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**STANDARDS FOR New Academic Degree ProgramS**

**FORM FOR Consultants EVALUATING PROPOSALS**

The standards for new academic degree program review are based on the regulations in New Jersey Administrative Code (N.J.A.C.) Title 9A – Higher Education, specifically N.J.A.C. 9A:1-2.10 through 2.14. As appropriate, required and recommended forms of evidence of fulfillment of the standards are described in this document. *Recommended elements provided in italics are intended to offer additional guidance to enhance and strengthen new academic degree program proposals.*

The four standards as defined in the regulations are:

1. Sufficient academic quality
2. Sufficient evidence of labor market demand for the program
3. Duplication with comparable programs of study in the State
4. Whether the proposed new program will require significant additional State resources

In accordance with the process outlined in the *Academic Issues Committee (AIC) Manual*, institutions are required to engage an external consultant who will evaluate proposed new academic degree programs and provide to the institution a comprehensive analysis with recommendations. Institutions are required to include the consultant’s report and their response to the consultant’s report with their full program proposal submission to the AIC. The purpose of this fillable form is to provide consultants with a clear outline of all items specified in the new academic degree program regulations in order for the consultant to complete a thorough analysis and evaluation.

**The following elements of each standard are required to be addressed and should be clearly presented by the institution to aid in the evaluation by the external consultant. Proposals should be evaluated by the consultant on the basis of evidence meeting each of the standards. Consultants should comment on each item to support and contextualize their evaluation by providing comprehensive feedback, justification, and explanation.**

***Elements provided in italics are intended to offer additional guidance to enhance and strengthen new academic degree program proposals, however these items are not required and should not be held against an institution if omitted.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Institution** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **New Academic Degree Program Title** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Degree Designation** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Degree Abbreviation** | Click or tap here to enter text. |

**STANDARD 1**

**SUFFICIENT ACADEMIC QUALITY**

N.J.A.C. 9A:1-2.11

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Status of the institution’s State licensure and accreditation by a nongovernmental entity recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 2) Evidence of appropriately qualified faculty, instructors, staff instructors and/or administrators. *Additional evidence may include, as applicable, other academic units within or outside the institution (e.g., clinical sites) to provide educational services to the program and the commitment of those units is consistent with offering a program of quality in the field.*  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 3) A plan for the dedication of sufficient resources, including human resources, to implement and maintain the program. *Such resources may include library holdings and other library resources, technology, specialized facilities and equipment (laboratory or otherwise), and/or other needed resources, as applicable.*  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 4) Clearly stated program objectives that are related to the institutional mission, strategic plan, and, where appropriate, to the careers, professions, or practices into which graduates of the program are expected to enter. *Consider including a plan for student enrollment which may include an appropriate recruitment strategy, appropriate admissions requirements, a plan for transfer students, articulation agreements and/or provisions for part-time enrollment, as applicable.*  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 5) Appropriate student learning outcomes, in the form of a table, that incorporate:  a) Appropriate scaffolding to allow students to build on knowledge as they progress  through curriculum;  **AND**  b) A variety of assessments and corresponding rubrics for students to demonstrate content mastery and skill acquisition.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 6) Evidence of program rigor in the curriculum with information that displays:  a) Program outcomes detailing what students will be able to demonstrate at completion of the curriculum, *which may include, if applicable, adequate program options and/or other opportunities for students, as well as fulfillment of curriculum certification and/or accreditation standards;*  b) Planned curriculum with course descriptions *which can be enhanced with supplementary information that may include credit values including hours per week and how many weeks per term*; *credit distribution and nature of required, elective, and research courses; mode of instruction; and/or a detailed curriculum that represents a suitable approach to professional study in the field, as applicable;*  c) A plan to provide students access to faculty, instructors and/or staff;  **AND**  d) Comparisons to the curricula of the same or similar programs at other institutions, if applicable, and if such curricula are available.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 7) Evidence of employer input in the development of the new program, where appropriate, **which may include:**  a) Participation of employers on advisory committees;  b) Letter of support from a chamber of commerce demonstrating the need and desire for the program;  c) Summary of employer or professional association feedback on the new program proposal and institution’s response to the feedback;  d) Evidence of employer/institution partnership agreements to provide research, experiential learning, or other equivalent opportunities to students in the program;  e) Survey results from employers in the field highlighting the skills and expertise needed with a clear connection to the program proposal;  f) A plan to ensure continued partnership with employers in the field for the new program proposed;  **AND/OR**  g) Other documentation of direct employer or industry participation in the design of the program.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 8) Evidence that demonstrates a commitment to equity, accessibility, and affordability within the new program, **which may include:**  a) A program equity statement for the program/field that is supported by evidence of an institution’s demonstrated commitment to and valuing of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, equitable enrollment and employment outcomes for historically underrepresented groups;  b) A plan to monitor student progress in the program in order to address unanticipated or unknown barriers to equitable program completion outcomes;  **AND/OR**  c) A plan to provide student services and accommodations to support equitable program completion outcomes.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 9) A plan for continuous review and improvement of the new academic program. Such plan **shall include** the following:  a) The primary activities within the program that are to be reviewed, including how the program will adapt for new technology and developments within the field;  b) Regularly scheduled time periods/intervals for review;  c) Metrics for program monitoring and guidance for how the institution will course correct, if needed;  **AND/OR**  d) Input by students, field experts, and external reviewers in program review processes.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |

