).

Follow this example from the PBC in Data Science Informatics from the IS Department for the chart:

Faculty	**Title (status)**	**Education**	**Field of Specialization**	**Courses Taught**
Dr. Michael Brown	Professor of the Practice GPD (Full time)	Ph.D., Computer Science, Nova Southeastern University	Computer Science, Data Science	• IS 675 Data Science
Dr. Augusto Casas	Lecturer (Full time)	Ph.D., Information Systems, Nova Southeastern University	Data Science and Cybersecurity	• IS 633 Database Management Systems • IS 678 Data Analytics in Cybersecurity
Dr. Vandana Janeja	Professor and Chair (Full time)	Ph.D., Information Technology, Rutgers University	Data Science, Cybersecurity	• IS 678 Data Analytics in Cybersecurity
Dr. Aryya Gangopadhyay	Professor (Full time)	Ph.D., Information Technology, Rutgers University	Data Science, Cybersecurity	• IS 675 Data Science
Dr. Zhiyuan Chen	Professor Associate Chair (Full time)	Ph.D., Computer Science, Cornell	Data Science, Privacy, Anonymization	• IS 633 Database Management Systems

Dr. George Karabatis	Professor (Full time)	Ph.D., Computer Science, University of Houston	Data Science, Cybersecurity, Systems Integration	• IS 676 Information Integration

Appendix 6. Instructions for Preparing Type E Proposal

These instructions are for developing a proposal for a directed technology certificate.

BUDGET:

A formal budget is not required for a TYPE E proposal, but discussion of the financial resources needed to support the curriculum should be included in the letter.

NARRATIVE:

Draft the body only of a letter that addresses the following topics and attach a copy of the curriculum.

(a) The curriculum for the certificate has been developed in consultation with a specific employer or employers to meet specific training needs

(b) The curriculum has been reviewed by the appropriate curriculum approval bodies at the institution

(c) A content specialist will be assigned to ensure high standards and maintain written documentation about the curriculum; and

(d) Financial resources are adequate to support the curriculum

Appendix 7. Instructions for Preparing Type F Proposal

These instructions are for developing a proposal for a cooperative degree program, as follows:

- **A joint degree program offers a single diploma signed by both institutions**
- **A primary degree program offers a degree from one (primary) institution, with cooperation on no more than 1/3 of the curriculum from a secondary or partner institution**

For a new joint degree program, or for a new primary degree program in which UMBC will be the degree-granting institution, follow the instructions for a Type A proposal. Attach to the proposal a fully executed copy of the MOU between UMBC and the partner institution.

Follow the instructions for a TYPE A proposal, in Appendix 2.

(For a primary degree program in which UMBC is the secondary partner institution offering no more than 1/3 of the curriculum, the proposal should be developed and submitted by the primary institution.)

See Appendix 15 for additional information on cooperative programs.

Appendix 8. Instructions for Preparing Type G Proposal

These instructions are for developing a proposal for a closed site program.

BUDGET:

No budget is required for a TYPE G proposal.

NARRATIVE:

(a) Draft the body only of a 1-2 page letter of notification that describes and provides a justification for the proposed offering

(b) Include a list of courses titles and credits

Appendix 9. Instructions for Preparing Type H Proposal

These instructions are for developing a proposal to change the name of an existing program.

Sample
Type H proposal

No budget is required for a TYPE H proposal.

NARRATIVE:

Follow the instructions for a Type G proposal, except that a list of courses is not required.

Appendix 10. Instructions for Preparing Type I Proposal

These instructions are for proposing a new track or a new PBC in the Master's in Professional Studies (MPS).

