Review and approve previous meeting minutes

- Dr. Koch motioned to approve the minutes with edits. Dr. Lindenmeier seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Susan Stansberry, SEFLA School Head

- The Educational Technology faculty line has a verbal commitment
- The SEFLA personnel committee completed all ARPT actions
- SELFA is working to finalize their ARPT document. The task force looked at work load.
- SELFA is developing a research project to include all faculty members
- Dr. Stansberry visited with Dr. Sheryl Tucker Stans to remind her that their concern across college is the serving of outside members on committees.

Julie Koch, HCCP School Head

- HCCP completed their ARPT document
- HCCP A&D’s are complete
- Dr. Julie Croff is our EHA representative on the Provost's Health Committee. Dean Romans, Dr. Croff and Human Sciences are meeting to look at how to move quickly.
- The OSU Center for Wellness & Recovery is hosting a strategic planning retreat. Dean Romans thanked HCCP faculty for their involvement.

Adrienne Sanogo, Interim STLES School Head

- The STLES subcommittee is working on their ARPT document. They are developing language for the Clinical faculty reappointment and they requested the other school
documents. Now, they are focusing on a timeline for clinical and the criteria that establishes Assistant and Associate positions from full positions.

- The subcommittee is also discussing clinical faculty work load. They want to remain in compliance with the university document and they are trying to address concerns.
- Can titles be changed to a Teaching Assistant? Title changes require new position requests. If this is the right thing to do, let’s start these processes.
- If faculty are doing advising, do they do advising as a part of their load or do we have to reduce teaching load to meet this need? If we are requiring them to do advising, maybe they should receive a course release. Contracts vary across the schools.

**Doug Smith, KAHR School Head**

- Denise Melot, Tina Castleberry and Rachel Tribble attended the KAHR monthly meeting
- The KAHR ARPT committee will meet Thursday, February 15th
- If the College is planning more entrepreneurial activates in the future, we need to consider other ways to facilitate these processes for faculty. Sometimes people fold in their own consulting or private practice work. How does this work with the university?
- The College is using one-time resources to purchase furniture for Colvin classrooms.

**Ed Harris, EHA Faculty Development and Research Committee Chair**

- FDRC will begin editing the College ARPT document.
- FDRC is reviewing faculty awards. There are great nominees.

**Donna Lindenmeier, EHA P&P Chair**

- The EHA P&P meeting is February 20. Proposals must be reviewed and approved by School P&P Committees or they will not be reviewed at EHA P&P meetings.
- Degree Works is the program they are using. Courses must be listed, and these changes must go through P&P. OSU hopes to move everything to Degree Works by August.

**Jennifer Cribbs, EHA Student Affairs Committee Chair**

- The Student Affairs Committee will discuss scholarships on Monday, February 19th.
• Last year’s changes to the scholarship application process, simplified the process. Dr. Sanogo thanked the committee for their work.
• April 28- EHA Scholarship Reception
• Dr. Cribbs provided the Student Affairs Committee governance document to FDRC.

**Tonya Hammer, EHA Tulsa Faculty Representative**

• Tami Moore and Mike Stout are now leading the Kettering Center for Community Engagement in Tulsa. They received a grant to host a dialogue event this spring Stillwater faculty and students are welcome to present. Dr. Hammer will send more information.
• The Body Image and Eating Disorder Lab is collaborating with DHM and they are participating in National Eating Disorders Awareness Week.
• Dr. Sanogo recently met with Tulsa Elementary Education faculty to discuss recruitment packages for paraprofessionals. They are moving forward with this program.
• Tulsa Public Schools is launching a [five-week training program](#) for teachers and they are asking for legislative permission to certify them.
• Project Echo is an outreach effort for rural health care. Each state has adopted their own Project Echo plan is through the OSU Center for Health Sciences. Weekly sessions have panels of experts connected through Zoom, and topics vary. Tele-Ed, through Project ECHO, will focus on professional development for rural school administrators. There is a room in Tulsa designated for this. They will initially target administrators because they are gatekeepers then other program areas will be included. The project will begin in April.
• The Tulsa campus is having technology problems and IT responses are not helpful. Dr. Sanogo will look into this. Tulsa Technology concerns can be shared with Dean Romans.
• March 3, [OSU Tulsa screening of American Creed](#). Sponsored by EHA, the Writing Project and OACTE.
Bert Jacobson, Associate Dean for Research, Engagement and Administration

