



Indiana University of Pennsylvania
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
AND RESEARCH

Graduate Curriculum Handbook

Revised 4/23/2013

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction and General Instructions	3
2. New Course Proposals	7
3. Course Revisions	16
4. Distance Education Approval	18
5. New Programs	21
6. Letters of Completion and Certificates of Recognition	30
7. Program Revisions	32
8. Variability of Delivery of Graduate Programs	35
9. Deletions and Moratoria	37
10. Appendices	
A. Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form	38
B. Distance Education Review Form	39

See [Curriculum Resources for Faculty](#) on the SGSR website for further information, including the Graduate Curriculum Tracking Log and sample curriculum proposals.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction and General Instructions

The purpose of this document is to describe the requirements for securing the approval of the University Senate for curricular changes. Our goal is to make the process as simple and streamlined as possible without neglecting the important purposes of the curriculum process, which are:

- to promote the highest standards of academic quality and integrity
- to encourage clarity and fairness in what is required of students in academic programs
- to guard against duplication of programs or courses
- to align with institutional goals and requirements
- to ensure that adequate resources are available to deliver the curriculum
- to improve curricular proposals through peer review and revision

What Help is Available for Preparing My Proposal?

In addition to this handbook and the examples of successful proposals posted on the [SGSR website](#), proposers are encouraged to contact the Dean's Associate of the SGSR at any stage of the process with questions. The Co-Chairs of the UWGC are also available for questions.

What Kind of Proposal Do I Need to Submit?

Proposals fall into two broad categories: **Course Proposals** are required for new courses (except special topics), course revisions, initial approval to offer a course as distance education, and course deletions. **Program proposals** are required for new programs, new certificates of recognition or letters of completion, program revisions, variability of delivery (approval to offer a program at a remote location or via distance education), and program moratoria or deletions.

Many curricular changes require a proposal in more than one of these categories. For example, revising an existing Master's degree to offer it online might well include new courses, distance education approval for new and existing courses, a variability of delivery to offer more than one third of the program online, and a program revision. It is helpful to submit all of these proposals at the same time, since they interface with each

other on many levels. The UWGC will usually not approve a program proposal until it has approved any course proposals required for the new or revised program.

In What Format Should I Submit My Proposal?

Each type of proposal has specific content requirements, but the general rules for submission are as follows:

- All proposals should be submitted electronically, with the exception of the Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form (cover sheet) containing the original signatures. The printed cover sheet should travel from one signatory to the next until it reaches the UWGC, while the proposal itself circulates electronically.
- The text of the proposal should be submitted as a single file in Microsoft Word format to facilitate editing. If the proposal contains copies of letters, catalog pages, etc. those may be submitted in a second file in .pdf format. Adobe Acrobat is very helpful in preparing and combining .pdf files and may be obtained under the university-wide contract with Adobe.
- Number all pages of the proposal consecutively beginning with the cover sheet; the first page of text should be page 2. It is helpful if the document header identifies the proposal as well (i.e., "HIST 421 Course Revision, page 5").

What is the Process for Approval?

All curricular proposals must originate from the faculty. Proposals then travel the following path and must receive approval at each level:

- 1) Department curriculum committee (indicated by signature on Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form, aka cover sheet)
- 2) Department faculty (reported in departmental meeting minutes)
- 3) Department chair (indicated by signature on cover sheet)
- 4) Teacher Education Curriculum Committee (TECC) – this is only necessary if the proposal involves initial teacher certification (indicated by signature on cover sheet)
- 5) College curriculum committee (indicated by signature on cover sheet)
- 6) College Dean (indicated by signature on cover sheet)

- 7) Dean's Associate of the School of Graduate Studies and Research (SGSR) – the Dean's Associate does not approve or deny proposals, but receives and reviews them before sending them to the SGSR Dean, the Provost and the UWGC
- 8) Dean of the SGSR (indicated by signature on cover sheet)
- 9) Provost – the Provost's approval is only needed for New Programs (indicated by signature on cover sheet)
- 10) University-Wide Graduate Committee (UWGC) (indicated by signature on cover sheet)
- 11) University Senate (reported in the Senate Minutes)
- 12) For new programs only: PASSHE Administration and Board of Governors (reported by letter from PASSHE and in the Board's minutes)

Changes requested at a higher level of this process are not re-submitted to committees at lower levels. If the UWGC requests a change in the course outcomes, those outcomes are not sent back through the process. It is up to the proposer to ensure that any changes do not alter the spirit and substance of what the department and college committees approved.

Once the proposal has reached the Dean's Associate of the SGSR, proposers can track the progress of their proposal on the Graduate Curriculum Tracking Log, available [on the SGSR website](#).

Expedited Review of Courses and Programs

Some revisions are eligible for Expedited Review. This greatly hastens the approval process and eliminates the need for review by the full UWGC. The Dean's Associate determines the suitability of a proposal for Expedited Review. The criteria for expedited review are:

- The proposal is approved and signed at the department and college level.
- The proposal is limited to minor revisions in existing courses, minor revisions in existing programs, and course deletions.
- The proposal does not contain a request for new resources.
- The proposed curriculum does not affect offerings by other programs.
- The proposed curriculum is not cross-listed with offerings in other programs.

Proposals receiving expedited review will be reviewed by the Dean's Associate who may seek further information from the department or may request changes in the department's proposal. Upon recommendation of the Dean's Associate, the SGSR Dean, and the Chairs of the UWGC (in that order) will sign off on the expedited review and sign to approve the proposal. If all necessary signatures are on the proposal authorization form, the UWGC will forward it on to the University Senate. If the SGSR Dean or the Chairs of the UWGC decline the recommendation of the Dean's Associate, the proposal will proceed through the normal curriculum approval process. It will be the responsibility of the Dean's Associate to notify the proposer if the proposal returns to the normal curriculum approval process.

About the University-Wide Graduate Committee

Article 31 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement states,

There shall be a curriculum committee at each University, which shall be selected as determined by the FACULTY, but which may include at least one (1) administrator if designated by the President.

At IUP, responsibility for curriculum and policy at the graduate level has been delegated to the University-Wide Graduate Committee (UWGC) of the University Senate. The [Senate's bylaws](#) define the committee's scope:

The area of responsibility of the Committee shall be degree requirements, all matters relating to graduate curricula, general policies for admission, scholarships, assistantships, and other matters pertaining to the graduate students and the School of Graduate Studies and Research (SGSR).