|  |
| --- |
| **STANDARD 1 met**  **STANDARD 1 not met** |

**STANDARD 2**

**Sufficient Labor Market Demand**

N.J.A.C. 9A:1-2.12

|  |
| --- |
| **Part One** |
| 1) Evidence that the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) number for the program is mapped to a single occupation or set of occupations listed in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) as set forth in the 2020 CIP-SOC Crosswalk created by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the National Center for Education Statistics, which is incorporated herein by reference, as amended and supplemented, and available at nces.ed.gov/Ipeds/cipcode/Files/CIP2020\_SOC2018\_Crosswalk.xlsx;  **AND**  2) Evidence of substantial labor market demand for the occupation or occupations that are mapped to the program, as supported by documentation of demand from the New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| If evidence of both items in Part One **can be met**, proceed to next section, STANDARD 3.  If evidence of both items in Part One **cannot be met**, proceed to Part Two below. |
| **Part Two** |
| 1) Evidence of **one or more** of the following:  a) Evidence of projected increasing demand in the careers, professions, or practices that graduates of the program are prepared to enter;  b) Evidence that the current number of graduates from existing programs at other institutions in the State will not be adequate to meet the projected demand in the careers, professions, or practices that graduates of the program are prepared to enter;  c) Evidence that the current profile of graduates from existing programs is not in accordance with the projected demand in the careers, professions, or practices that graduates of the program are prepared to enter;  d) Evidence of substantial employer engagement, which may include, but is not limited to, program appraisal, program partnerships, and opportunities to review and comment on the program, in the development of program curriculum;  **OR**  e) Evidence of strength in the employment outcomes from current degree programs at the institution at the same academic degree level of the program.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| If evidence of any items in Part One or Part Two **cannot be met**, proceed to Part Three. |
| **Part Three** |
| 1) Explanation of why there are insufficient data available to assess the program according to the criteria in Part One and Part Two above;  2) Evidence of preparation for a career, profession, or practice through the program;  **AND**  3) Evidence that a majority of graduates from the program are reasonably likely to obtain employment, including self-employment, in the careers, professions, or practices indicated in the program proposal within 12 months of:  a) Graduation from the program,  **OR**  b) The receipt of a terminal degree in a program sequence that includes the proposed program.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |

