



**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
Texas Public Universities and Health-Related Institutions**

**Proposal for a New Doctoral Program**

**Directions:** Texas public universities and health-related institutions complete this form to propose a new doctoral degree program. This form requires signatures of (1) the Chief Executive Officer, certifying adequacy of funding for the new program; (2) the Chief Executive Officer, acknowledging agreement to reimburse expert external reviewers' costs; (3) the Chief Financial Officer, certifying the accuracy of funding estimates for the new program; (4) a member of the Board of Regents (or designee), certifying Board of Regents approval for Coordinating Board consideration; or, if applicable, (5) a member of the Board of Regents (or designee), certifying that criteria have been met for Commissioner consideration. Institution officials should also refer to [Texas Administrative Code \(TAC\), Title 19, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.46](#), *Criteria for New Doctoral Programs*.

**Note:** An institution must submit Planning Notification prior to submitting a proposal for a new doctoral program. An institution is considered by the Board to be planning for a new doctoral program if it takes any action that leads to the preparation of a proposal for a new program. This includes hiring personnel, including consultants and planning deans, leasing and/or purchasing real estate, building facilities, and/or developing curriculum. Planning Notification must be submitted at least one year prior to submission of a proposal to offer the degree, if the proposed program leads to the award of a professional degree, as defined by [Texas Education Code 61.306](#). Institutions submit Planning Notification through the online submission portal, as a letter to the Assistant Commissioner of the Academic Division of Academic Quality and Workforce.

**Contact:** Division of Academic Quality and Workforce, 512-427-6200.

**Administrative Information**

1. Institution Name and Coordinating Board Accountability Group:
2. Proposed Program:  
Show how the proposed program would appear on the institution's Program Inventory (e.g., Doctor of Philosophy in Electrical Engineering).
3. Proposed CIP Code:  
List of CIP Codes may be accessed online at [www.txhighereddata.org/Interactive/CIP/](http://www.txhighereddata.org/Interactive/CIP/).  
Include justification if the proposed program name is not included in the Texas Classification of Instructional Programs.

4. Location and Delivery of the Proposed Program:  
Provide the location of instruction and how the proposed program will be delivered to students (e.g., Instructed on the main campus in Lubbock, face-to-face).
  
5. Administrative Unit:  
Identify where the proposed program would fit within the organizational structure of the institution (e.g., Department of Electrical Engineering within the College of Engineering).
  
6. Program Description:  
Describe the proposed program.
  
7. Proposed Implementation Date:  
Provide the date that students would enter the proposed program (MM/DD/YYYY).
  
8. Institutional and Department Contacts:  
Provide contact information for the person(s) responsible for addressing any questions related to the proposal.
  1. Name:  
  
Title:  
  
E-mail:  
  
Phone:
  2. Name:  
  
Title:  
  
E-mail:  
  
Phone:

## Proposed Doctoral Program Information

### I. Need

#### A. Job Market Need

Demonstrating the need for additional graduates in the field is vital. Provide short- and long-term evidence of the need for graduates in the Texas and U.S. job markets. Cite the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Texas Workforce Commission, professional association data, and other documented data sources to create a supply/demand analysis. Institutions should be able to show how the number of new graduates produced both in Texas and nationally compares to the number of job openings that require a doctoral degree in the discipline now and in the future on both the state and national levels. The use of predictive modeling is encouraged. If the program is designed to address particular regional or state needs in addition to workforce demands, provide a detailed description.

#### B. Existing Programs

The information provided indicates knowledge of existing programs in Texas and of high-ranking programs nationally. This section provides an understanding of program duplication, capacity, and quality. Identify all existing degree programs in the state, include those specific to the region and major programs at peer institutions across the nation. Peer institutions have similar missions, doctoral-research/scholarship programs, and research expenditures. Peer institutions include, but are not limited to, out-of-state peer groups identified in the Coordinating Board's Accountability System.

Identify the existing programs and their locations in Texas. Provide enrollments and graduates of these programs for the last five years, and explain how the proposed program would not unnecessarily duplicate existing or similar programs in Texas. Provide evidence that existing Texas programs are at or near capacity and describe how the existing programs are not meeting current workforce needs. Provide the job placement of existing Texas programs.

Include an assessment of capacity to accept additional students in existing Texas programs. One indicator of capacity is the faculty-to-student ratio in existing programs in the discipline. Another indicator is the number of students admitted to a program in comparison to the number of qualified applicants.