The UWGC is comprised of twelve elected faculty members (at least one from each college), from which the committee elects a co-chair. A second co-chair is appointed by APSCUF, and three graduate students are appointed by the Graduate Student Association. The Dean of the SGSR represents the President as an *ex officio* member. The Dean's Associate of the SGSR is not a voting member of the committee but attends its meetings.

The UWGC provides peer review of graduate programs and courses before they are considered by the full University Senate. As a committee of colleagues, the UWGC wishes to help faculty through the curricular process and facilitate the goals of departments and the university. The UWGC also considers all matters of academic policy relating to graduate education.

CHAPTER 2

New Course Proposals

New course proposals that follow the required format and procedures, are clearly written, and do not require any additional information for the UWGC's deliberations are usually approved in a relatively short time. Since the UWGC is composed of members not familiar with your subject area, it is important that your course proposal be written so that a general audience can understand it.

Preparing the Proposal

As part of the process it is necessary to supply the UWGC with specific information about the new course before the UWGC can take action on the proposal. One of the charges of the UWGC is to oversee and protect the academic integrity of the curriculum. Thus, the committee must not only determine the quality of the course proposal itself, but also determine that any resources (departmental, college, or university) needed for the successful delivery of the course are available. In addition, any overlap with existing courses or subject areas need to be addressed. Issues of overlap can be resolved by the involved departments supplying letters to accompany the proposal stating their position concerning the new course.

When preparing a new course proposal that will be cross-listed with other departments, the UWGC asks that only one person be listed as the contact person. The Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form should list all department abbreviations for the course on the appropriate line. The Form should include the signatures of department curriculum committee chairs, department chairs of all involved departments, and the appropriate college curriculum committees. The course proposal should also include an explanation of how consistency of the course will be maintained across multiple departments with the expectation that a common syllabus will be used in each situation.

Presenting the Proposal

When your proposal is considered by the UWGC, the chairs of the UWGC or the Dean's Associate of the Graduate School might contact the proposing department for clarification and/or further information, or the proposers might be invited to meet with the committee. Departments will be notified of any action taken by the UWGC. If the course is approved and forwarded to the University Senate, the department will be informed of

the date on which the Senate will take action on the proposal. Departments are strongly urged to have a representative at the Senate meeting who is familiar with the proposal and who can answer any technical, philosophical, or professional questions concerning the course that might arise. The UWGC reserves the right to remove a proposal from the floor if no department representative is present because the committee members may not be able to adequately answer specific questions from the Senate floor.

Procedures for Multi-Department Course Proposals

On the Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form that accompanies the proposal: The unit (college or group of departments) proposing the course/program, not the department of the person writing the proposal, should be listed under Proposing Department/Unit. All department curriculum committees included in the proposal must participate in the approval process, not just the proposer's curriculum committee and not just the department chairs. Therefore, letters/emails of support (or acknowledgement in the case of nonsupport) from all of the chairs and department curriculum committees participating are required attachments.

Format for Requesting New Graduate Course Proposals

See the general instructions for submitting proposals [here](#).

Part I – Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form

This is the cover page of the proposal. The form should include the name and course number. For new courses, please access the list of **UNavailable** course numbers, at www.iup.edu/registrar (click on *For Faculty*, then on *Course Information*, and then on *UNavailable Course Numbers*. All **other** courses numbers are available).

Graduate courses span numbers 500 through 999. The first digit in the course number has meaning: the higher the first digit, the greater the course difficulty, the more specialized the content, and the greater the learning expectations. In addition, for most courses numbered 800 or greater, faculty receives additional compensation entitled "Doctoral Enhancement," a factor that must be considered when considering resource issues.

The numbering must conform to the following policy:

- *500-599 level courses*—Graduate level course, but all dual-level courses (500/400) are open to enrollment by both graduate and qualified undergraduate

students. Existing 500-level courses may become dual-level (400/500) for regular admission of junior and senior undergraduates; alternatively, existing 400 level undergraduate courses may become dual-level to include graduate students. To make a course dual-level, approval must be obtained from BOTH the University Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (first) and the Graduate Committee (second).

- *600-level courses*—Masters level only.
- *700-level courses*—Primarily for masters but can be dual-level with doctoral courses (700/800 dual listed), with the majority of students being at the masters level.
- *800-level courses*—Primarily for doctoral but can be dual-level with masters courses (700/800), with the majority of students being at the doctoral level.
- *900-level courses*—Doctoral level only.

In addition, the following course numbers have been designated by the University Senate:

581 Special Topics
681 Special Topics
698 Internship
699 Independent Study
781 Special Topics
795 Thesis
798 Internship
799 Independent Study
881 Special Topics
898 Field Experience/Internship
899 Independent Study
995 Dissertation

Part II - Syllabus of Record

The syllabus of record describes the course to those interested in the course and provides guidance to departmental faculty who wish to teach the course. While each faculty member has the academic freedom to deliver a course in his/her own style, this does not extend to changing the purpose, nature, or course outcomes of the course. The syllabus of record is different from the individual course syllabi that an instructor distributes to students. A copy of the syllabus of record for each course is to be maintained in the office of the department offering the course.

All Syllabi of Record should be “delivery neutral,” that is, prepared without reference to a particular method of delivery (online or in the classroom). This will facilitate a more streamlined process should the program wish to change the method of delivery at any time in the future.

The syllabus of record for a new course proposal will contain the following elements:

1. Catalog Description

This includes the course title, number of credits (the undergraduate formula, 3c-3l-4cr is not applicable at the graduate level), prerequisites and an appropriately written course description. For online courses, the number of credits should represent the amount of time the student will spend in activities that replace what would take place in the classroom (lecture, discussion, classroom activities, etc.).

2. Course Outcomes

These should be observable, measurable and student-centered. What is it that students are expected to be able to do as a result of taking this course? For graduate-level courses, the UWGC expects that at least some of the course outcomes will target higher-level cognition, as defined in the well-known Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956) and as revised in more recent work (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001; Marzano and Kendall, 2007). Explanations of these taxonomies, along with lists of appropriate verbs for use in course outcomes, are readily available on the web. Course outcomes that lean too frequently on “understand,” “be familiar with,” or “recognize” are often seen by the UWGC as too basic for a graduate-level course.