- The Grants Coordinator search committee is interviewing three candidates. Dean Romans thanked faculty and staff for their work with grants and contracts and apologized for the challenges.
- The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs search committee is scheduling interviews for the end of February.
- Kim Moss is scheduling EPAF training for EHA staff.
- EHA has invited three Belizean Ministry of Education members to campus.
- Dr. Ormsbee shared a request for existing degree programs to fast track through OSRHE. They would not have to go through the entire P&P process. Colleges would fill out the form and send it strait to Dr. Ormsbee and she would forward it to the Board of Regents. These courses and degrees must be existing, and the only change would be the online delivery. Dr. Jacobson is collecting feedback Dr. Ormsbee.

John Romans, Dean Report

- Dean Romans and Leslie Evans met with McKnight Center Director Mark Blakeman. Mark is interested in partnering with the EHA for their educational mission. They discussed EHA Cineculture and music therapy. In April, the center is bringing in a storyteller through the New York Museum of Art. Our student teachers could also work with the McKnight Center. Dean Romans will help facilitate conversations with Professional Education and STLES.
- The Deans Council discussed Title IX and Michigan state compliance issues. Please be aware of our reporting responsibilities for our students.
- In the fall semester, Slate will be replacing CollegeNet. CollegeNet does not talk to Banner but Slate does. Slate should help solve time delays and faculty will require more training.
- There is a University level shift happening where Undergrad admissions is realizing they need more granular data from programs.
- At the January 16th Faculty Council meeting GTA and GRAs were added to a background check policy draft. Dean Romans has the draft policy and he will work with HR. This is considered a best practice.
Nominations for **EHA Staff Awards** are due March 31st. Dr. Adrienne Sanogo and Dr. Doug Smith volunteered to serve on the selection committee.

The Graduate Coordinator search committee will meet February 15th.

**Faculty Governance**

Leadership Team discussed school feedback regarding faculty governance restructuring.

- There is concern that there isn’t a fourth standing committee.
- KAHR is challenged with their small number of faculty members
- Explicit language is needed that who doesn’t have standing committee chair has an extra faculty rep at Leadership Team.
- HCCP prefers representation be one member and one alternate for the College ARPT committee. This would require a change in our College ARPT doc.
- Diversity issues should be added to each standing committee.
- Should the Diversity Committee or International Committee serve as the fourth standing committee? FDRC consensus was that another standing committee would be burdensome.
- Should committee chairs be tenured faculty members? This could be difficult for Student Affairs and the smaller schools. Maybe language should say encouraged or preferred.
- Should a staff rep be added to Leadership Team? Would they have voting rights?
- There needs to be a more mindful plan for choosing the Tulsa faculty rep for Leadership Team.
- STLES tenure request was for the chairs and elected faculty rep. Do school docs have info on how these reps and chairs are selected? We need to find out of the school docs list this?

Donna Lindenmeier motioned for Dean Romans to correct the faculty governance document and bring forth to Leadership Team for review. Ed Harris seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Julie Koch motioned for the EHA Diversity Committee and EHA International Committee not have elected reps on Leadership Team. Donna Lindenmeier seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.
• Julie Koch motioned to add diversity language to each standing committee. Donna Lindenmeier seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

**ARPT document updates**

• FDRC will begin the process of updating the College ARPT document. FDRC will have this by the end of March.
• February 28- Deadline for finalized School ARPT documents. School Heads should send to Dean Romans. Dean Romans will review the School ARPT documents and send them to legal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018 EHA Leadership Team meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, August 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 11, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 8, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, December 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, January 17, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, January 31, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 28, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 11, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 25, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 9, 2018 (OSU Tulsa Campus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F-1 Purpose

The shared governance structure has been designed to enable faculty to have a major influence on the policy and direction of the College of Education, Health and Aviation (EHA). The committees are comprised of faculty elected by their colleagues to collaboratively conduct the business of EHA. The committees hold responsibility for providing the faculty voice in decisions that impact faculty development, personnel policy, curricula development and implementation, long- and short-term planning and development, and resource allocation.