#### C. Student Demand

Provide short- and long-term evidence of student demand for the proposed program. Types of data commonly used to demonstrate this include increased enrollment in related and feeder programs at the institution, high enrollment in similar programs at other institutions, qualified applicants rejected at similar programs in the state, and student surveys (if used, include data collection and analysis methods). Surveying students currently enrolled in feeder programs provides limited data about actual student demand. Information that demonstrates student interest includes the development of a student interest group. Provide documentation that qualified applicants are leaving Texas for similar programs in other states.

#### **D. Student Recruitment**

Plans to recruit students are realistic and based on evidence of student demand and unmet need in similar programs in Texas. Indicate if the proposed program and its discipline are projected to have a special attraction for students of a particular population. Be specific about efforts to recruit students from underrepresented groups.

#### **E. Enrollment Projections**

Enrollment projections are realistic and based on demonstrable student demand. Projections take into account student attrition, graduation rates, and part-time students. Attrition calculations should be based upon the average rates of related supporting graduate programs at the institution, if available.

Complete Table 1 to show the estimated cumulative headcount and full-time student equivalent (FTSE) enrollment for the first five years of the proposed program, including the ethnic breakdown of the projected enrollment (White, African American, Hispanic, International, Other). Include summer enrollments, if relevant, in the same year as fall enrollments. Subtract students as necessary for projected graduations or attrition. Provide explanations of how headcounts, FTSE numbers, projections for underrepresented students, and attrition were determined. Define full-time and part-time status.

**Table 1.** Enrollment Projections

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
White					
African American					
Hispanic					
International					
Other					
<b>Total New Students</b>					
Attrition					
<b>Cumulative Headcount</b>					
FTSE					
Graduates					

## **II. Academics**

#### **A. Accreditation**

If the discipline has a national accrediting body, describe plans and timeline to obtain accreditation. For disciplines where licensure of graduates is necessary for employment, such as clinical psychology, plans for accreditation are required. If the program will not seek accreditation, provide a detailed rationale. If doctoral-level accreditation is not available but is projected to become so within the next five years, include that information. It is not necessary to provide copies of the accreditation criteria.

#### **B. Admissions Standards**

Admissions standards are set to admit the most qualified students through a rigorous and competitive process. Standards are appropriate for the discipline. Standards are set to ensure full enrollment, as projected in the proposal, and will allow the program to become nationally recognized.

Describe the institution's general graduate admissions standards and the program-specific admissions standards for applicants of the proposed program. The description addresses how the proposed program will seek to become nationally competitive. Provide specific information about minimum grade point averages, standardized test score, and TOEFL iBT score requirements. Explain how students will be assessed for readiness to enroll in program coursework. Include any policies for accepting students transferring from other graduate programs. Explain whether the proposed program will accept full-time and part-time students.

### C. Program Degree Requirements

Describe the similarities and differences between the proposed program and peer programs in Texas and nationally. Indicate the different credit hour and curricular requirements, if any, for students entering with a bachelor's degree and students entering with a master's degree. Minimum semester credit hours should be comparable to peer programs. Texas Education Code 61.059 (I) limits institutions from receiving formula funding for doctoral students who have taken more than 99 total semester credit hours. Provide a justification if the program requires more than 60 semester credit hours beyond the master's degree or 90 hours beyond the baccalaureate. Acceptable justifications may include licensure or accreditation requirements.

Complete Table 2 to show the degree requirements of the proposed program. If requirements vary for students entering with a master's degree or comparable qualifications, provide an explanation. Modify the table as needed. If necessary, replicate the table to show more than one option.

**Table 2:** Semester Credit Hour Requirements by Category

Category	SCH Entering with a Bachelor's	SCH Entering with a Master's
Required Courses		
Prescribed Electives		
Electives		
Dissertation		
Other (Specify, e.g., internships, clinical work, residencies)		
<b>TOTAL<sup>1</sup></b>		

<sup>1</sup> Texas Education Code 61.059 (I) limits funding for doctoral students to 99 SCH. Programs may be allowed to require additional SCH, if there is a compelling academic reason.

Complete Table 3 to provide a comparison of the proposed program to existing and/or similar programs in Texas in terms of total required semester credit hours (SCH). Modify the table as needed.

**Table 3.** Semester Credit Hour Requirements of Similar Programs in Texas

Institution	Program CIP Code	Degree Program	SCH, Entering with a Bachelor's	SCH Entering with a Master's

#### D. Curriculum

Describe the educational objectives of the proposed program. For the description of educational objectives, distinguish between aspects of the curriculum that are standard for the field and aspects that would be unique to the proposed program.

If the proposed program has a unique focus or niche, describe it in relationship to peer programs. Indicate how the niche or specialties of the proposed program are appropriate for the job market and student demand, and describe how they complement other peer programs in the state (or nation, if relevant).