|  |
| --- |
| **STANDARD 2 met**  **STANDARD 2 not met** |

**STANDARD 3**

**Duplication with Comparable Programs**

N.J.A.C. 9A:1-2.13

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Listing of all currently offered programs at the same degree level **and** in the same academic discipline. Proceed to items 3 and 4 in this section.  Sufficient (Proceed to items 3 and 4 in this section)  Not sufficient (Standard 3 for duplication is not met)  Explanation:  **OR**  2) Explanation of the institution’s method for determining that there are no comparable academic degree programs in the State.  Sufficient (Standard 3 is met, there is no duplication. Proceed to Standard 4)  Not sufficient (Standard 3 for duplication is not met)  Explanation: |
| 3) Justification for necessary duplication of a currently offered program in the State at the same degree level and in the same academic discipline.  a) Explanation of a relevant relationship between the proposed academic degree program and the institutional mission or a specific area of institutional academic focus;  **AND**  b) Explanation of how a collaborative approach with another institution of higher education that currently offers the program per the listing, including, but not limited to, articulation agreements and joint degree programs, would not be cost effective or a feasible alternative to offering the proposed academic degree program.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 4) Justification for necessary duplication of a currently offered program in the State at the same degree level and in the same academic discipline.  Evidence of **one or more of the following**:  a) Evidence of significant instructional differentiation from currently offered programs at other institutions in the State that are at the same degree level and in the same academic discipline;  b) Evidence of projected student population differentiation from currently offered programs at the same degree level and in the same academic discipline;  c) Evidence of projected sustainable cost savings for students compared with the cost of  currently offered programs at the same degree level and in the same academic discipline;  d) Evidence of student and community demand at the institution and in the region for the program, **including, but not limited** **to**, evidence that shows demand through:  i) Surveys or interviews of current students, faculty, and staff at the institution;  ii) Surveys or interviews of elected officials or other members of the institution’s local community;  iii) Documented capacity constraints within currently offered programs at the same degree level and in the same academic discipline at other institutions;  **AND**  iv) Data on State and/or regional enrollment trends.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |

|  |
| --- |
| **STANDARD 3 met**  **STANDARD 3 not met** |

**STANDARD 4**

**AddiTIONAL State Resources**

N.J.A.C. 9A:1-2.14

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Projections for State support must include all of the following:  a) The total of the projected budget for the proposed academic program that would be supported by either direct State support and/or indirect State support, including, but not limited to, State student assistance grant and scholarship programs;  b) The projected increase in direct State support to the institution due to the proposed academic program;  c) The projected increase in indirect State support to the institution due to the proposed academic program;  d) Any concurrent changes to the budget of the institution that may represent a projected reduction in State support to the institution;  **AND**  e) The anticipated length of time that any projected increases in State support would be required for the program.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 2) Evidence that the proposed new academic degree program will:  a) Offset continued State support for the program through sustained increases to State revenue and any additional economic impact to the State generated by the program;  **AND/OR**  b) Become sustainable within five years in the absence of the significant additional State resources that were used to establish the program.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |
| 3) Institutional plan for integrity and compliance monitoring, as well as internal fiscal controls, to prevent misuse of State funding and government resources.  Sufficient  Not sufficient  Explanation: |

|  |
| --- |
| **STANDARD 4 met**  **STANDARD 4 not met** |

**Consultant’s Recommendation**

The proposal meets all four standards and can be submitted to the AIC.

The proposal failed to meet one or more of the standards. The consultant should provide detailed information in the next section to support this recommendation.

**Standards to be Addressed by Institution**

The consultant should only use this section if the second box, above, is checked in order to provide detailed information to support a determination that the proposal failed to meet one or more of the standards. The consultant should also suggest items for the institution to address to attain compliance with the standards using the particular standard’s specific citation from this document, example: “Standard 1, item 5b.”

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**General Suggestions/Comments**

The consultant should use this section to provide additional feedback for the institution that is not related to the four program standards.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Consultant Information**

Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Title: Click or tap here to enter text.

Institution: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date Reviewed: Click or tap to enter a date.

Signature: Click or tap here to enter text.

Internal Use Only:

Date Received: Click or tap to enter a date.

Received by: Click or tap here to enter text.

**Institution’s Response to Consultant Recommendations for Standard(s)**

Institutions should adequately respond to the comments provided by the consultant in the “Standards to be Addressed by Institution” section above.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Institution’s Response Submitted by:**

Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Title: Click or tap here to enter text.

Email: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date Reviewed: Click or tap to enter a date.

Signature: Click or tap here to enter text.