BUDGET & NARRATIVE:

Include in the written proposal for a new track in MPS:

a) Name of the program
b) Description of program
c) Centrality to UMBC mission
d) Sponsoring department(s)
e) Target audience and market demand
f) Curriculum, including core MPS requirements
g) Educational objectives
h) Faculty oversight
i) Plan for program evaluation
j) Enrollment projections
k) Resources needed, including UMBC budget
l) Adequacy of library resources

Guidelines for Proposal for New track in PBC

Include:

a) Name of the program
b) Description of program
c) Centrality to UMBC mission
d) Sponsoring department(s)
e) Target audience and market demand
f) Curriculum
g) Educational objectives
h) Faculty oversight
i) Resources needed
j) Enrollment projections

Appendix 11. Instructions for Preparing Type J Proposal

These instructions are for proposing a change in program modality (e.g., from face-to-face (on-campus program) to online instruction (distance education)).

BUDGET:

No budget is required for a TYPE J proposal.

NARRATIVE:

Develop the narrative only of a letter that includes:

(a) The name and degree of the program

(b) The HEGIS and CIP code of the program

(c) A description of, and rationale for, the addition, change, suspension, or discontinuation of program modality

(d) An affirmation that the program's most recently approved curriculum and objectives are coherent, cohesive, and comparable, regardless of program modality

(e) The planned implementation date of the addition or change

Appendix 12. Instructions for Suspension or Discontinuation of a Program or Modality

A program or modality may be suspended for up to three years, for review of its future. After that time, the program must be either discontinued or re-activated.

An institution may temporarily suspend a program and examine its future direction.

During a period of program suspension, an institution has the opportunity to:

Study its future commitment to a particular field of study; and determine whether the program should be: Maintained in present form; consolidated with other program offerings; or discontinued.

The suspension of a program relieves an institution from having to submit a program proposal to the Commission to reactivate a discontinued program.

Criteria and Process for Program Suspension.

A program may be suspended for a period of time not to exceed 3 years. The catalog and other official publications shall indicate the official status of the program. New students may not be admitted into a program during the period of suspension. Currently enrolled students shall be given the opportunity to satisfy degree requirements. Before suspending a program, the institution shall notify the Secretary in writing. After a 3-year period, the institution shall either discontinue or reactivate the program and notify the Secretary in writing.

The Commission does not review a program proposed for discontinuance by an institution. However, an institution shall provide written notice to the Commission in advance of a program's discontinuance.

BUDGET

No budget is required.

NARRATIVE

Prepare narrative only of a letter that explains:

(a) Rationale for suspending or discontinuing program

(b) The number of students enrolled in the program who are using that program modality and their expected graduation dates; and

(c) A plan that covers each of the students using the program's modality to ensure that: The student's time to completion of the program is not increased; and students and faculty continue to have access to course material, student services, and academic support for the duration of the program.

Appendix 13. Long-Term Goals of the Maryland Higher Education Commission

Four long-term goals, quality, access and choice, accountability, and HBI enhancement, guide the Commission's program approval responsibilities, with each goal having the following focus:

B. Quality shall focus on the effectiveness of institutional actions, including:

(1) The extent to which an institution fulfills its stated mission;

(2) The centrality of a proposed program to the institution's approved mission; and

(3) The adherence of a proposed program to commonly accepted standards of academic practice as found in Regulation .06 of this chapter;

C. Access and choice for Maryland citizens to higher education shall focus on the needs of citizens for higher education programs, services, and research, including:

(1) Financial assistance;

(2) Transferability of credit;

(3) Economic development;

(4) Equal opportunity concerns; and

(5) Expansion of educational opportunities and choices for minority and educationally disadvantaged students at institutions of higher education;

D. Accountability shall focus on whether there is a comprehensive set of reliable and valid indicators, appropriate to the mission of the institution, which can assess an institution's effectiveness in delivering the proposed program; and

E. HBI enhancement shall focus on whether the proposed program advances the expansion of mission, program uniqueness, or institutional identity at HBIs.