Describe how the proposed program would achieve national prominence. Indicate if the proposed program is designed to have a particular regional focus.

Provide an explanation of required, prescribed, and elective courses and how they fulfill program requirements.

Describe policies for transfer of credit, course credit by examination, credit for professional experience, placing out of courses, and any accelerated advancement to candidacy. Provide a plan that would allow a student entering with relevant work experience to rapidly progress through the program or provide an explanation why this would not apply.

Identify any alternative learning strategies, such as competency-based education, that may increase efficiency in student progress in the curriculum. If no such policies are in place to improve student progression through a program, provide an explanation.

Complete Tables 4, 5, and 6 to list the required/core courses, prescribed elective courses, and elective courses of the proposed program and semester credit hours (SCH). Note with an asterisk (\*) courses that would be added if the proposed program is approved. Modify the tables as needed. If applicable, replicate the tables for different tracks/options.

**Table 4.** Required/Core Courses

Prefix and Number	Required/Core Course Title	SCH

**Table 5.** Prescribed Elective Courses

Prefix and Number	Prescribed Elective Course Title	SCH

**Table 6.** Elective Courses

Prefix and Number	Elective Course Title	SCH

#### **E. Candidacy and Dissertation**

If the proposed program requires a dissertation, describe the process leading to candidacy and completion of the dissertation. Describe policies related to dissertation hours, such as a requirement to enroll in a certain number of dissertation hours each semester. If there is no dissertation required, describe the summative activities leading to the degree. Indicate if a master's degree or other certification is awarded to students who leave the program after completing the coursework, but before the dissertation defense.

#### **F. Delivery Modes, Use of Distance Technologies, and Delivery of Instruction**

If an institution is offering more than 50 percent of its proposed program via distance education modality, the Learning Technology Advisory Committee will also review the proposed program. It is expected that if an institution offers *any* portion of its program via distance education that it will have sufficient technology resources to deliver doctoral-level education from a distance without sacrificing quality. Provide documentation that the distance education options are appropriate for the course content and built into the curriculum accordingly.

Describe the use of distance technologies in the program, including a description of interactions between students and faculty, opportunities for students to access educational resources related to the program, exchanges with the academic community, and in-depth mentoring and evaluation of students.

Describe the various delivery modes that will be used to deliver coursework and any special arrangements for specific sites where students will meet. Describe equipment, software, and connectivity needs for delivery of this program both for students and for the institution.

Include a specific emphasis on the delivery mode(s) and include the following information:

- a. Describe the typical course and its delivery method.
- b. Describe the presence of text, graphics, video clips, graphical interactions, and self-tests, etc.
- c. Will courses be taught completely on-line or will they be hybrid? If a course or program will include face-to-face meetings, how will they occur?
- d. What platform will be used to deliver the electronic components of the program?
- e. How will sustained faculty-student and student-student interaction be facilitated?
- f. What is the anticipated student-faculty ratio?

#### **G. Program Evaluation**

Describe how the proposed program will be evaluated. Describe any reviews that would be required by an accreditor, and show how the proposed program would be evaluated under [Board Rule 5.52](#).

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.

Describe how evaluations would be carried out. Describe how the results of evaluation would be used to improve distance delivery.

The institution's *Characteristics of Doctoral Programs* are current. Describe the plan for using the *Characteristics of Doctoral Programs* for ongoing evaluation of the proposed program and quality improvement. Include the link to the institution's designated website for existing doctoral programs.

#### **H. Strategic Plan and Marketable Skills**

Describe how the proposed doctoral program fits into the institution's overall strategic plan, and provide the web link to the institution's strategic plan.

Describe how the proposed program will align with the state's *60x30TX plan*, and address the goals related to completion, marketable skills, and student debt. Specifically identify the marketable skills the students will attain through the proposed program. Explain how students will be informed of the marketable skills included in the proposed program.

Explain how the proposed program builds on and expands the institution's existing recognized strengths.

## I. Related and Supporting Programs

Provide data on existing bachelor's and master's programs that would support the proposed program, including applications, admissions, enrollments, and numbers of graduates. Provide graduation rates of related and/or supporting master's programs.

Complete Table 7 with a list of all existing programs that would support the proposed program. This includes all programs in the same two-digit CIP code, and any other programs (graduate and undergraduate) that may be relevant. Include data for the applications, admissions, enrollments, and number of graduates for each of the last five years. Modify the table as needed. The example provided in Table 7 shows degree programs that would relate to or support an additional Ph.D. in another area of chemistry, for example a proposal for a PhD in Chemistry (40.0501).