F-2 Guiding Principles of Shared Governance

- We believe that the work of the EHA is important and has a tremendous impact on the success of the College and its members.
- We strive for a culture, environment, and structure that infuses and perpetuates an atmosphere of openness, trust, and collegiality.
- We believe in a responsible representative structure whereby the viewpoints of all members are presented fairly, openly, and respectfully during the course of business.
- We believe that it will be vital to our success that duly elected/selected representative members of the EHA commit to continuously gather and disseminate information among all members of the College of in a timely fashion.
- We believe that all faculty should be involved in the work of policy development related to College affairs.
- We believe in a culture where faculty and staff work in conjunction with administrators to develop policies; administrators then work to carry out those policies.
- We believe in an administrative team that is responsive to its faculty and staff and that operates in a service capacity to members of the EHA.
- We strive for continuous open and honest communication among all members of the EHA. A manifestation of this commitment is the open publication (via website or electronic distribution) of all agendas and minutes of any and all public meetings of the College.
- We believe in continued growth and development and are open to the evolution of these guiding principles and any structure that may be an outgrowth of these principles.

**F-3 Leadership Team Configuration**
The faculty governance configuration is presented in *figure A*. The figure reflects the Chairs of each of the three standing committees in the EHA: Faculty Development and Research, Student Affairs, and Programs and Planning. When appropriate, these committees may form requisite task forces and/or ad hoc committees with additional faculty, staff, student, or other representation to provide policy review and recommendation. Leadership Team also includes:

- Dean
- Associate Deans
- School Heads
- School Representatives
- Tulsa Representative

---

**Figure A**
Oklahoma State University
CEHA
Shared Government Structure

**Committee Responsibilities**

**Student Affairs:**
- Scholarship and awards
- Advisement and counseling
- Convocation and commencement

**Faculty Development and Research:**
- Faculty development
- Faculty research
- Faculty sabbatical
- Policy recommendation
- Extension

**Program and Planning:**
- Graduate programs
- Undergraduate programs
- Academic standards and curriculum
- CEHA planning and resource allocation

---

**Shared Leadership Team**
F-4 Standing Committee Configuration

Responsibilities of the Faculty Development and Research Committee include, but are not limited to, matters of: (1) faculty development; (2) faculty research; (3) faculty sabbatical; (4) policy recommendation; and (5) extension.

Responsibilities of the Student Affairs Committee include, but are not limited to, matters of: (1) scholarships and awards; (2) advisement and counseling; (3) convocation and commencement.

Responsibilities of the Programs and Planning Committee include, but are not limited to, matters of: (1) graduate programs; (2) undergraduate programs; (3) academic standards and curriculum; and (4) EHA planning and resource allocation.

F-5 Standing Committee Representation

Faculty governance representation on standing committees is shown in figure A-1. It is extremely important that representatives on committees understand their responsibility for being present and fully participating in committee work. To that end, if an elected representative is unable to attend a meeting, an alternate representative should attend.

The Faculty Development and Research Committee includes:

- two (2) tenured (preferred) or tenure-line faculty members from each department/school and one (1) alternate representative (to attend if one of the two representatives cannot attend)
- one (1) staff representative (ex officio)
- Associate Dean for Research, and Engagement and Administration (ex officio)

The Student Affairs Committee includes:

- one (1) tenured or tenure-line faculty members from each academic department/school and one (1) alternate representative (to attend if representative cannot attend)
- one (1) staff representative (ex officio)
- Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ex officio)

The Programs and Planning Committee includes:

- two (2) tenured or tenure-line faculty members from each school and one (1) alternate representative (to attend if one of the two representatives cannot attend)
- one (1) staff representative (ex officio)
- Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ex officio)
Student Affairs:
- 1 tenured or tenure-track faculty members from each school
- 1 alternate from each school to attend if member will be absent
- 1 staff representative
- Associate Dean of Academic Affairs (ex officio)

Faculty Development and Research:
- 2 tenured or tenure-track faculty members from each school
- 1 alternate from each school to attend if member will be absent
- 1 staff representative
- Associate Dean of Research, Engagement, and Administration (ex officio)

Shared Leadership Team
- Dean
- Associate Dean(s)
- School Heads (4)
- EHA FDRC Chair
- EHA SA Chair
- EHA P&P Chair
- Elected School Rep (4)
- Elected rep from OSU – Tulsa (rotates yearly among schools)

Program and Planning:
- 2 tenured or tenure-track faculty members from each school
- 1 alternate from each school to attend if member will be absent
- 1 staff representative
- Associate Dean of Academic Affairs (ex officio)
F-6 Election of Representatives and Implementation Timelines
The format for the election of committee representatives and at-large representatives is shown in Figure B. The committee representatives from each department/school will be elected for each of the three standing committees as follows:

- one committee representative, one-year term (Only one representative for student affairs to be elected for two year term)

One committee representative, two-year term, elected during even-numbered years

F-7 Shared Leadership Communication
The Shared Leadership Team is an integral part of the communication process. Meetings of the standing committees and the Shared Leadership Team are open meetings with the exception of deliberations about sensitive personnel matters.

