Campus Administrative Review for New Departments and Degree Programs

Proposals for new departments and degree programs undergo review by both the Academic Senate and the campus administration. The administrative review focuses on enrollment, resource needs, and impacts to other campus units. The administrative review must happen early in the proposal process, after the departmental faculty or program planning committee vote to approve the proposal, and before the Faculty Executive Committee considers it at the school/college level. The administrative review culminates with a letter from the cognizant dean indicating whether they support the proposal. The dean's letter and substance of the administrative review must accompany the proposal throughout the subsequent review process.

Required elements of an administrative review:

1. The cognizant dean will appoint a liaison to work with the proposers in conducting the administrative review.
2. If a new degree program is being proposed, a preliminary assessment of program viability including probable student demand and an environmental scan of likely competitor programs should be included. Student demographics and their alignment with UCR's mission to serve students historically underserved by higher education should be considered. Professional opportunities and prospects for graduates (e.g., employment, graduate school) also should be considered. Proposers are encouraged to seek out expert advice to improve the quality of the study. University Extension (UNEX) has substantial experience with market studies and the UNEX dean's office can potentially assist or provide a referral.
3. A five-year enrollment plan, developed in consultation with, and including the endorsement of, the Office of Institutional Research. The plan should include both new and continuing student headcounts and FTE counts (both first-years and transfers). It should be built upon anticipated credit loads, retention rates, graduation rates, and growth constraints that are appropriate for UCR. It also should include enrollment impacts on other programs and thus on campus enrollment overall. The plan should explicitly reflect the market study as well as enrollment benchmarks from comparator institutions.
4. A five-year financial plan, developed in consultation with, and including the endorsement of, the Office of Financial Planning & Analysis. The plan should include costs for personnel (e.g., faculty, lecturers, teaching assistants, readers, graduate student assistants, administrative and technical support staff including academic advising, and anyone else who will be supported by the core budget), stipends (e.g., chair, vice chair), capital costs (e.g., renovations), support services (e.g., library resources, computing, other equipment), and other administrative expenses (e.g., physical and virtual branding, advertising and recruiting, events, travel, institutional memberships, professional development, etc.). The plan also should include sources of funding (e.g., campus, fees, philanthropic) to cover these costs. If the plan requires no new resources then this should be clearly stated and sufficiently explained and justified.
5. A five-year space plan, developed in consultation with, and including the endorsement of, the cognizant dean's office. This should include specific space needs (e.g., numbers, sizes, and types of rooms) as well as a proposal for acquiring it. Include specific room numbers, if known. Also include letters of support from and/or MOUs with affected units (e.g., those willing to transfer or share space).
6. An assessment of potential impacts to other campus units, including reliance on courses taught by other units, staff/services/space/resources that are under the purview of other units, and any other anticipated impacts particularly at the school/college level. Potentially impacted units must be given opportunities to participate in this assessment and provide input. Anticipated impacts to general assignment classroom space are not required.

There may be additional requirements described in Academic Senate documentation for proposals that undergo systemwide review (e.g., SSGPDPs). This document does not change those requirements.