3. Course Outline

This should provide an outline of the topics examined in the course as well as an indication of the amount of time spent on each topic. The course content may be laid out in weekly or hourly offerings, with the total number of weeks adding up to 14 or the number of hours adding up to 42 for a three-credit class (not including the final exam/culminating experience). **Each hour is an academic hour of 50 minutes.** Allot time for exams in the outline, including the final exam/culminating experience.

If the course outline calls for more or fewer than 14 weeks/42 hours + final exam, please explain this clearly in the outline.

For courses that are exclusively summer offerings, the course outline should be in hours. For online courses, the number should represent the amount of time the student will spend in activities that replace what would take place in the classroom. Each topic area should include relevant suggested readings and major assignments.

For example:

1. Week One: Topic A, relevant readings, etc.
2. Week Two: Topic B, readings, assignments, etc.
3. ...

Or

1. Topic A (5 hours) relevant readings, etc.
2. Topic B (2 hours) readings, assignments, etc.
3. ...

4. Evaluation Methods

This section should make clear how each of the course outcomes will be observed and evaluated. The UWGC looks for a close correspondence between the course outcomes and the evaluation methods. Indicate the type(s) of evaluation used (quizzes, exams, projects, papers, etc.) and detail the requirements on evaluations particular to this course. Indicate the weight of each type of evaluation being used, how the final grade will be determined, and a grading scale. Evaluation methods should clearly be consistent with graduate level expectations. Please be sure that total percentages equal 100%.

5. Sample Grading Scale

Describe how letter grades will be assigned. Please note that letter grades of A, B, C and F, **but not D**, are awarded at the graduate level.

6. Course Attendance Policy

Generally this attendance policy should be generic so that different instructors may tailor their own attendance policy. If, however, the department wishes to require attendance for a course, include a specific policy that conforms to the following guidelines:

- a. Each policy must be distributed in writing during the first week of the course.
- b. Each policy must recognize students' need to miss class because of illness or personal emergency.
- c. Each policy must define some limited level of allowable absence.

7. Required Textbook(s), Supplemental Books and Readings

The UWGC recognizes that textbooks change rapidly in some fields and by the time the course is offered the textbook indicated in the syllabus may be outdated. Please indicate, however, your judgment of the best textbook available at the time the course is proposed.

8. Special Resource Requirements

List any materials or equipment the student is expected to supply for this course. Is there a lab fee associated with the course?

9. Bibliography

An appropriate list of resource materials used in preparing for the course and for teaching the course. List 5 to 10 entries using a citation style appropriate to your discipline.

Part III -- Course Implementation

Detailed answers to each of the following questions must be included in the proposal. It is helpful if you phrase each response within the context of the question.

- 1.** Is this course to be a dual-level course? If so, please note that the graduate approval occurs after the undergraduate. Note that dual level courses **MUST** include course outcomes and requirements for graduate students of appropriate difficulty and scope above and beyond those listed for undergraduate students.
- 2.** If this course may be taken for variable credit, what criteria will be used to relate the credits to the learning experience of each student? Who will make this determination and by what procedures?
- 3.** Do other higher education institutions currently offer this course? If so, please list examples (institution, course title).

4. Is the content, or are the skills, of the proposed course recommended or required by a professional society, accrediting authority, law or other external agency? If so, please provide documentation.
5. What is the relationship between the content of this course and the content of courses offered by other departments? Summarize your discussions (with other departments) concerning the proposed course and indicate how any conflicts have been resolved. Please attach relevant memoranda from these departments that clarify their attitudes toward the proposed course.
6. Will this course be cross-listed with other departments? If so, please summarize the department representatives' discussions concerning the course and indicate how consistency will be maintained across departments.
7. How frequently do you expect this course to be offered? Is this course particularly designed for or restricted to certain semesters?
8. How many students do you plan to accommodate in a section of this course? What is the justification for this planned number of students? Does any professional society recommend enrollment limits or parameters for a course of this nature? If they do, please quote from the appropriate documents.
9. If this course is a distance education course, include the [Graduate Distance Education Review Form](#) and respond to the questions listed.
10. Include any additional information that might be needed by the UWGC for reviewing this new course proposal.

Part IV -- Letters of Support or Acknowledgement

Attach letters from interested or affected departments/programs.

Part V -- Senate Agenda Item

The Senate agenda item should include: 1) the name of the sponsoring department, 2) the course name and number, 3) a brief summary of the rationale for the new course; 4) the catalog description; 5) the number of credits, 6) course prerequisites (or state "none") and 7) the catalog start term. The agenda item must be submitted to the Dean's

Associate in the SGSR at least 14 days before the next Senate meeting. A sample Senate Agenda Item can be [found on the SGSR website](#).

Dual-Level, Cross-Listed, and Special Topics Courses

Dual-level courses are meant to serve two audiences simultaneously- senior undergraduates and graduate students. These courses carry a 400/500 number combination, where the 400-level course is listed in the undergraduate catalog and the 500-level version is listed in the graduate catalog. Requests for 300/500 level dual-listed courses will be denied. The last two numbers in 4xx and 5xx should match; please check with the Registrar's Office that both numbers are available.

In a dual-level course, the graduate students are subjected to higher expectations than undergraduate students. Consequently, at a minimum, the syllabus must include:

- additional course outcomes for graduate students,
- extra assignments or more involved assignments, more readings, or some other expectation that is appropriately rigorous for graduate level work that assess whether or not the student has met graduate course outcome(s)
- a different evaluation method (grading scale). NOTE: Graduate level grading scales must not include a "D" grade.

In general, the UWGC is looking for sufficient differences between the undergraduate and graduate student experiences. Current PASSHE policy requires that, "At least 50% of coursework (excluding thesis, research or internship hours) to complete a master's degree must be identified as primarily directed at graduate students with *the majority of students in the course* obtaining graduate credits." {Italics added}.

The approval process is the same as for any other graduate course, except that the course proposals are approved by the University Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee before submission to the UWGC. New dual-level courses can be created, existing 500-level courses may become dual-level (400/500) for regular admission of senior undergraduates, or existing 400-level undergraduate courses may become dual-level to include graduate students. In all three cases, approval must be obtained *first* from the University Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and *second* from the UWGC prior to submission to Senate. Approval of a dual-level course by the University Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee does not mean that the course is, or will be, approved by the UWGC.

Cross-Listed Courses

The approval process for cross-listed courses is the same as for any other graduate course. Endorsements for cross-listing from each respective department and college committee are essential.