Minutes. Minutes of any ad hoc committees or task forces created by one of the three committees will be submitted to the particular committee. Minutes of each of the three committee meetings will be posted electronically. Minutes of Shared Leadership Team meetings will be sent electronically to all faculty members, chair of the Staff Action Team, and chair of the EHA Student Council.

Meetings. Meetings of the three committees and Shared Leadership Team will be hold regularly schedule meetings or meet as needed as determined by the committee during the academic year, and the agenda will be posted one week in advance by e-mail. Meetings of the Shared Leadership Team will also be held no less than once a month during the academic year and the agenda posted one week in advance.

Equal representation – some statement to the effect of:
Full and open meetings of the entire EHA faculty and/or in electronic communications to all faculty are generally where voting on policies and issues takes place. The Shared Leadership Team is comprised of representatives of the entire faculty. Equal representation of all parts of the EHA is important for fostering an environment of all voices being represented and heard with no one group having more representation than others.
F-1 Purpose

The shared governance structure has been designed to enable faculty to have a major influence on the policy and direction of the College of Education, Health and Aviation (EHA). The committees are comprised of faculty elected by their colleagues to collaboratively conduct the business of EHA. The committees hold responsibility for providing the faculty voice in decisions that impact faculty development, personnel policy, curricula development and implementation, long- and short-term planning and development, and resource allocation.

F-2 Guiding Principles of Shared Governance

- We believe that the work of the EHA is important and has a tremendous impact on the success of the College and its members.
- We strive for a culture, environment, and structure that infuses and perpetuates an atmosphere of openness, trust, and collegiality.
- We believe in a responsible representative structure whereby the viewpoints of all members are presented fairly, openly, and respectfully during the course of business.
- We believe that it will be vital to our success that duly elected/selected representative members of the EHA commit to continuously gather and disseminate information among all members of the College of in a timely fashion.
- We believe that all faculty should be involved in the work of policy development related to College affairs.
- We believe in a culture where faculty and staff work in conjunction with administrators to develop policies; administrators then work to carry out those policies.
- We believe in an administrative team that is responsive to its faculty and staff and that operates in a service capacity to members of the EHA.
- We strive for continuous open and honest communication among all members of the EHA. A manifestation of this commitment is the open publication (via website or electronic distribution) of all agendas and minutes of any and all public meetings of the College.
• We believe in continued growth and development and are open to the evolution of these guiding principles and any structure that may be an outgrowth of these principles.

**F-3 Leadership Team Configuration**
The faculty governance configuration is presented in figure A. The figure reflects the Chairs of each of the three standing committees in the EHA: Faculty Development and Research, Student Affairs, and Programs and Planning. When appropriate, these committees may form requisite task forces and/or ad hoc committees with additional faculty, staff, student, or other representation to provide policy review and recommendation. Leadership Team also includes:

- Dean
- Associate Deans
- School Heads
- School Representatives
- Tulsa Representative

---

**Student Affairs:**
- Scholarship and awards
- Advisement and counseling
- Recruitment and retention of students
- Convocation and commencement
- Encourage diversity within EHA

**Program and Planning:**
- Graduate programs
- Undergraduate programs
- Academic standards and curriculum
- CEHA planning and resource allocation

---

**Faculty Development and Research:**
- Faculty development
- Faculty research
- Faculty sabbatical
- Policy recommendation
- Extension

---

**Shared Leadership Team**

---
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**F-4 Standing Committee Configuration**

Responsibilities of the **Faculty Development and Research Committee** include, but are not limited to, matters of: (1) faculty development; (2) faculty research; (3) faculty sabbatical; (4) policy recommendation; and (5) extension.

Responsibilities of the **Student Affairs Committee** include, but are not limited to, matters of: (1) scholarships and awards; (2) advisement and counseling; recruitment and retention of students; (3) convocation and commencement; encourage diversity within EHA.

