

# Minnesota State Colleges and Universities

## APPLIED DOCTORATE

### NEW PROGRAM APPLICATION

All new programs must be reviewed and formally approved by the Office of the Chancellor. Proposals for new applied doctorate programs may be presented at any time during the year. Academic Program Review unit staff will review your proposal. Throughout the approval process staff will be available for consultation and assistance in all aspects of proposal development. Usually, the progress of a proposal toward final approval is not linear, but involves numerous questions, discussions, and negotiations.

#### APPLICABLE POLICIES

The following Board of Trustees policies are available at <http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/index.html> under the heading, Chapter 3 – Educational Policies.

POLICY 1A.1 – MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

POLICY 3.14 – PROGRAM APPROVAL

POLICY 3.17 – DEGREES DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES

PROCEDURE 3.17.1 – DEGREES DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES

POLICY 3.25 – DEGREE GRANTING AUTHORITY

#### PLANNING

Allowing enough time for new program development and implementation is important. Additional research and information may have to be collected to prepare the best possible proposal, so campuses should allow several months as a minimum for completion of the approval process.

In-depth planning well in advance of program implementation is critical for a variety of reasons:

- A formal Notice of Intent is advised. The notice of intent will be posted on the Program Approval listserv for 21 days to seek comment. Once the Notice of Intent has been posted, it is expected that a completed program application will be submitted within 60 days.
- All new program proposals are reviewed against criteria that reflect current policy shaping the program approval process, current practice in the field, and national and regional accreditation guidelines. We recommend that you begin by reviewing the list of “New Applied Doctorate Program Rating Criteria” which follows this introductory section. New proposals must address ALL criteria identified below.
- The application timeline established by the institution should be consistent with Office of the Chancellor timelines, and should take into consideration that lead time will be needed to market the program. (See Sample Timeline)
- New program proposals will require a careful analysis of occupational demand in the targeted labor market area and student interest. This may require an extended period of time to design surveys,

gather data, research the economic data in the labor market area, and gather other materials supportive of an investment in developing this new curriculum.

- Internal Review of New Program Proposals. Proof of reviews and/or approvals by campus faculty and administrators must be included with the new program proposal. In some cases, institutional missions, policies and procedures will need to be amended to reflect doctoral level programming. An advisory committee is recommended to provide on-going advice and support on curriculum, needs of the field of study, and linkages to current research.
- External Review of New Program Proposals. External reviews are required for all new doctoral programs. The procedures are outlined below. For the first doctoral level program proposed by an institution, approval by the Higher Learning Commission, which may include a site visit, is required.
- External Collaboration. The Academic Program Review unit encourages cooperative and collaborative efforts among MnSCU institutions. In some cases, formal agreements must be reached that may require extended discussions and approvals on multiple campuses.

### PROPOSAL EVALUATION

All proposals will be evaluated against the “New Applied Doctorate Program Criteria” in the next section. All criteria must be addressed. Information resulting from the staff review of the program application will be provided to the university.

### SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Some information is mandated by Board policy; other information provides Academic Program staff with a comprehensive understanding of the proposal. Academic Program review staff will help with identifying occupational/professional demand information, will provide information about designing student interest surveys, and can provide information on the location of similar programs offered at both public and private institutions in the targeted labor market area to address the question of unnecessary program duplication. Graduate follow-up information may also be obtained for similar programs to strengthen proposals. It may be helpful to present information from other published data sources (*include citations with page numbers*). Appendices of applications for new programs should also include vitae of faculty involved in the program or qualifications for new faculty. Complete descriptions of curriculum, including course descriptions, student learning outcomes, and measurement techniques should be included.

Programs should consult with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) to ensure that the proposed program meets all the requirements, expectations and recommendations outlined by that body. See especially Chapter 7 of the *Accreditation Handbook* (2003) for the process for seeking approval for Institutional Change. Also recommended is the report prepared by the HLC Task Force on the Professional Doctorate (2005-2006).