Special Topics Courses

The designation of a course as *Special Topics* is used when a course is in the experimental stage of development or when a department offers a course as a special topic when the subject for the course has a short life span (for example, when a visiting professor is teaching in the department). A syllabus for each Special Topics course must be approved by the department curriculum committee, the department chairperson, and the college dean.

By action of the University Senate, course numbers 581, 681, 781, and 881 have been set aside for a special category of courses that can be repeated for credit. Dual-level 481/581 Special Topics courses can also be offered. A department may offer several Special Topics courses of different title and content simultaneously, and students are permitted to schedule more than one of these courses. Only six (6) credit hours of Special Topic credits can be used toward the completion of a graduate degree.

University Policy restricts Special Topics courses to being offered three times. Under exceptional circumstances, a fourth and final offering of a Special Topics undergraduate or graduate course will be permitted if a new course proposal has been submitted to the University Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or UWGC prior to the scheduling of the fourth offering.

It is the responsibility of the department chairperson and college dean to monitor the offering of each Special Topics course to ensure that it is not offered more than three times. Special Topics courses cannot become a regular part of a department's curriculum without receiving formal approval by the UWGC and the Senate. To convert a Special Topics course to a regular course offering of the department or program, follow the guidelines for new course proposals.

CHAPTER 3

Course Revisions

It is not unusual for a course to evolve into something quite different from the course approved by the Senate. When this occurs, however, it is important for the department to have the revised course approved by the Graduate Committee and the Senate. A course revision must be submitted:

- when the course title or number changes
- when the number of credits for a course change
- when course outcomes change
- when course prerequisites change
- when the catalog description changes
- when the syllabus of record changes. Please note that this does not include normal updating to keep abreast of the field or course readings.

Many minor course revisions are processed by the UWGC via an expedited review (see Appendix A). Consultation with the SGSR Dean's Associate and/or the co-chairs of the UWGC is recommended if a department is in doubt about whether any modifications to an established graduate course qualify for expedited review.

When preparing a course revision that will be cross-listed with other departments, the Graduate Committee requests that only one person be listed as the contact person. The Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form should list all department abbreviations for the course on the appropriate line. The signature page should include the signatures of department curriculum committee chairs, department chairs of all involved departments and the appropriate college(s). The course revision should include an explanation of how consistency of the course will be maintained across multiple departments with the expectation that a common syllabus will be used in each situation.

Format for Course Revisions (Please number all pages)

Part I. [Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form](#)

Part II. Description of the Curriculum Change

- New [syllabus of record](#), including catalog description with course title, number of credits, prerequisites, an appropriately written course description, and an updated bibliography.

Graduate Curriculum Handbook, rev. April 2013

[TOC](#) * [Intro](#) * [New Courses](#) * [Course Revisions](#) * [Distance Ed](#) * [New Programs](#) * [Certificates](#) * [Program Revisions](#) * [Variability of Delivery](#) * [Deletions/Moratoria](#) * [Cover Sheet](#) * [DE Form](#)

- A summary of the proposed revisions
- Justification/rationale for the revision
- The old syllabus of record

Part III. Letters of Support or Acknowledgment

- Attach letters from interested or affected departments/programs.
- Procedures for Approval of a Course Revision

CHAPTER 4

Distance Education Approval

Introduction

Faculty must seek distance education (DE) approval when they would like to offer a new, existing, or special topics course online for the first time. The procedures for approving DE courses are established in Article 42 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and in a [Side Letter between APSCUF and the IUP Administration](#). The Side Letter establishes what constitutes DE and when faculty must seek DE approval:

Article 42 of the CBA defines distance education as..."mediated communication/instruction between faculty member(s) and student(s) other than when faculty member(s) and student(s) are physically present in the same classroom."

In accordance with the definition, this policy applies to all courses where *more than one-third of the contact hours* are conducted via distance education technologies and the students are located at remote sites with little or no required presence in a traditional classroom setting on an IUP campus.

Furthermore, when more than one-third of the required courses are designated as "distance education" courses, a Variability of Delivery proposal must be approved through the graduate peer review process.

The CBA specifically states that "distance education shall not include instruction at multiple locations on the same campus" (Article 42 A-1). Courses offered via technology to students at branch campuses and other off-site locations are considered distance education courses. Several kinds of courses are exceptions to the above policy and are not considered distance education courses:

- Clinical experience
- Practicum
- Individualized instruction
- Internship
- Student teaching
- Thesis and dissertation
- Cooperative education
- Independent study

Distance Education Approval Process

The basic requirement is to complete the [Distance Education Review Form](#), which consists of 1) signature pages, 2) the “Five Questions” outlined in the CBA, and 3) the Sample Module. However, given the fact that many courses for DE are new, require revision, or are special topics courses, course proposals for DE must often include more than just the DE Review Form. Here are the possible scenarios:

An existing, approved course is to be offered online: Submit the existing Syllabus of Record as well as the DE Review Form (**See Note below)

An existing, approved course is to be revised and offered online: Submit a Course Revision, including the old and new Syllabi of Record, as well as the DE Review Form.

A special topics course is to be offered online: Submit the Syllabus for the special topics course, as well as the DE Review Form.

A new course is to be offered online: Submit a New Course Proposal, including a new, [“delivery-neutral” Syllabus of Record](#), as well as the DE Review Form.

****Please Note:** The UWGC generally believes that a course should be revised and updated whenever it is to be offered online, and encourages departments to do so. This allows the proposer to update the Course Outcomes and evaluation methods in light of the new delivery method. If in reviewing an existing course for DE approval, the UWGC concludes that some aspects of the course should be revised, the UWGC may request a course revision from the proposer.

For existing and special topics courses, the DE Review Form travels the following path for approvals:

1. Departmental Designee (usually the chair)
2. College Dean
3. Dean’s Associate of the SGSR (does not approve/deny, but reviews prior to sending on to the UWGC)
4. UWGC, which has 30 days from receipt of the course to deliver a positive or negative recommendation to the Provost. The Senate receives the UWGC recommendation for information only.
5. The President or designee (currently the Provost), who has 30 days from receipt of the UWGC’s recommendation to approve or deny the course for DE.

For new and revised courses, the Course Proposal travels the regular approval path; however the DE Review Form need only be approved as outline above.

Completing the DE Review Form

As with all proposals, the DE Review Form should be submitted electronically except for the Signature Pages, which should circulate on paper. Regarding the individual components of the DE Review Form:

Signature Pages – These require signatures as outlined above.