Responsibilities of the **Programs and Planning Committee** include, but are not limited to, matters of: (1) graduate programs; (2) undergraduate programs; (3) academic standards and curriculum; and (4) EHA planning and resource allocation.

**F-5 Standing Committee Representation**

Faculty governance representation on standing committees is shown in figure A-1. It is extremely important that representatives on committees understand their responsibility for being present and fully participating in committee work. To that end, if an elected representative is unable to attend a meeting, an alternate representative should attend.

The **Faculty Development and Research Committee** includes:

- two (2) tenured (preferred) or tenure-line faculty members from each department/school and one (1) alternate representative (to attend if one of the two representatives cannot attend)
- one (1) staff representative (ex officio)
- Associate Dean for Research, and Engagement and Administration (ex officio)

The **Student Affairs Committee** includes:

- one (1) tenured or tenure-line faculty members from each academic department/school and one (1) alternate representative (to attend if representative cannot attend)
- one (1) staff representative (ex officio)
- Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ex officio)

The **Programs and Planning Committee** includes:

- two (2) tenured or tenure-line faculty members from each school and one (1) alternate representative (to attend if one of the two representatives cannot attend)
- one (1) staff representative (ex officio)
- Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ex officio)
Student Affairs:
- 1 tenured or tenure-track faculty members from each school
- 1 alternate from each school to attend if member will be absent
- 1 staff representative
- Associate Dean of Academic Affairs (ex officio)

Faculty Development and Research:
- 2 tenured or tenure-track faculty members from each school
- 1 alternate from each school to attend if member will be absent
- 1 staff representative
- Associate Dean of Research, Engagement, and Administration (ex officio)

Shared Leadership Team
Dean
Associate Dean(s)
School Heads (4)
EHA FDRC Chair
EHA SA Chair
EHA P&P Chair
Elected School Rep (4)
Elected rep from OSU – Tulsa (rotates yearly among schools)

Program and Planning:
- 2 tenured or tenure-track faculty members from each school
- 1 alternate from each school to attend if member will be absent
- 1 staff representative
- Associate Dean of Academic Affairs (ex officio)
F-6 Election of Representatives and Implementation Timelines

The format for the election of committee representatives and at-large representatives is shown in Figure B. The committee representatives from each department/school will be elected for each of the three standing committees as follows:

- one committee representative, one-year term (Only one representative for student affairs to be elected for two year term)

**one committee representative, two-year term, elected during even-numbered years**

F-7

Shared Leadership Communication

The Shared Leadership Team is an integral part of the communication process. Meetings of the standing committees and the Shared Leadership Team are open meetings with the exception of deliberations about sensitive personnel matters.

**Minutes.** Minutes of any ad hoc committees or task forces created by one of the three committees will be submitted to the particular committee. Minutes of each of the three committee meetings will be posted electronically. Minutes of Shared Leadership Team meetings will be sent electronically to all faculty members, chair of the Staff Action Team, and chair of the EHA Student Council.

**Meetings.** Meetings of the three committees and Shared Leadership Team will be held regularly schedule meetings or meet as needed as determined by the committee during the academic year, and the agenda will be posted one week in advance by e-mail. Meetings of the Shared Leadership Team will also be held no less than once a month during the academic year and the agenda posted one week in advance.

Equal representation – some statement to the effect of:

Full and open meetings of the entire EHA faculty and/or in electronic communications to all faculty are generally where voting on policies and issues takes place. The Shared Leadership Team is comprised of representatives of the entire faculty. Equal representation of all parts of the EHA is important for fostering an environment of all voices being represented and heard with no one group having more representation than others.
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## INTERNAL ROUTING/SIGNATURE APPROVAL SHEET for NEW and MODIFIED DEGREE PROGRAMS

This routing sheet is to be used for all new program proposals or for modifications to existing programs (certificate and degree programs). Signatures of individuals below indicate their review and approval of the attached Program Request. Please attach this routing sheet to the Regents Program Request Form, along with the complete proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of Program (circle):**

- BACCALAUREATE
- MASTERS
- DOCTORATE
- SPECIALIST

**CERTIFICATE:** (Undergraduate or Graduate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Academic Unit (e.g., Department, Division, School)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Dept./School Head or Program Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title of Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Address and Phone of Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Printed Name: Department/School Curriculum Chair**  
**Signature/Date**