Appendix 14. MHEC Criteria for Determination of Program Duplication

The elimination of unreasonable program duplication is a high priority. Ordinarily, proposed programs in undergraduate core programs consisting of basic liberal arts and sciences disciplines are not considered unnecessarily duplicative. Unreasonable duplication is a more specific concern in vocational/technical, occupational, graduate, and professional programs which meet special manpower needs. The issue of how a proposed program meets an institution's local and State area needs shall be addressed.

Evidence demonstrating that a proposed program is not duplicative of similar offerings in the State shall be submitted by the institution. At a minimum, this evidence shall be substantiated on the basis that the proposed program to be offered is not unreasonably duplicative of existing programs in a specific geographically proximate location in the State.

Determination of Duplication.

(1) In determining whether a program is unreasonably duplicative, the Secretary shall consider:

(a) The degree to be awarded;
(b) The area of specialization;
(c) The purpose or objectives of the program to be offered;
(d) The specific academic content of the program;
(e) Evidence of equivalent competencies of the proposed program in comparison to existing programs; and
(f) An analysis of the market demand for the program.

(2) The analysis shall include an examination of factors, including:

(a) Role and mission;
(b) Accessibility;
(c) Alternative means of educational delivery including distance education;
(d) Analysis of enrollment characteristics;
(e) Residency requirements;
(f) Admission requirements; and
(g) Educational justification for the dual operation of programs broadly similar to unique or high-demand programs at HBIs.

Appendix 15. Requirements for Cooperative Programs (Joint or Primary)

A. The Commission encourages institutions to:

(1) Explore the opportunities for cooperation with other institutions, within a segment and between segments, offering similar programs; and

(2) Document the extent to which cooperative arrangements have been explored.

B. An institution considering a new program or a substantial modification is encouraged to explore cooperative development of these program initiatives.

C. The institution shall follow cooperative degree program guidelines developed by the Commission to assist institutions in establishing these programs.

D. Cooperative programs shall be designated as belonging to one of the degree program categories in this regulation.

E. Requirements for Joint Degree Programs.

(1) Two or more institutions may offer a joint degree program in which the cooperating institutions are substantively involved in required coursework, faculty exchange, and shared use of facilities.

(2) A student enrolled in a joint degree program shall receive a single diploma that bears the names and seals of all cooperating institutions.

(3) The proposed program shall be planned by representatives from each cooperating institution. Identical proposals for each institution shall go through the normal program approval procedures for the institutions and segments, including formal approval and recognition by each governing board.

(4) A memorandum of understanding between or among cooperating institutions shall be included when the program proposal is submitted.

(5) Each institution is responsible for designating a program director. The program directors shall inform each other as they administer the program, select or assign faculty, set common admissions standards, coordinate curriculum modifications, monitor operations, plan budgets, write grants, and establish joint library purchases.

(6) Distribution of course work in the major field of study is based on programmatic requirements and the respective strengths of cooperating institutions. The ideal

arrangement approximates an *even* division of curriculum responsibilities between or among the cooperating institutions. The proposed degree shall be consistent with the institutional mission as it is outlined in the State Plan.

(7) An arrangement shall exist for recruiting and admitting students and for administration of student support services in joint degree programs.

(8) A mechanism shall exist for monitoring and evaluating programs, with provisions for participation by faculty, students, and administrators from each institution involved.

F. Requirements for Primary Degree Programs.

(1) One or more institutions may offer a primary degree program.

(2) The diploma shall be awarded by the primary institution.

(3) The program shall be planned by the institution awarding the degree. However, the institution designated as primary assumes responsibility for ensuring the involvement of other institutions of higher education having particular and complementary strengths in the same or similar program area. The program proposal shall show the actual involvement of other institutions of higher education in such areas as coursework, faculty, and facilities.

(4) A memorandum of understanding between or among cooperating institutions shall be included when the program proposal is submitted.

(5) The primary institution shall offer at least 2/3 of the course requirements. The proposed degree shall be consistent with the institutional mission as it is outlined in the State Plan. Other institutions may participate by the appropriate and complementary addition of courses, faculty, and facilities.

