### Northern New Mexico College
#### ACADEMIC POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>New Degree Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File Reference:</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Approved By Board of Regents:</td>
<td>November 17, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replaces Policy Approved On:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose:</td>
<td>To Provide a consistent methodology for the development and implementation of new degree programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy:</td>
<td>Development of New Degree Programs (Including Certification, Associate, Baccalaureate, Masters and Ph.D. Programs) must follow the prescribed process described herein.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Procedures:

Proposals are to be submitted on Form NNMC1001-rev111705 (New Degree Program Approval) to the Office of the President. Upon review, The Office of the President will make one of three recommendations regarding the proposal:

1. Denial
2. Approval Pending Additional Planning
3. Approval to Implement

A partially completed proposal (short form) may be submitted to obtain an “Approval Pending Additional Planning” status which will determine the degree of feasibility of offering a particular degree program. If the Office of the President approves "pending additional planning" then a complete proposal may be submitted for approval/denial. This short-form" must include the criteria marked with an asterisk (*) as indicated on Form NNMC1001-rev1005.

The Office of the President will submit all Baccalaureate Degree Program “Approvals to Implement” to the Board of Regents at their next regularly scheduled meeting, for their final approval. The Office of the President will submit all Graduate Degree Program “Approvals to Implement” to the New Mexico Higher Education Department for pre-approval prior to submitting them to the Board of Regents for final approval. Failure to provide complete and accurate information may result in a recommendation to resubmit the proposal.

**Denial** will be recommended for proposals that do not meet the criteria for new program development or which are missing key data elements or contain concerns that may be addressed in a resubmission.

**Approval Pending Additional Planning** will be recommended for proposals that, while meeting other of the criteria, provide evidence that key programmatic components and/or resources are not in place to implement the program. In order to receive implementation approval, evidence must be presented to the Provost in a subsequent status report that the key programmatic components and/or resources are no longer missing. After such evidence has been provided, the program may be recommended to the Board for implementation approval.

**Approval to Implement** will be recommended for proposals that meet all criteria for new program development. No further submissions will be required, and, subsequent to Board approval, institutions may offer the new program at a date no sooner than that stipulated in the proposal.
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Criteria for New Degree Program Approval
(Including Certification, Associate, Baccalaureate, Masters and Ph.D. Programs)

1. The proposed program relates to the institutional mission statement as contained in the Strategic Plan.

2. The proposed program does not duplicate other NNMC offerings or, otherwise, provides a convincing rationale for doing so.

3. There is evidence that planning for the proposed program has been a collaborative process involving academic units and offices of planning and budgeting at the institutional level, as well as external consultants, representatives of the community, surveys and/or other analysis which verifies the demand and support for said proposal, etc.

4. The proposal provides a reasonable timetable of events leading to the implementation of the proposed program.

5. The proposal provides evidence that there is a need for more people to be educated in this program at this level.

6. The proposal contains reasonable estimates of headcount and FTE students who will major in the proposed program.

7. The proposal provides an appropriate, sequenced, and described course of study.

8. For Bachelor's programs, the total number of credit hours does not exceed 128; otherwise, the proposal provides a reasonable argument for an exception to the 128 credit hours maximum.

9. For bachelor's programs, the proposal lists all prerequisites and provides assurance that they are the same standardized prerequisites for similar degree programs within the New Mexico Higher Education Department (HED). If they are not, the proposal provides an acceptable rationale for a request for exception to standardized prerequisites.

10. The proposed program relates to specific institutional strengths such as programs of emphasis, other academic programs and/or institutes and centers.

11. If there have been program reviews or accreditation visits in the discipline pertinent to the proposed program, or in related disciplines, the proposal cites recommendations that were made and provides evidence that progress has been made in implementing those recommendations.

12. The proposal provides evidence that the institution has analyzed the feasibility of providing all or a portion of the proposed program through distance learning technologies via its own technological capabilities as well as through collaboration with other universities.

13. The proposal provides evidence that there is a critical mass of faculty available to initiate the program based on estimated enrollments.

14. For doctoral programs, the proposal provides evidence that the faculty in aggregate have the necessary experience and research activity to sustain the program.

15. The proposal provides evidence that, if appropriate, there is a commitment to hire additional faculty in later years, based on estimated enrollments.

16. The proposal provides evidence that library resources are sufficient to initiate the program.

17. The proposal provides evidence that classroom, teaching laboratory, research laboratory, office, and any other type of space which is necessary for the proposed program is sufficient to initiate the program.

18. The proposal provides evidence that necessary and sufficient equipment to initiate the program is available.
19. The proposal provides evidence that, if appropriate, fellowships, scholarships, and graduate assistantships are sufficient to initiate the program.

20. The proposal provides evidence that, if appropriate, clinical and internship sites have been arranged.

21. The proposal provides a complete and reasonable budget, reflecting the text of the proposal. Costs for the program should reflect costs associated with similar programs at other HED institutions.

22. In the event that resources within the institution are redirected to support the new program, the proposal indicates the source from which funds will be redirected, and provides evidence that such a redirection will not have a negative impact on undergraduate education.

23. For an undergraduate program, the proposal provides evidence that community college articulation has been addressed and ensured.

24. For disciplines where specialized accreditation is available, the proposal indicates whether the institution will seek such accreditation for the proposed program. If the institution indicates that specialized program accreditation will not be sought, adequate justification is provided.

25. The proposal provides evidence that the academic unit(s) associated with a new degree have been productive in teaching, service, scholarship and research, where appropriate.

Cross Reference:

Employees represented by a bargaining unit may also be governed by the appropriate bargaining unit agreement.