**Table 7.** Related and Supporting Programs

	20XX	20XX	20XX	20XX	20XX
<b>e.g., BS in Chemistry (40.0501)</b>					
Applications					
Admissions					
Enrollment					
Graduates					
<b>e.g., MS in Chemistry (40.0501)</b>					
Applications					
Admissions					
Enrollment					
Graduation Rate					
<b>e.g., Ph.D. in Chemistry (40.0501)</b>					
Applications					
Admissions					
Enrollment					
Graduation Rate					

## J. Existing Doctoral Programs

The addition of a new doctoral program should build upon the success of the institution's current doctoral programs. Proposals for new doctoral programs will be considered in context to the success of an institution's existing doctoral programs. Provide the most recent five years of data on enrollments and numbers of graduates for existing doctoral programs.

Describe how existing closely related doctoral programs would enhance and complement the proposed program. Describe all interdisciplinary relationships of the proposed program with existing programs. Also, check to see if any of the institution's doctoral programs are on the Low-Producing Programs list. If any existing doctoral programs are low-producing, list them and provide an explanation for the low productivity and plans for addressing the issue. For new doctoral programs approved during the last five years, check the Annual Progress Reports to determine if the program(s) are meeting institutional projections. Address how the proposed program would meet the proposed projections.

## K. Recent Graduates Employment

For existing related and supporting graduate programs (master's and doctoral), provide an overview of graduate employment by listing the overall number and percentage of graduates employed within one year of graduation. Also, provide information on the specific jobs held by recent graduates of the programs, such as job titles, fields of employment, and the location and names of their employers.

## III. Faculty

### A. Faculty Availability

The core faculty members should already be employed by the institution. Core Faculty are full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who would teach 50 percent or more in the proposed program or other individuals integral to the proposed program and who could direct dissertation research. The proposed program should currently have at least four full-time equivalent (FTE) qualified core faculty members. Faculty to student ratios should be comparable to peer programs. Existing programs should not be significantly weakened if core faculty are to be reassigned to the proposed program. Support Faculty are other full- or part-time faculty who would be affiliated with the proposed program. The addition of the newly proposed program should not negatively affect the existing programs in related areas. The stated specialties of the faculty should align with the proposed course offerings.

Complete Table 8 to provide information about Core Faculty. Add an asterisk (\*) before the names of the individuals who would have direct administrative responsibilities for the proposed program. Add a pound symbol (#) before the name of any individuals who have directed doctoral dissertations or master's theses. Modify the table as needed.

**Table 8.** Core Faculty

Name and Rank of Core Faculty	Highest Degree and Awarding Institution	Courses Assigned in Program	% Time Assigned to Program
<i>e.g.: Robertson, David Assoc. Prof</i>	<i>PhD. in Molecular Genetics Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison</i>	<i>MG200, MG285 MG824 (Lab Only)</i>	<i>50%</i>
Projected New Core Faculty in Year ____			

Support Faculty are other full- or part-time faculty who would be affiliated with the proposed program. Modify the table as needed. Complete Table 9 to provide information about Support Faculty.

**Table 9.** Support Faculty

Name and Rank of Support Faculty	Highest Degree and Awarding Institution	Courses Assigned in Program or Other Support Activity	% Time Assigned to Program
<i>e.g.: Robertson, David Assoc. Prof</i>	<i>PhD. in Molecular Genetics Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison</i>	<i>MG200, MG285 MG824 (Lab Only)</i>	<i>10%</i>
Projected New Support Faculty in Year ____			

### B. Teaching Load

Indicate the targeted teaching load for core faculty supporting the proposed program. Teaching load is the total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty, divided by the number of core faculty at the institution the previous year. Provide an assessment of the impact the proposed program will have, if approved, on faculty workload for existing related programs at the institution.

A two-two load for faculty supporting a doctoral program should be the target. The teaching load may vary according to discipline, but it should be low enough to allow the faculty to continue advanced research, supervise dissertations, and provide advising for the proposed program's students. The teaching load of faculty should be comparable to peer programs and meet the institution's standards.

If the distance program will result in additional students, describe how faculty resources will be provided (hiring additional faculty, reallocating faculty resources from other programs, etc.).

### C. Core Faculty Productivity

Scholarly activity is determined by calculating the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, books/book chapters, juried creative/performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries filed/patents issued per core faculty member over the last five years. A minimum of two peer-reviewed publications per year is expected for research faculty, although this may vary according to the expectations of the discipline and the required professional activity of the faculty. Faculty supporting doctoral-level professional practice degrees should be engaged in research, applied or otherwise, that has the potential to improve clinical practice and appear in publications relevant to the field.