(6) Students shall be matriculated at the primary institution as degree candidates in accordance with the policies for degree completion requirements at that institution. Advising and other student services shall be provided by the primary institution but this does not preclude appropriate involvement in these areas by the cooperating institution.

(7) The primary institution is responsible for all administrative functions associated with the program, including communication and relationships with the cooperating institutions.

(8) The primary institution is responsible for the continuing evaluation of the program in accordance with institutional policies. The evaluation process shall provide an opportunity for the involvement of representatives from cooperating institutions, as appropriate.

Appendix 16. Steps in MHEC's New Program Review Process

Submission of a Program Proposal.

If a proposed program can be implemented using existing resources, the program proposal may be submitted simultaneously to the institution's governing board and the Secretary. Otherwise, the program proposal will be approved by the appropriate governing board before submission to the Secretary.

A program proposal from a public institution must provide documentation as required by Education Article, §11.206.1(c), Annotated Code of Maryland.

Within 10 days after receipt of a program proposal, the Commission:

Shall notify an institution of the status of the institution's proposal; and

May request documentation deemed to be missing or insufficient in response to the program review parameters.

A program proposal is not considered to be complete until the applicant submits supporting documentation requested by the Commission.

The submission of substantial supplemental information beyond that requested by the Commission may cause a program proposal to be changed significantly, and thereby cause the proposal to be considered a new submission, triggering another 60-day review.

Review of a Program Proposal.

The Secretary shall review each program proposal according to the criteria for program review in Regulation .06 of this chapter and the delegation of the Commission authority in Regulation .04 of this chapter.

Immediately after receipt of a completed program proposal, the Secretary shall:

Inform all institutions and segments of the proposal; and

Allow a 30-day period for comments and objections.

The Secretary or an institution may file an objection to implementation of a proposed program if the objection is based on:

(a) Inconsistency of the proposed program with the institution's approved mission;

(b) Not meeting a regional or Statewide need consistent with the State Plan;

(c) Unreasonable program duplication which would cause demonstrable harm to another institution; or

(d) Violation of the State's equal educational opportunity obligations under State and federal law.

If an objection is filed under §B(3) of this regulation, the Commission shall immediately notify the proposing institution's governing board and president.

The Secretary shall determine that an institutional objection is justified if it is based upon the criteria in §8(3) of this regulation and is accompanied by detailed data and information supporting the reasons for the objection.

The Secretary may request additional information from the proposing or objecting institutions.

If the Secretary determines that an objection is justified under §8(5) of this regulation, the Secretary shall negotiate with the proposing institution's governing board and president, or designees, to modify the proposed program in order to resolve the objection.

The Secretary may invite representatives of the objecting institution to any negotiations.

If the objection cannot be resolved within 30 days of receipt of an objection, the Secretary shall make a final determination on the proposed new program unless the respective representatives of the proposing and objecting institutions agree to a longer negotiation period.

The review shall be completed within 60 days of the date the Secretary determined that the program proposal was complete unless the deadline is extended with the agreement of the proposing institution.

Final Action by the Secretary.

Favorable Action.

Unless there is a request for a Commission review, favorable action by the Secretary on a completed program proposal constitutes final program approval or recommendation, and final degree authorization, if required.

An institution shall implement an approved or recommended program in accordance with the approved program proposal and the conditions set by the Secretary.

The Secretary may request an institution to submit a progress report responding to the original proposal and any conditions that may be imposed.

Unfavorable Action.

If the Secretary does not approve or recommend the program proposal, the Secretary shall provide a written explanation of the reasons for the disapproval or non-recommendation.

Following the Secretary's decision, an institution may elect to:

Revise the proposal to address the Secretary's reasons for disapproval or non-recommendation and submit the revised proposal for reconsideration; or

Have the matter reviewed by the Commission in accordance with Regulation .28 of this chapter.

A revised, resubmitted program proposal is considered a new proposal for purposes of the statutory 60-day time frame for Commission action.