The DE “Five Questions” – These questions are outlined in the CBA and are designed to determine whether the content of the course can be delivered online. They are:

1. *How is/are the instructor(s) qualified in the distance education delivery method as well as the discipline?* – Answers typically address the instructor’s experience teaching online, use of technology in teaching, and workshops or training attended.
2. *How will each outcome in the course be achieved using distance education technologies?* – This is a key question for the UWGC. Answers should specifically show how each course outcome will be achieved using online methods. Proposers should avoid using the same answer for each outcome, and present as many specific examples as possible.
3. *How will instructor-student and student-student, if applicable, interaction take place?* – Again, this should mention specific examples.
4. *How will student achievement be evaluated?* – This section can refer to the evaluation methods section of the syllabus, but should specify how these evaluation methods will be applied in the online context.
5. *How will academic honesty for tests and assignments be addressed?* – Such strategies as the use of a proctor, the use of test banks and restricted windows of availability, the use of Turnitin plagiarism software, and other similar measures are encouraged.

The Sample Module – This should essentially take the form of an assignment for one week or session of the course. It should be clear from the Module exactly what students should do and how they will be evaluated. The Module need not include the complete readings, but may include instructor-developed documents such as a powerpoint lecture, worksheets or discussion prompts, rubrics, etc. A good Module will usually include some element of student-instructor or student-student interaction.

CHAPTER 5

New Programs

Introduction

This chapter describes the approval process and details how to prepare the new program proposal. Unlike most curricular changes, new programs **require approval by PASSHE**. New programs include new degree designations or new “minor programs” (i.e., a new Certificates of Recognition (COR) or Letter of Completion (LOC)) when no major program exists. New tracks, CORs or LOCs within an existing degree program **do not** require PASSHE approval and should follow the format for a program revision. Similarly, a new COR would require a New Program proposal **only** if it is unrelated to a major program.

Approval Process

1. Letter of Intent to PASSHE

New programs must receive the Chancellor’s approval at two points in the process: 1) prior to beginning the normal curricular process and 2) after approval by the IUP Senate and Trustees.

Consequently, the first step in proposing a new graduate degree program is to submit a **Letter of Intent** for approval by PASSHE. The Letter of Intent is an online form that requires concise answers to a set of questions specified by PASSHE, but must make a compelling case for the new program. The purpose of the Letter of Intent is to alert the Graduate Dean, Graduate Committee Chair, Provost, and Chancellor’s Office that a new program proposal is being developed, and provide an opportunity for reaction to the proposal’s feasibility, potential, and conformance with mission. Consequently, departments are strongly encouraged to consult with the College Dean, the SGSR Dean and/or SGSR Dean’s Associate, and the Graduate Committee Co-Chairs in developing this document.

The Letter of Intent needs to be approved by the College Dean, the Graduate Dean, and the Provost, who will submit it to PASSHE. The specific procedures are as follows:

- a. Prepare the Letter of Intent describing the program as envisioned at this early stage. Following the guidelines on the form, discuss both the resources

available to implement the proposal and any additional resources that may be needed. Indicate the funding source for additional resources. The Letter of Intent should contain enough detail to give a general but clear idea of the program. Contact the Office of the Provost for assistance in the calculation of revenue and expenditure expectations.

- b. Send copies of the completed Letter of Intent simultaneously to 1) the College Dean, 2) the Graduate Dean and the Dean's Associate, and 3) the Chairs of the Graduate Committee (for information only). The Graduate and College Deans will confer to determine initial support for the concept, and work with the department to address any problems.
- c. The College and Graduate Deans will send a joint memo and a copy of the Letter of Intent to the Provost requesting review and a decision.
- d. After consulting with the College and Graduate Deans, the Provost, if satisfied with the general feasibility of the proposed program, will forward a copy of the Letter of Intent to the Chancellor with a cover Letter indicating the Provost's preliminary support. The Provost will send copies of the cover Letter to the Department Chair, College Dean, Graduate Dean, and Graduate Committee Co-chairs.

2. IUP Curricular Process

Once PASSHE has approved the Letter of Intent, the department will write the curriculum proposal and send it through the [IUP curricular process](#).

Please note that graduate courses, new programs, or program revisions involving an **initial** Pennsylvania Department of Education teaching certification must be reviewed by the Teacher Education Coordinating Council (TECC). Graduate courses, programs, or revisions that will be specifically marketed to teachers for the purpose of secondary certification are encouraged to secure a letter of support from the Dean of the COE-ET.

3. Final PASSHE Approval

Once the new program is approved by the IUP Senate, the President, and the Council of Trustees, the Provost's Office will submit the proposal to PASSHE personnel for review. PASSHE may recommend revisions to the proposer via the IUP Provost. Once satisfied, PASSHE will then recommend the program for approval by the Board of

Governors. No new program can be marketed prior to the President of IUP receiving approval from the Board of Governors.

Please note that, once approved, a proposal becomes the baseline for how the program will be evaluated. *IUP and PASSHE will monitor the enrollment targets in the proposal and may take action if a program does meet its enrollment projections.*

Preparing and Submitting a Proposal for a New Program

A New Program proposal is typically an extensive, detailed, and carefully crafted document that makes a compelling case for the new program. Proposers should allocate a semester to complete a proposal. The [Curriculum Resources for Faculty section of the SGSR website](#) contains best practice examples that show how others have organized and formatted successful proposals. Some basic recommendations are:

- All pages of the proposal should be numbered, and use a standard font throughout.
- The use of bulleted lists throughout the document are recommended
- Any references cited in support of the proposal (e.g. bibliography, PASSHE or IUP policies, employment data, etc.) should be as current as possible.
- The proposed program must conform to current APSCUF Collective Bargaining Agreement requirements.

Components of the New Program Proposal

The proposal must include a [Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form](#), which should be attached to the front of the proposal, indicating the type of submission. For each change within the proposal, such as new course proposals, course revisions, and course deletions, submit a separate Authorization Form.

The new program proposal should follow PASSHE's Format for Proposals for New Academic Programs. This format includes the following components:

- **PASSHE Cover Page:** The PASSHE Cover Page provides the name of the title of the program, the names of the institution, college, department, and individual who prepared the proposal, the month and date of the proposal and the proposed implementation date.
- **Table of Contents:** Follows PASSHE's recommended format.