Questions regarding the application rating process and form should be addressed to the staff member working with your proposal:

[Jeanette.daines@so.mnscu.edu](mailto:Jeanette.daines@so.mnscu.edu)  
Bemidji State University

[Neala.schleuning@so.mnscu.edu](mailto:Neala.schleuning@so.mnscu.edu)  
Minnesota State University,  
Mankato

[Erin.sperling@so.mnscu.edu](mailto:Erin.sperling@so.mnscu.edu)  
Metropolitan State University

Minnesota State University  
Moorhead  
St. Cloud State University

Southwest Minnesota State  
University

Winona State University

Submit one electronic copy of the completed application via e-mail, and one paper copy via fax or mail to the following address:

Academic Program Review Unit  
FAX: (651) 296-3214

# NEW APPLIED DOCTORAL PROGRAM RATING CRITERIA

The following elements will receive enhanced scrutiny in the application for new applied doctorate programs. The Office of the Chancellor will expect to see detailed discussion of the following proposal elements.

## INSTITUTIONAL EVIDENCE

- **Mission.** Program reflects mission of the institution; and the program award is appropriate, given the mission of the institution. The program is consistent with institutional academic plan.
- **Student Interest.** Evidence of sustainable interest in the program beyond the initial year of implementation. Recommended: four year projections.
- **Professional Demand** – Evidence of sustainable demand for graduates of the program beyond the initial graduating classes. Discuss why this degree is needed. Include sources of information in support of need.
- **Unnecessary Duplication.** Evidence that approval of this program will not adversely affect enrollment at MnSCU institutions within the proposed labor market area, and that the anticipated number of graduates will not adversely affect placement of graduates.
- **Appropriate Length.** Program length is within policy limits including all credit-bearing requirements required for graduation. The program includes a minimum of 72 semester credits beyond the baccalaureate degree.
- **External Collaboration.** Evidence of support for the program from professional accrediting organizations, or other agencies that provide oversight or are critical to the effectiveness of the program in the field of study in question.

Describe any collaborative activities with other MnSCU institutions in the development of this proposal.

- **Resources—Faculty/Staff.** Faculty in the proposed program are expected to have earned doctorates in an appropriate field of study, be recognized as having been granted official Graduate Faculty Status and a record of scholarship appropriate to the curriculum and purpose of the program. The Office of the Chancellor expects information, as appropriate, on plans to increase the number of participating faculty and to enhance the areas of faculty expertise in the proposed program. Additional staffing needs at the departmental level should be identified, and included in budget information. These may include administrative support staff, administrative staff, coordinators, etc.
- **Resources—Practice.** An important element of a practitioner degree is the opportunity for students to serve in a clinical setting appropriate to their field of study and degree. This section should include information and data about resources available for practica, capstone experiences, clinical agencies, community sites, or other elements designed to give students real life experiences in their fields. This section may also address the need for preceptors, supervisors, or other faculty and staff necessary to create and manage these resources.
- **Resources—Information.** Evidence of sufficient information resources, or a substantive plan to acquire those resources, to sustain the program (a clear three to five year budgetary commitment is essential). Library resources may include online and regional access. Strength of the library collection will be of particular importance.
- **Resources—Technology and Facilities.** Evidence of sufficient resources, as appropriate to the program, in technology, equipment, research support and facilities, or a substantive plan to

acquire those instructional and research resources, to support the program over a three to five year period.

- **Resources—Student, Budget and Personnel.** Financial support for at least a three to five year budget commitment should be outlined. Realistic projections of revenues, expenditures, and internal reallocations to support the proposed program.
- **Program—Curriculum.** A detailed description of the proposed curriculum should include admission requirements; a conceptual framework; program objectives; outcomes and quality assurance measures; course outlines and/or syllabi if available; schedule of faculty workload; course delivery methods; and a time-to-degree plan.
- **Program—Purpose and Approach.** Clarify how the proposed program will respond to 21<sup>st</sup> Century educational/professional/ occupational challenges and opportunities in the field of study. This includes partnership consultation with the practitioner constituencies about skills/competencies for the degree. Documentation of consultation with statewide groups of practitioners (superintendents, psychology board, nursing accrediting bodies, etc.) about current practice should be included in the application. How does the program meet the standards of the field set by specialized accrediting bodies that will or could accredit the program?