Complete Tables 10 and 11 to provide information about faculty productivity, including the number of publications and scholarly activities and grant awards. Table 10 shows the most recent five years of data by Core Faculty, including the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, books/book chapters, juried creative/performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries filed/patents issued.

Where relevant to performing arts degrees, major performances or creative endeavors by Core Faculty should be included. Examples are provided below. Do not include conference papers, reviews, posters, and similar scholarship. The format of the tables and information may vary, as long as the information is conveyed clearly. Include a list of the key journals in the field.

**Table 10:** Total Faculty Publications and Other Scholarly/Creative Accomplishments for the Past Five Years

Faculty Name	Refereed Papers	Book Chapters	Books	Juried Creative/Performance	Patents
<i>e.g., Mencimer, Jennifer</i>	12	3	2	0	5
<i>e.g., Walker, Guy</i>	22	8	0	0	1

Table 11 shows the number and amount of external grants by Core Faculty. If applicable to the field, faculty should be securing external research funds. For each core faculty member, provide the total amount of external funding generated within the past five years (consistent with the methodology used for calculating scholarly activity). Grants earned at institutions or organizations other than the applying institution should not be counted unless the grant money carries over with the faculty member to the applying institution.

**Table 11.** External Grant Awards for the Past Five Years

Faculty Name	Grant Source	Grant Subject	Dates	Total Grant Amount	Institutional Amount
<i>e.g., Mencimer, Jennifer</i>	<i>National Science Foundation</i>	<i>Extragalactic Astronomy</i>	<i>2017-2021</i>	<i>\$5,000,000</i>	<i>\$2,500,000</i>
<i>e.g., Walker, Guy</i>	<i>Fund for Astrophysical Research</i>	<i>Develop Astronomical Equipment</i>	<i>2017-18</i>	<i>\$400,000</i>	<i>\$400,000</i>

#### **D. Faculty Professional Development and Curriculum Support**

Describe the training in delivering instruction via distance education faculty members currently have or will be given. Describe any support that will be available for the start-up development of the courseware.

## **IV. Resources**

### **A. Student Financial Assistance**

To be competitive, it is critical that institutions offer comprehensive financial assistance packages to recruit and retain high-quality doctoral students. Providing financial assistance for doctoral students engaged in coursework and dissertation writing is recommended.

Identify the number of full- and part-time students who would be funded and the anticipated amounts for each of the first five years. Provide a plan to provide financial support for at least 50 percent of the full-time students enrolled in the proposed program. Provide a description that demonstrates that the level of financial support will be comparable to or competitive with existing doctoral programs in the discipline. Provide examples of assistance for other similar programs. Budget information should address the amount of assistantships per student, tuition and fee arrangements, and benefits, if any.

Modify the table as needed to distinguish between Teaching Assistantships, Research Assistantships, and Scholarships/Grants. If student financial assistance is reliant upon grant funding, explain how funding will be consistently sustained if grant income falls short of projections. Additionally, show how the level of student support compares to the anticipated overall student cost of tuition and fees.

Some professional programs do not typically support doctoral students. In addition, some programs have high numbers of part-time students who work full-time (e.g., Education and Public Affairs), and financial support for such students is not expected.

**Table 12.** Student Financial Assistance

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>Teaching Assistantships</b>	# of Full-time students					
	Amount per student					
	# of Part-time students					
	Amount per student					
<b>Research Assistantships</b>	# of Full-time students					
	Amount per student					
	# of Part-time students					
	Amount per student					
<b>Scholarships</b>	# of Full-time students					
	Amount per student					
	# of Part-time students					
	Amount per student					

## **B. Library Resources**

A printout of the library's relevant holdings or a list of the planned acquisitions is not necessary. A letter or other statement from the librarian describing the adequacy of existing resources is required (include as Item E in Required Appendices). Provide the library director's assessment of both paper and electronic library resources necessary for the proposed program. Describe plans to build the library holdings to support the proposed program. Include the amount allocated to the proposed program.

Describe how students will access library resources, including print, electronic, and in person. Describe how communication with the library and interaction with the library staff and librarians occur. Describe how resources are made available in a format that is accessible to remote students.

## **C. Facilities and Equipment**

Describe the availability and adequacy of facilities and equipment to support the proposed program. Describe plans for new facilities and equipment, improvements, additions, and renovations.

Provide the amount of anticipated expenditures related to facilities and equipment, and include those amounts in the budget under "Costs and Revenues." Also, describe the status of all building project(s) related to the program and include the schedule for completion. For shared equipment and facilities, describe availability for the proposed program.