- **Body of the Proposal:**
 1. Appropriateness to Mission
 2. Need
 3. Academic Integrity
 4. Coordination with Other Programs
 5. Assessment and Accreditation
 6. Resource Sufficiency
 7. Impact on Educational Opportunity
 8. Bibliography (Optional)
 9. Executive Summary
 10. Five-year Budget Projection
- **Appendix**
- **Senate Agenda Information**

1. *Appropriateness to Mission*

This section should begin with a general description of the program, including its scope and purpose. The section should then explain how the proposed program fits into PASSHE's mission, goals, and initiatives. This section should then discuss how the proposed program aligns with IUP's mission and strategic plan, along with that of the Academic Affairs division. Proposers should link numerous aspects of their program directly to quotations from those mission statements and plans to demonstrate appropriateness to mission. This section should be no more than one page in length. The SGSR will expand on this section as needed to meet the requirements of PASSHE.

2. *Need*

Provide evidence that demand for this program exists. Need should be substantiated in terms of the job market, student demand, projected enrollments, and competing programs. A survey of student interest should be conducted on a statewide basis. Surveying current IUP students is not considered by PASSHE to be enough evidence to support the need for the proposed program. Charts and tables that provide evidence of need should be included in the appendix. Additionally, the professional literature may be cited and included in the bibliography to show the need for the new program. This section should show the proposed program's uniqueness as compared to competing programs. The web addresses for competing programs should be provided in this description of competing program curricula.

3. *Academic Integrity*

This section is designed to demonstrate the adequacy and appropriateness of the proposed program/revision. This section should describe its structure and administration, the proposed curriculum, and its instructional staffing.

a. *Program structure and administration*

In which department will this program be located? Will there be a program director and/or an oversight committee? How will continuity and oversight be ensured? Specify a catalog term for the program.

b. *Program goals*

Describe the general goals of what this program is intending to teach. Are the requirements dictated by any accreditation criteria? If so, describe.

c. *Student learning outcomes*

This section should list the expected outcomes by which the program will be measured in later reviews.

d. *Curriculum overview*

Provide an overview of the program in the format used in the IUP Graduate Catalog, showing the course and credit requirements of the program, required courses, electives, tracks, etc. In addition, provide a typical sequence of how students would progress through the program, including a timeline.

e. *Course offerings*

Describe briefly how each course in the program supports the program goals and student learning outcomes. Complete individual proposals for each new graduate course or course revision must be included in the appendices.

f. *Learning experiences and instructional methods*

Describe the pedagogical methods used in the program, include a description of any distance education or online methods.

g. *Leadership and faculty qualifications*

Briefly describe the expertise of each faculty member who will be involved in the proposed program using the following form. Please note that all faculty must be eligible to teach at the graduate level. Finally, please state that, to the best of your knowledge, the new program is in compliance with the current CBA. Programs found to be in violation of the CBA, even after formal approval, will

require the prompt submission of a new proposal containing the necessary modifications. Typical issues of concern are faculty workload, dependence on temporary faculty, and sufficiency of resources.

Name:

Years at University:

Degree(s) Earned:

Current Teaching Responsibilities (list course numbers and titles):

Teaching Responsibilities for Proposed Program (list course numbers and titles):

Scholarship Related to the Proposed Program:

Additional Responsibilities Related to the Proposed Program:

Other Information Relevant to the Proposed Program:

h. Student qualifications, support and advisement

Outline the requirements for the proposed degree program/revision, specifying *all* requirements for admission, degree candidacy, and graduation. Show how a student would progress through the degree program (e.g., first semester courses, etc.).

4. Coordination with Other Programs

Describe, as appropriate, coordination with programs at other institutions (especially PASSHE institutions); coordination with other departments or units on campus; and coordination with outside agencies, corporations, etc. Attach notifications of support, as needed.

a. Related Programs at Other Institutions

Demonstrate that the proposed program/revision does not duplicate unnecessarily existing programs at other PASSHE or area universities. Further, the proposal should include communication with other appropriate institutions. Attach evidence that resource sharing and student transfer programs have been considered and either incorporated or ruled out, as appropriate.

b. With other Departments or Units on Campus

Explain why the proposed program/revision is substantially different from existing programs at IUP. To ensure cooperation and communication within the university, provide notifications to and response from each department potentially affected by the program. These notifications should verify that the information has been relayed to the departments and provide such comments that make clear each department's position. If a department is unresponsive, please include copies of two notification attempts.

c. With Outside Agencies, Corporations, Etc.

How will relationships with business, industry, public agencies, etc. strengthen this program?

5. Assessment and Accreditation

Describe how student learning outcomes data will be collected and used to improve the program (see [Board of Governors' Policy 1997-01, Assessing Student Learning Outcomes](#)). Discuss how program goals will be evaluated, along with the schedule for program assessment. If accreditation is available for the program, describe the plan for achieving accreditation.

6. Resource Sufficiency

Discuss financial resource sufficiency, including all costs of instruction, marketing, and all revenues generated through enrollments. This section must demonstrate that the program, based on headcounts and FTEs, will be financially self-sufficient within five years.

Describe how the department will allocate or reallocate faculty workload to deliver the credits in the new program, including how any new faculty lines will be integrated into the program. Similar descriptions should accompany other needs, such as additional space, library resources, or equipment.

7. Impact on Educational Opportunity

Describe how the program will provide opportunities to serve diverse student populations and under-represented groups of students. Provide appropriate information regarding the probable impact of the new program/revision on PASSHE and IUP goals for enhancing educational opportunity and assurance of civil rights.

8. *Bibliography (Optional)*

9. *Executive Summary*

The executive summary is the only item that the Board of Governors receives for a new graduate program. The summary must address each of the sections of the full proposal and must not exceed three pages. The Dean’s Associate can provide examples.

10. *Five-Year Budget Projection*

This a projection of costs and revenues prepared by Academic Affairs according to the following table:

ESTIMATED REVENUES	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	Existing	New	Existing	New	Existing	New	Existing	New	Existing	New
Tuition or University E&G										
External Grants and Contracts										
Other										
TOTAL REVENUE										
ESTIMATED EXPENSES	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
Salaries and/or benefits (Faculty and Staff)										
Learning resources										
Instructional equipment										
Facilities and/or modifications										
Other										
TOTAL EXPENSES										
DIFFERENCE (Rev.-Exp.)										
ESTIMATED IMPACT OF NEW PROGRAM	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
FTE Enrollment										
Projected Annual Credits Generated										
Tuition Generated										

11. *Appendix*

Include any new course proposals or course revisions.