Discuss the applied research approach and how this degree is different from the Ph.D, and different from other degrees offered by the institution in the proposed field of study. Competencies in this degree must be different from professional competencies gained in other degrees at other levels.

- **Program—Assessment and Evidence of a Continuous Improvement Plan.** Develop a plan for assessing the progress and achievements of the proposed program after its initial three years. A report at the end of three years is required by the Office of the Chancellor. Describe a plan for follow up of graduates.
- **Institutional Readiness—Evidence of Organization of Graduate Education.** A discussion of the university governance structure should include
  - Focused and effective leadership in graduate studies as demonstrated by a designated administrator with appropriate authority and resources, graduate council and a separate graduate-level curriculum recommendation process
  - Policies for graduate faculty status appropriate for doctoral level studies
  - Supporting policies regarding admissions, students' academic performance, supervision of graduate students, and associated policies and procedures appropriate for doctoral studies.
- **Institutional Readiness—Evidence of Institutional Capacity to Deliver Doctoral Level Education.** This section should also include a broad discussion of institutional capacity and impact of degree beyond the program offering the degree. It will include
  - Description of the institution's quality assurance processes
  - Discussion of relationship with the professional field of study and related fields to assess the need for and acceptance of the program
  - Discussion of the financial impact on the institution and the institution-wide planning undertaken to support the program
  - discussion of appropriate committee responsibilities to graduate education, the capacity to staff dissertation and capstone committees (within the department offering the degree, and other departmental faculty who might serve on committees)
  - Identification of other support and consultation needs (such as support for student research design and computer time, etc.), graduate student advising, and student support services.

## **EVIDENCE OF EXTERNAL REVIEW**

An external review of all new applied doctoral programs shall be conducted. The findings of the external review will become part of the final new program application.

*Reviewers.* Three individuals from other states, selected for their expertise in the field under review, will be identified. Two reviewers will be selected by the university in consultation with the Office of the Chancellor. One anonymous reviewer will be selected by the Office of the Chancellor. Preference should be given to representatives of the profession or professional accrediting bodies, when available. For a university's first doctoral level program, the Office of the Chancellor strongly recommends selection of individuals with experience as consultant evaluators for the Higher Learning Commission.

*Responsibilities of Reviewers.* The team of two reviewers will conduct a site visit. The anonymous reviewer will conduct a "desk" review of the proposal submitted to the Office of the Chancellor. The reviewers will submit reports to the Office of the Chancellor, addressing all program approval criteria outlined in the New Applied Doctorate Program Application.

*Disposition of the Report.* The report from the on site reviewers will be shared with the university. Identity of the desk reviewer and his or her report will remain confidential. Recommendations for changes to the New Applied Doctorate Program Application by Office of the Chancellor staff, if any, will be shared with the university.

## **HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION APPROVAL**

At the time the first doctoral level program is proposed by an institution, evidence of consultation with the Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) concerning formal approval of the proposed change to offer degrees at a new level must be submitted as part of the approval process. The final approval process by the HLC will be initiated subsequent to formal MnSCU approval. See Chapter Seven: The Ongoing Relationship of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools' *Handbook of Accreditation*.

**Minnesota State Colleges and Universities**  
**NEW APPLIED DOCTORATE**  
**PROGRAM APPLICATION**

[This form is designed for electronic use. You should have some familiarity with the Word table-making function. NOTE: A hard copy signature page must be sent following electronic submission.]

**SECTION I: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM**

<b>Institution:</b>				
<b>Suggested 6-Digit CIP Code</b>	<b>Program Name (s)</b>	<b>Award</b>	<b>Credit Length</b>	<b>Location/s</b>
<b>Effective start date(s):</b>		<b>Affiliated educational institution that offers one or more credits in this program, if applicable (list):</b>		
<b>Brief catalog description of the program:</b>				
<b>Program Learning Outcomes (“Graduates will be able to ____”):</b> Include a detailed description of proposed learning outcomes and related assessments.				