**D. Support Staff**

Describe plans, if any, to increase or reallocate support staff in order to provide sufficient services for the projected increases in students and faculty. Provide confirmation that existing programs will not be significantly weakened if staff are to be reassigned to the proposed program.

**E. External Learning**

If the proposed program requires an Internship, Clerkship, Clinical Experience, or other external learning opportunity explain how and where this requirement would be met. Describe plans for developing and maintaining this aspect of the proposed program, and provide confirmation that the additional requirements would not negatively affect other programs at the institution. If specific plans for external learning are already developed, list the name of the facility, the city and county of location, a brief description of the facility and its services, and an estimated number of student placements. Explain the impact this new program would have, if approved, on the available number of external learning opportunities in Texas for this type of program.

**F. List of Potential Expert External Reviewers**

Develop a list of suitable expert external reviewers for the proposed program who could provide a desk review and/or serve on a site visit team. Expert External Reviewers should have recognized expertise in the discipline and hold the rank of full professor or senior administrator at institutions with top-ranked programs. Potential expert external reviewers should not have close ties to the institution that could generate a conflict of interest. Potential expert external reviewers should be from institutions outside the state of Texas. Institutions are responsible for reimbursing the Coordinating Board for the travel expenses incurred by and fees paid to expert external reviewers used for desk reviews and site visits that are part of the doctoral review process.

Provide the names and contact information for six potential expert external reviewers to review the proposed program. Describe concisely the qualifications of each expert external reviewer.

**Table 13.** Institution's Proposed Expert External Reviewers

<b>Reviewer #1</b>	
<b>Name</b>	
<b>Title and Rank</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	
<b>Phone #</b>	
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Qualifications/Expertise</b>	
<b>Reviewer #2</b>	
<b>Name</b>	
<b>Title and Rank</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	
<b>Phone #</b>	
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Qualifications/Expertise</b>	
<b>Reviewer #3</b>	
<b>Name</b>	
<b>Title and Rank</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	
<b>Phone #</b>	
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Qualifications/Expertise</b>	
<b>Reviewer #4</b>	
<b>Name</b>	
<b>Title and Rank</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	
<b>Phone #</b>	
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Qualifications/Expertise</b>	
<b>Reviewer #5</b>	
<b>Name</b>	
<b>Title and Rank</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	
<b>Phone #</b>	
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Qualifications/Expertise</b>	
<b>Reviewer #6</b>	
<b>Name</b>	
<b>Title and Rank</b>	
<b>Institution</b>	
<b>Phone #</b>	
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Qualifications/Expertise</b>	

## **G. Five-Year Costs and Funding Sources Summary**

Adding a new doctoral degree program will cost the institution some amount of money. Calculating the costs and identifying the funding sources associated with implementation of a new doctoral program requires several institutional offices to collaborate to present an accurate estimate.

Provide an overview of new and reallocated costs for the proposed program using the form Costs to the Institution of the Proposed Doctoral Program. Faculty salaries include all faculty assigned to the proposed program. If an existing faculty member is reassigned to the program, the salary is reflected as a reallocated cost. New faculty salaries need to be competitive for the discipline, and figures include start-up costs in proportion to the new faculty member's allotted time in the proposed program. Faculty salaries do not include benefits or pensions. If the proposed program will hire new faculty, it is a new cost. Program administration includes all institutional costs associated with running the program, including amounts associated with the Dean's office, Institutional Research, and other administrative costs. Graduate Assistant costs are identified either as new or reallocated, as appropriate. Clerical/Staff include specific costs associated with the new program. This includes the additional staff needed to organize applications, prepare for the proposed program, and for general administration of the proposed program. If the enrollments in the proposed program are projected to be large, the associated costs related to clerical/staff may also be more. New staff or purchases of new equipment should be adequate to support the stated goals and enrollments for the proposed program. Other program costs identified in the proposal should be realistic.

Total funding for the proposed program should meet or exceed total costs by the end of the first five years. On the forms provided, include a description of sources for existing and anticipated external funding. Include explanatory footnotes as needed.

Because enrollments are uncertain and programs need institutional support during their start-up phase, institutions should demonstrate that they could provide:

- 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
- half of the costs of the proposed program during years three through five from sources other than state funding.

Funding sources may include formula income, other state funding, tuition and fees, reallocation of existing resources, federal funding, and other funding (such as awarded grants). The total projected income of state funding, tuition and fees, and private funds will allow the proposed program to become self-sufficient within five years.

Consult with your institution's Institutional Research department when calculating the formula funding.

When estimating program funding for new programs, institutions take into account that students switching programs do not generate additional formula funds for the institution. For example, if a new doctoral program has ten students, but six of them switched into the program from existing master's programs at the institution, only four

of the doctoral students would generate additional formula funding.