12. *Senate Agenda Item*

On a separate page attach a program description suitable for inclusion in the Graduate Catalog. This description must include 1) name of sponsoring department/degree program 2) rationale for offering new program 3) catalog description 4) catalog start term 5) program objectives, 6) admission prerequisites, and 7) degree/program requirements. The agenda item must be submitted to the SGSR Dean's Associate 14 days before the next senate meeting.

CHAPTER 6

Letters of Completion and Certificates of Recognition

The SGSR will issue a Letter of Completion (LOC) or a Certificate of Recognition (COR) to a graduate student who completes a sequence of courses or studies apart from a degree program. Students will complete a minimum of 12 credits post baccalaureate degree for a LOC and 18 credits post baccalaureate for a COR from a curriculum-approved set of courses, which constitute the LOC or COR. LOC and CORs typically will be designed for students who do not intend to pursue graduate degrees. These programs of study can be cited on a student's résumé; however, they are completed in less time and at less expense than a graduate degree

- A LOC or COR proposal for which there is no accompanying major must follow the procedures for New Program Proposals.
- A LOC or COR proposal for which there is an accompanying departmental major may follow the procedures for Program Revisions.

The following guidelines apply to the development of both LOCs and CORs.

- At least 50% of credits must be at the 600 level or higher.
- All electives must be consistent with the purpose of the LOC and COR and a rationale must be provided for their inclusion. Given that an LOC or COR is to be well-defined sequence of courses, a maximum of 3 credits of special topics courses may be included.
- An LOC or COR is a unique entity, targeting a different audience from that of existing graduate degree programs. Although courses required for an existing graduate degree may be included, the proposal must demonstrate that these courses can justifiably stand alone and be completed in a satisfactory manner by students not enrolled in the degree program.
- Applicants must meet all of the Admission Requirements as given in the current IUP Graduate Catalog. Applicants apply via the normal process [as defined on the Graduate Admissions section of the SGSR website](#).

Graduate Curriculum Handbook, rev. April 2013

[TOC](#) * [Intro](#) * [New Courses](#) * [Course Revisions](#) * [Distance Ed](#) * [New Programs](#) * [Certificates](#) * [Program Revisions](#) * [Variability of Delivery](#) * [Deletions/Moratoria](#) * [Cover Sheet](#) * [DE Form](#)

- In addition to the admission standards established by the SGSR, LOC and COR admission standards are determined by the department(s) offering the letter or certificate and should be unique to that LOC or COR.
- An LOC or COR student choosing later to pursue a graduate degree will have to submit a full application to the SGSR for admission to the graduate degree program.
- All credits may be transferred between an LOC and COR and a graduate degree program at the recommendation of the program and approval of the SGSR. Transfer credits from other institutions are not permitted, unless the LOC or COR is part of an inter-institutional cooperative program.
- Students must maintain academic good standing, defined as a 3.0 GPA (unless a higher GPA is required by the admitting department).
- An interdisciplinary LOC or COR will consist normally of courses that are offered by two or more departments. Faculty coordinating an interdisciplinary LOC or COR may be from a department that does not offer any graduate degrees.
- Inter-institutional LOCs and CORs may be proposed following the additional guidelines in the Variability in Delivery procedure detailed in this Handbook.
- A student must complete the program of study within the timeframe and parameters established by the LOC or COR.
- The completion of an approved LOC or COR will be noted on a student's transcript.

CHAPTER 7

Program Revisions

Overview

This chapter describes the process for requesting changes to an existing graduate program. This description will include relevant information regarding two types of program revisions (i.e., Major program Revision, Minor Program Revision) and the requirements for each. In addition, the chapter describes the procedures for proposing a Program Revision and includes the required forms. Finally, the chapter provides a description of the approval process.

Description/Types of Program Revisions

A Program Revision involves any request for changes to an existing program. Program Revisions are reviewed and approved by IUP, with notification supplied to PASSHE via a formal letter from the Provost's Office.

These requests fall into two categories, thus there are two types of Program Revisions:

- **Major Program Revision** involves a significant change in at least 50% of the total credits in the program. Minor course revisions do not count towards the 50% calculation.
- **Minor Program Revision** involves ALL changes that fall outside of the criteria for a Major Program Revision.

Procedures for Proposing a Program Revision

The required components from major and minor program revisions are similar, but there are some additional components required for major program revisions. Three components are common to both major and minor program revisions. These are:

- Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form
- Proposal
- Senate Agenda Item

Required Documentation for Major and Minor Program Revisions

1. Cover Sheet: [Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form](#)

2. Proposal:

A brief summary of the proposed changes:

- a. Outline of any changes to the Program Admission and/or Graduation requirements. Include any changes in required /elective course and changes to the catalog term.
- b. Description of each new or revised graduate course. Append/include proposals for each new graduate course or course revision as appropriate.
- c. The rationale for the proposed changes. (Describe why these changes are needed.)
- d. A discussion of any resource implication.
- e. A side-by-side comparison of the Current vs. Proposed program. Please underline items that are being deleted, place in bold items that are being added, and place an asterisk (*) by items that have requirements. (Please format it using Tables rather than Columns.)
- f. Emails or letters to and response from each department potentially affected by changes to the program. These should verify that the information has been relayed to the departments and provide such comments that make clear each department's position. If a department is unresponsive, please include copies of notification attempts

3. Senate Agenda Item

The Senate agenda item should include 1) the title of the program, 2) the sponsoring department; 3) the catalog start term; 4) the side-by-side comparison; 5) a brief summary of the rational for the revision; 6) the catalog description; and 7) brief summaries of each major change (new courses, course deletions, etc.). The agenda item must be submitted to the Dean's Associate in the SGSR at least 14 days before the next Senate meeting. Sample Senate Agenda Items are available on the [SGSR website](#).

Additional Documentation Required for Major Program Revisions

In addition to the three sections listed above, additional documentation must be provided for a Major Program Revision Proposal. Include five (5) additional sections

which address each of the following, plus related proposals for each new course or course revision included in the major revision.

4. Need (The economic need for the revision)

A detailed section, usually with charts and tables, that defines the economic need based on external surveys, the projected job market, and the competition. An appendix usually contains the curriculum of the competing programs.

5. Academic Integrity

Describe how the revision will address academic integrity. Discuss program structure, program goals, and student learning outcomes. Also include a curriculum overview with list of courses and a description of faculty qualifications.