**SECTION II: GENERAL RATING CRITERIA**

*All criteria must be addressed. See narrative for explanation of items. Enter information here, in sections III-V or attach appendices as appropriate.*

<b>a. Mission.</b>
<b>b. Student Interest.</b>
<b>c. Professional Demand.</b>
<b>d. Unnecessary Program Duplication.</b>
<b>e. Appropriate Length.</b>
<b>f. External Collaboration.</b>
<b>g. Resources-Faculty/Staff. Complete item III-D. Additional narrative may be added here.</b>
<b>h. Resources—Practice.</b>

**SECTION II: GENERAL RATING CRITERIA**

*All criteria must be addressed. See narrative for explanation of items. Enter information here, in sections III-V or attach appendices as appropriate.*

i. Resources—Information, Research Support Services.
j. Resources—Technology and Facilities. Complete Section III-E. Additional narrative may be added here.
k. Resources—Student, budget & personnel. Complete Section III-A – D. Narrative may be added here.
l. Program—Curriculum. Complete Sections IV and V. Additional narrative may be added here.
m. Program—Purpose and Approach.
n. Program—Assessment Plan after the Third Year.
o. Institutional Readiness—Evidence of Organization of Graduate Education.
p. Institutional Readiness—Evidence of Institutional Capacity to Delivery Doctoral Level Education.
q. Response to External Review of Proposal. Attach comments/reviewer’s report.
r. Evidence of Consultation/Approval with Higher Learning Commission to Offer Degrees at the Doctoral Level.

**SECTION III: ENROLLMENT, BUDGET AND PERSONNEL** *(The Office of the Chancellor will assume that a reallocation will be achieved to balance revenues and expenditures)*

**A. STUDENT ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS** (include projections for cohorts as appropriate)

	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year
Number of Program Majors (Fall headcount)				
Annual Full-Time-Equivalent Majors				
Annual Credit Hours in EXISTING Courses <sup>1</sup>				
Annual Credit Hours in NEW Courses <sup>1</sup>				
Annual Number of degrees Awarded				

**B. REVENUES ANTICIPATED.** If revenue is being diverted from existing programs, provide a detailed description in the budget narrative of how the current program/s will be sustained/changed.

Student Tuition <sup>2</sup>				
Fees				
External (Grants, gifts, other)				
State Allocation				
Internal Reallocation (identify source in narrative above)				

<sup>1</sup> Include credit hours generated by both majors and non-majors in courses offered by the academic unit directly responsible for the proposed program.

<sup>2</sup> current rate per credit x student FYE x 32 semester credits per year

**SECTION III: ENROLLMENT, BUDGET AND PERSONNEL** (The Office of the Chancellor will assume that a reallocation will be achieved to balance revenues and expenditures)

<b>TOTAL</b>				
<b>C. EXPENDITURES.</b> Identify projected expenditures.				
	<b>First Year</b>	<b>Second Year</b>	<b>Third Year</b>	<b>Fourth Year</b>
NEW Salary and Fringe <sup>3</sup>				
EXISTING Salary and Fringe <sup>3</sup>				
Supplies				
Equipment				
Library holdings				
Travel, Purchased Services and Other Expenses				
<b>TOTAL</b>				
<b>D. FACULTY AND STAFF.</b> Identify projected personnel needs.				
NEW Faculty/Staff FTE				
EXISTING Faculty/Staff FTE				
<b>E. FACILITY AND MAJOR EQUIPMENT. (if applicable)</b> Describe all construction and/or major renovations that will be necessary if the proposed program is approved, and estimate the cost. If space will be rented for the proposed program, describe the type of space and cost.				