The Other State Funding 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).

Reallocation of Existing Resources includes the salary of faculty reassigned who may be partially or wholly reallocated to the new program. Explain how the current teaching obligations of those faculty are reallocated and include any faculty replacement costs as program costs in the budget. If substantial funds are reallocated, explain how existing undergraduate and graduate programs will be affected.

Federal Funding (In-hand only) refers to federal monies from grants or other sources currently in hand. 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.

Tuition and Fees includes revenue generated by the institution from student tuition and fees.

Other Funding category may include auxiliary enterprises, special endowment income, or other extramural funding.

#### **H. Signature Page**

The appropriate signature page must be selected and signed by the required institutional official and board of regents.

### **V. Additional Distance Education Delivery Consideration**

#### **A. Adherence to *Principles of Good Practice***

Submit the Certification Form or provide a statement from the Chief Academic Officer certifying adherence to *Principles of Good Practice* as well as adherence to Coordinating Board distance education rules and policies.

#### **B. Administrative Oversight and Structure**

Identify the person/office directly responsible for the overall management of the proposed program. Identify other responsibilities of the person/office with primary responsibility and any modifications in responsibility made to accommodate the program. Describe the ways in which the delivery method will affect the proposed program.

For online programs:

1. How will exam proctoring and monitoring be managed and evaluated?
2. How will user authentication be validated?
3. How will the proposed program assure compliance with accessibility standards and regulations (institutional, state, and federal) for instructional delivery, course materials, and other components of the proposed program?

### **C. Collaborative Arrangements**

Describe all collaborative arrangements with other institutions that will be participating in the delivery of the proposed program. Be certain to identify the:

1. Responsibilities of each institution.
2. Process for the credentialing of faculty at each participant site.
3. Institution awarding credit.

### **D. Program Differences**

If the proposed program will be delivered both on-campus face-to-face at the main campus and at a distance, describe all differences between on-campus and distance delivery, including:

1. Student admission and advisement.
2. Qualifying and other exams.
3. Independent study.
4. Courses and sequencing.
5. Library access.
6. Discuss the accommodations available for students with special needs to assure accessibility to the course materials, activities, and support services related to the proposed program.

### **E. Student Interactions**

- Describe the orientation process. Beyond the courses, how are students oriented to the services of the institution – library, student support, etc.
- Describe how electronic and on-campus students would interact. How will interactions occur between distance education students?
- Describe how instructor and students will interact throughout the program. Include interactions both in and out of the classroom setting. How is the sense of community developed? As a doctoral program, detail how you can create a residency equivalent experience.
- Describe residency requirements.
- Describe the advisement process throughout the proposed program.
- Describe how you plan to address dissertation requirements, oversight, and mentoring during the dissertation process.

## **VI. Required Appendices**

### **A. Course Descriptions and Prescribed Sequence of Courses**

### **B. Five-Year Faculty Recruitment Plan/Hiring Schedule**

### **C. Institution's Policy on Faculty Teaching Load**

If teaching load policy is set at the departmental level, include that information.

### **D. Itemized List of Capital Equipment Purchases During the Past Five Years<sup>1</sup>**

*Equipment* means an article of nonexpendable, tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost, which equals or exceeds the lesser of the capitalization level established by the governmental unit for financial statement purposes, or \$5,000.

### **E. Librarian's Statement of Adequate Resources**

### **F. Articulation Agreements with Partner Institutions**

Include copies of any agreements or Memoranda of Understanding related to the proposed program. These include formal and sustained arrangements with other universities, private businesses, or governmental agencies that contribute directly to the proposed program and student research/residency opportunities.

### **G. Curricula Vitae for Core Faculty**

### **H. Curricula Vitae for Support Faculty**

### **I. List of Specific Clinical or In-Service Sites to Support the Proposed Program**

### **J. Letters of Support from Peer Institutions and/or Area Employers**

Letters from regional and national companies who have made commitments to hire doctoral graduates from the proposed new program are particularly helpful. Also, include statements of support or commitments to shared research projects from other institutions in the state with similar doctoral programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Equipment" has the meaning established in the Texas Administrative Code §252.7(3) as items and components whose cost are over \$5,000 and have a useful life of at least one year.

## Costs to the Institution of the Proposed Program

Complete the table to show the costs to the institution that are anticipated from the proposed program.

