Top 10 Reasons Substantive Change Proposals are Not Approved

In academic year 2013-14, 16 (out of 143) substantive change proposals received a Not Accept action on first review. This represents 11% of all Substantive Change proposals reviewed in this time period.

The reasons for which proposals were not approved are shown in the table below. It is important to note that proposals generally had more than one area of concern that led to a Not Accept action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Effectiveness</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Need</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Teams</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach out</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Faculty
   - Workload (course load, advising, research, dissertation, committees) was unrealistic
   - Hiring plan or search process was incomplete
   - Qualifications or vitae were not included or inadequate
   - Governance issues were not detailed
   - Training for the new modality was not available
   - Faculty to student ratio was unrealistic
   - Culture of scholarship was not developed or supported
   - Overall description of faculty was incomplete
2. **Curriculum/Curricular Map**
- Curricular design or content was questionable
- Curricular map was not included or lacked detail
- Sequencing of courses was problematic
- Program requirements were not fully described
- Research component was not included
- Clinical component was not included
- General education requirements were not discussed
- General education requirements were not clearly linked to degree program
- Credits earned differed from campus-wide standards
- Syllabi were not adapted to reflect the change in modality
- Syllabi lacked detail (required textbooks, instructors, etc.)
- Submitted syllabi did not include capstone or culminating experience
- Syllabi revealed that depth and rigor of course was inappropriate for degree
- Course SLOs were not articulated in syllabi
- Syllabi submitted did not reflect each track proposed

3. **Finances/Budget**
- Budget did not cover first three years of the program
- Budget did not include sufficient detail regarding direct and indirect costs
- Budget does not match proposal narrative (faculty, enrollment, tuition)
- Revenue was not based on enrollment projections, was based on unrealistic enrollment projections, or did not align with enrollment projections provided elsewhere in the proposal
- Budget accounted for multiple degree programs
- Budget did not account for attrition
- Cost of student scholarships was not included
- A contingency plan in response to lower than expected enrollments was not provided

4. **Assessment/Educational Effectiveness**
A weak or incomplete plan for assessing the educational effectiveness of a new program was by far the most common reason proposals were not approved. Issues (in order of frequency) include:
- Assessment plan was not fully developed or lacked detail
- Program SLOs did not align with course SLOs
- Program SLOs did not align with the institutional mission or context
- Plan lacked direct measures of student learning
- Program SLOs were not specific and/or measurable
- Cooperation of adjunct, partnering institution, or foreign faculty in process was unclear
- Plan failed to specify assessment measures and/or evaluation methods
• Plan to assess equivalence with traditional program was not included
• Findings from prior program reviews were not included
• Plan focused on capacity not student learning

5. Program Description
• Information about how the accelerated time frame of the program would meet credit hour requirements was not included
• Program description does not delineate scholarly expectations for a research doctorate
• Structure and content of the program does not meet WASC standards for graduate education
• Accumulation of proposed courses does not reflect a coherent degree program
• Pedagogical components of the degree program are not clearly articulated
• The delivery modalities of the program are not clearly explained

6. Program Need
• A formal needs analysis was not conducted
• No market research was conducted
• Adequate evidence of program need in the region was not provided
• Evidence of student demand for the program was not described
• Sufficient data on the demand for graduates from the program by employers was not provided
• Proposal did not include analysis of competitors in the region and nationally

7. Student Support Services
• The coordination and management of student support services was not fully described
• Student orientation materials were not developed, including student readiness for online learning
• The role and qualifications of student advisors was not included

8. Admissions
• Admissions requirements lacked detail about the type of students expected to enroll in the program
• Admissions requirements were not rigorous enough to ensure that students would be qualified for the program
• Plans for evaluating transcripts from students transferring from unaccredited and/or international institutions were not fully explained
• University policy on transfer credit was not included
• Projected attrition for the program was unusually high

9. Teach-out
• An approved teach-out policy was not provided
10. Library
- Information about library services available to students was not provided
- Library staff and hours were insufficient to support students in the program