**SECTION IV: PLANNING AND DESIGN**

<b>a. Provide a chart of faculty workload sufficient to cover delivery of the curriculum.</b>				
<b>b. Provide a time-to-degree timeline.</b>				
<b>c. Admission. Program Specific Admission Requirements</b> (if different from institution Graduate School admission requirements). <b>Describe Institutional Graduate School admission requirements for doctoral programs.</b>				
<b>d. Program Conceptual Framework.</b>				
<b>e. Program Delivery Methods</b> (land, online, either).				
<b>f. Faculty Position</b>	<b>FT or PT</b>	<b>Doctoral Classes Taught</b> <b>Year: course # (credit hours, terms) = total credit hrs</b>	<b>Teaching %</b>	<b>Other %</b>
<i>Example - Faculty Member A</i>	<i>FT</i>	2007: 600 (3, FS) 601 (3, FS) 602 (3, FS) = 18 2008: 600 (3, FS) 601 (3, FS) 602 (3, F) = 15	100 84	0 16
<i>Example - Faculty Member B</i>	<i>PT</i>	2007: 600 (3, FS) = 6 2008: 601 (3, FS) 602 (3, FS) = 12	33 67	0 0

<sup>3</sup> Fringe benefits: 25 percent of salary; Salary and fringe correspond to part D FTE.  
 Page 8  
 Academic Program Review Unit  
 DRAFT  
 Working Draft Valid through 12/31/2006



**SECTION V: PROGRAM CURRICULUM** (See “Program Design” section of the program approval manual for a description of program components.)

Use the following headings to provide information for required courses in the program. List all courses required for the students to graduate, including prerequisite courses and/or degrees.

PROGRAM COMPONENT/COURSES	COURSE TITLE/NUMBER	NUMBER OF CREDITS	EXISTING COURSES?	
			Y	N
<b>Prerequisites.</b> List individual courses or degrees as appropriate; indicate whether prerequisites are counted in total degree requirements, or are prerequisites to admission.				
<b>Major – Field</b> (list individual courses including applied research, capstone, or thesis)				
<b>Supporting Field Courses</b> (If any)				
<b>TOTAL CREDITS IN AWARD</b>				
<b>PERCENTAGE OF DEGREE CREDITS OFFERED AT THE DOCTORAL GRADUATE LEVEL ONLY</b>				

**SECTION VI: APPROVAL VERIFICATION\****Application Author**Title**Campus**Phone and E-Mail**Approval of Institution's Graduate Council/Dean:**Approval Chief Academic Officer:**Approval of President:**Signature of cooperating institution's president:*

*\*NOTE: In combination with an electronically sent application, you must send a hard copy of this signature page to complete the application process.*

**SECTION VII: APPENDICES/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

A. Professional Demand Data

B. Student Interest Data

C. Collaborative Agreements, if applicable.

D. Faculty Vitae

E. Curriculum, including Course Outlines and/or Syllabi, and Assessment Methods

F. Evidence of external support, if available.

G. Summary of Program Governance Decisions, including Curriculum Committee Membership and Minutes showing recommendations (required). Approval of Institution Graduate Council, Graduate Dean.

H. Evidence of External Review Findings

I. Documented Approval/Consultation with the Higher Learning Commission for Proposed Changes

J. Letters of Support (optional, but encouraged)

**Sample Timeline for  
Doctoral Program Approval  
Fall 2007 Start-up**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Date Completed</b>
July-December 2005	Revision of Institutional Mission, Vision, Purpose (if necessary)	University	
	Planning and Curriculum Design	University	
January-March 2006	Revision/Approval of Applicable MnSCU Policies	MnSCU Board of Trustees	
February 2006	Letter of Intent	University Presidents	
March-April 2006	Adoption of Program Approval Criteria/Process	Office of the Chancellor w/MnSCU Graduate Council	
May 2006	Adoption of Institutional Policies and Structures	University	
September 2006	Institutional Program Approval	University	
September 30, 2006	Submit Application to Office of Chancellor	University	
September-Spring 2007	IFO/MnSCU Special Task Force	IFO, Office of Chancellor	
September-October 2006	External Review of Proposal (site visit and desk reviews)	Office of Chancellor, University	
October 2006	Planning with Higher Learning Commission	HLC/Office of Chancellor/University	
November-December 2006	Review-Approval of Program Proposal	Office of the Chancellor	
January-March 2007	HLC Review-Action (possible site visit)	HLC, Office of the Chancellor, University	