6. Coordination with other programs

Include a description of the process of coordination with program on other campuses, especially PASSHE institutions; coordination with other departments or units on campus; and/or coordination with outside agencies.

7. Assessment And Accreditation

Describe the method of assessment of both students learning outcomes, and of the program itself, and any accreditation requirements.

8. Resource Sufficiency:

Document how the Revision will ensure financial resource sufficiency, including all costs of instruction, marketing, and all revenues generated through enrollments. This section must demonstrate that the program, based on headcounts and FTEs, will be financially self-sufficient (i.e. generate revenue) within five years.

9. Related proposals

Append a proposal for each new graduate course or course revision included in the major program revision.

CHAPTER 8

Variability of Delivery of Graduate Programs

A Variability of Delivery (VOD) proposal outlines a plan to deliver a program beyond traditional method which may include, but is not limited to: distance education, off-campus education, external degree programs, extension programs, non-traditional programs, programs serving special graduate populations, and inter-institutional offerings or agreements. The purpose of a VOD proposal is to demonstrate that the new method(s) of delivery are viable and consistent in quality and content with the original programs.

A proposal must be submitted to the UWGC detailing the plans to modify the mode of delivery when the change affects 33% or more of:

- A program, as measured relative to total degree credits.
- A course, as measured relative to the number of hours.
- A LOC or COR, as measured relative to total LOC or COR credits.

A VOD should include, at a minimum, the following components. Proposers are encouraged to include any additional components that would assist the UWGC in understanding the purpose, scope and need for the program.

1. Cover Sheet:

[Graduate Curriculum Authorization Form](#)

2. Proposal:

A brief summary of the proposed changes:

- a. The rationale for the proposed change in delivery.
 - b. A discussion of any resource implication.
- Impact on Existing Programs: How will the change in the method of delivery affect the existing program?

Graduate Curriculum Handbook, rev. April 2013

[TOC](#) * [Intro](#) * [New Courses](#) * [Course Revisions](#) * [Distance Ed](#) * [New Programs](#) * [Certificates](#) * [Program Revisions](#) * [Variability of Delivery](#) * [Deletions/Moratoria](#) * [Cover Sheet](#) * [DE Form](#)

- Course Schedule: Indicate when classes will be scheduled to meet (weekends, intensive workshop, self-paced) and for how long (4 hours per day for six weeks, 8 hours per weekend for a semester, etc.).
 - Outcomes Assessment: Describe the methodologies to be used to assess whether or not student learning has been achieved.
3. Emails or letters to and response from each department potentially affected by changes to the program:

These should verify that the information has been relayed to the departments and provide such comments that make clear each department's position. If a department is unresponsive, please include copies of notification attempts.

CHAPTER 9

Deletions and Moratoria

Departments should regularly delete those courses that have not been offered during the past six years. Deletions of programs, tracks, or courses may also be necessary as the needs of a particular discipline evolve or as accrediting agencies dictate such revisions. The format and process for a document describing a deletion is identical as that for a minor program revision.

Emails or letters of notification should be included that were addressed to departments potentially affected by the deletions, along with their responses. If a department is unresponsive, please include copies of notification attempts. Please also indicate:

- When the deletion is to take effect and the sequence of individual course deletions required for the phase-out, if it is a program, track, or minor that is being deleted.
- How the deletion will affect students currently enrolled in the program and how students will be notified.
- When the deleted items need to be removed from the Graduate Catalog.

Reactivation of Graduate Programs Placed in Moratorium/Inactive Status

Admission to a graduate program may be suspended, or a graduate program may be placed in moratorium, for a variety of reasons. Action to suspend admission may be initiated by the department or by the President. For more information regarding procedures for suspension, contact the Dean of the SGSR or the Provost's Office. All requests for reactivation of graduate programs placed in moratorium or inactive status must be reviewed by the UWGC. A reactivation request must be made within three calendar years after the program has been placed in moratorium. A program is terminated after the expiration of its three year moratorium; in such cases the revival of a program requires a new program proposal.

To reactivate a program under moratorium, a request must come from the department to the college dean and the graduate dean, with justification for the reactivation. This justification must include a detailed explanation of the reason(s) why the program went into moratorium, and also describe a coherent and logical plan as to how those reason(s) are being addressed in the revision. The format for the proposal is identical to that of a program revision.



GRADUATE CURRICULUM AUTHORIZATION FORM

TYPE OF PROPOSAL (check as appropriate)

Program Proposals

- New Program
- Major Program Revision
- Minor Program Revision
- Variability of Delivery
- New COR/LOC
- Program Deletion or Reactivation

Course Proposals

- New Course
- Major Course Revision
- Minor Course Revision
- Dual-Level Course
- Cross-Listed Course
- Course Deletion or Reactivation

NAME OF PROGRAM OR COURSE:	
DEPARTMENT:	
AUTHOR OR CONTACT PERSON:	
EMAIL:	

REQUIRED SIGNATURES

	Printed Name	Signature	Date
Dept Curriculum Chair			
Dept Chair			
TECC Chair (if required)			
College Curriculum Chair			
College Dean			
SGSR Dean			
Provost (new programs only)			
UWGC Chair			

EXPEDITED REVIEW*

SGSR Dean's Associate			
SGSR Dean, SGSR			
UWGC Co-Chair			
UWGC Co-Chair			

*Note: As appropriate, an expedited review is initiated by the SGSR for minor curriculum revisions



GRADUATE DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW FORM

NAME OF COURSE:	
DEPARTMENT:	
INSTRUCTOR OF RECORD:	
EMAIL:	

REQUIRED PROPOSAL COMPONENTS

(check to indicate component is included in proposal and assembled in this order)

Responses to Distance Education Questions

1. How is/are the instructor(s) qualified in the distance education delivery method as well as the discipline?
2. How will each outcome in the course be achieved using distance education technologies?
3. How will instructor-student and student-student, if applicable, interaction take place?
4. How will student achievement be evaluated?
5. How will academic honesty for tests and assignments be addressed?

Current Syllabus of Record (if existing course)

New Syllabus of Record (if new course or special topics)

Representative Course Module

REQUIRED ENDORSEMENTS

The objectives of this course can be met via distance education:

AGREE	DISAGREE		Signature	Date
		Dept Chair		
		College Dean		
		UWGC Chair		

This distance education course is:

APPROVED	REJECTED		Signature	Date
		Provost		