Cost Category	Cost Sub-Category	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year	TOTALS
Faculty Salaries <sup>1</sup>	New						
	Reallocated						
Program Administration	New						
	Reallocated						
Graduate Assistants	New						
	Reallocated						
Clerical/Staff	New						
	Reallocated						
Student Support (Scholarships)							
Supplies and Materials							
Library & Instructional Technology Resources <sup>2</sup>							
Equipment <sup>2</sup>							
Facilities							
Other (Identify)							
TOTALS							

<sup>1</sup> Report costs for new faculty hires, graduate assistants, and technical support personnel. For new faculty, prorate individual salaries as a percentage of the time assigned to the program. If existing faculty will contribute to program, include costs necessary to maintain existing programs (e.g., cost of adjunct to cover courses previously taught by faculty who would teach in new program).

<sup>2</sup> Equipment has the meaning established in the Texas Administrative Code §252.7(3) as items and components whose cost are over \$5,000 and have a useful life of at least one year.

### Anticipated Sources of Funding

Complete the table to show the amounts anticipated from various sources to cover new costs to the institution as a result of the proposed program. Use the Non-Formula Sources of Funding form to specify each non-general revenue source.

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

<sup>1</sup> Indicate formula funding for students new to the institution because of the program; formula funding should be included only for years three through five of the program and should reflect enrollment projections for years three through five.

<sup>2</sup> Report other sources of funding here. In-hand grants, "likely" future grants, and special item funding can be included.

## Non-Formula Sources of Funding

Complete the table to specify each of the non-formula funding sources for the amounts listed on the Anticipated Sources of Funding form.

Funding Category	Non-Formula Funding Sources
II. Other State Funding	#1
	#2
III. Reallocation of Existing Resources	#1
	#2
IV. Federal Funding (In-hand only)	#1
	#2
V. Tuition and Fees	#1
	#2
VI. Other Funding	#1
	#2

## **H. Institutional and Board of Regents Signature Page for Board Consideration**

**1. Adequacy of Funding** – The Chief Executive Officer shall sign the following statement:

*I certify that the institution has adequate funds to cover the costs of the new program. Furthermore, the new program will not reduce the effectiveness or quality of existing programs at the institution.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**2. Accuracy of Financial Estimates** – The Chief Financial Officer shall sign the following statement:

*I certify that the estimated costs and sources of funding presented in the proposal are complete and accurate.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Financial Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**3. Reimbursement of Expert External Reviewer Costs** – The Chief Executive Officer shall sign the following statement:

*I understand that the doctoral proposal process includes the use of expert external reviewers. In the event that one or more expert external reviewer are contracted to review a doctoral proposal put forward by my institution, I understand that my institution will be required to reimburse the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for costs associated with the use of such expert external reviewers. By signing, I agree on behalf of my institution to provide reimbursement for expert external reviewer costs.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost/Chief Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**4. Board of Regents Certification of Criteria for Board Consideration** – The Board of Regents or designee must certify that the new program has been approved by the Board of Regents and meets the criteria under Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 19, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.46.

*On behalf of the Board of Regents, I certify that the new program meets the criteria specified under Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 19, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.46 and has been approved by the Board of Regents.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board of Regents (Designee)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## H. Board of Regents Signature Page for Commissioner Consideration

- 5. Board of Regents Certification of Criteria for Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner Consideration** – Typically proposals for doctoral programs are approved by the Board, supported with a recommendation for approval by the Commissioner. Under very limited circumstances, a program may be approved by the Commissioner. In this case only, the Board of Regents or designee must certify that the new program meets the criteria under Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 19, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.50 (b) and (c).

TAC §5.50(b) The program:

- (1) has a curriculum, faculty, resources, support services, and other components of a degree program that are comparable to those of high quality programs in the same or similar disciplines at other institutions;
- (2) has sufficient clinical or in-service sites, if applicable, to support the program;
- (3) is consistent with the standards of the Commission of Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges and, if applicable, with the standards or discipline-specific accrediting agencies and licensing agencies;
- (4) attracts students on a long-term basis and produce graduates who would have opportunities for employment; or the program is appropriate for the development of a well-rounded array of basic baccalaureate degree programs at the institution;
- (5) does not unnecessarily duplicate existing programs at other institutions;
- (6) does not be dependent on future Special Item funding;
- (7) has new five-year costs that would not exceed \$2 million.

TAC §5.50(c) The program:

- (1-2) is in a closely related discipline to an already existing doctoral program(s) which is productive and of high quality;
- (3) has core faculty that are already active and productive in an existing doctoral program;
- (4) has a strong link with workforce needs or the economic development of the state; and
- (5) the institution has notified Texas public institutions that offer the proposed program or a related program and resolved any objections.

*On behalf of the Board of Regents, I certify that the new program meets the criteria specified under Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 19, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.50 (b) and (c) and has been approved by the Board of Regents.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board of Regents (Designee)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date