**Printed Name: Academic Unit Graduate Coordinator**  
**Signature/Date**

**Printed Name: Dept./School Head or Program Director**  
**Signature/Date**

**Printed Name: College Curriculum Chair**  
**Signature/Date**

**Printed Name: College Dean**  
**Signature/Date**

**Printed Name: Graduate Council Vice-Chair**  
**Signature/Date**

**Printed Name: Graduate Dean**  
**Signature/Date**

**Printed Name: Instruction Council Chair**  
**Signature/Date**

*Required only for graduate programs.
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education  
EXISTING PROGRAM ONLINE DELIVERY REQUEST FORM

If requesting institution has gone through the electronic delivery approval process and has been approved to offer electronically delivered programs, subsequent programs may be requested through the abbreviated process which is listed on page five of this form. If you have any questions contact Dr. Stephanie Beauchamp 405-225-9399.

Institution submitting request: ________________________________

State Regents’ three-digit program code and Program name of the program: ________________________________

Date of Letter of Intent: ________________________________

Date of Governing Board Approval: ________________________________

Signature of President: ________________________________ Date: ________________________________

Complete this section ONLY if the requesting institutions HAS NOT gone through the electronic delivery approval process and has not been approved to offer electronically delivered programs.

3.16.11 Program Approval Procedures for Online

Institutions that have not been approved previously to offer online programs are required to request approval as follows: (1) if programs are offered in such a manner that an individual student can take 100 percent of the courses for the major through online delivery or other computer-mediated format; or (2) the program is advertised as available through online delivery or other computer-mediated format. For the purpose of this policy, major is defined as courses in the discipline of the student’s declared degree program, excluding support courses, general education courses, and elective courses (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.2). Criteria for approval are based on qualitative consideration and the compatibility of the requested offering with the institution's mission and capacity as described below.

2. Delivery Method

Electronically delivered programs must describe the delivery method that will be used to deliver the program content (e.g., Blackboard, Desire2Learn, etc.) and the major features that will facilitate learning. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.11.B.2)

3. Demand for the Program

Proposed programs must respond to the needs of the larger economic and social environment. Thus, the institution must demonstrate demand for the proposed program. (State Regents’ Policy 3.4.5.F)
The proposal should show evidence of sufficient student and/or employer need for the program to be offered in this learning mode. Evidence should also demonstrate employer’s preference for graduates of the proposed program and target audience (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.11.B.3) especially in the five workforce ecosystems developed by the State Department of Commerce that includes aerospace and defense, energy, agriculture and biosciences, information and financial services, and transportation and distribution.

4. Unnecessary Duplication

The elimination of unnecessary program duplication is a high priority of the State Regents. Where other similar programs may serve the same potential student population, the proposed program must be sufficiently different from existing programs or access to existing programs must be sufficiently limited to warrant initiation of a new program. (State Regents’ Policy 3.4.5.H and 3.16.11.B.4)

Provide specific evidence that offering the existing program in the proposed learning mode is not unnecessarily duplicative of similar offerings in the state.

6. Requests for New Programs.

Requests for new programs for offering on-campus and/or through an online format will be submitted for initial approval through the Academic Program Approval Policy 3.4.

7. Cost and Funding of the Proposed Program

The resource requirements and planned sources of funding of the proposed learning mode must be detailed in order to assess the adequacy of the resources to support a quality program. This assessment is to ensure that the program will be efficient in its resource utilization and to assess the impact of this proposed learning mode on the institution’s overall need for funds. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.11.B.7)

Provide productivity goals related to the cost and funding of the proposed program.

3.16.5 Academic Standards.
The expectation is that there is no difference in the academic quality, academic standards including admission and retention standards, and student evaluation standards for courses and programs regardless of delivery method. Electronic media courses and programs must meet the following academic standards.

A. Faculty. Describe the training and faculty development that the faculty receives to achieve competency in the technology required for teaching at a distance. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.A)

B. Faculty/Student Interaction. Describe the provisions for appropriate real-time and delayed interaction between faculty and students and among other students enrolled in the class. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.B)

C. Academic Integrity. Describe methods that are in place for ensuring academic integrity. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.C)

D. Student Confidentiality. Describe methods that are in place to ensure the confidentiality and privacy of student personal data. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.D)

E. Identify Verification. Institutions shall have an appropriate method to verify the identity of students taking distance education courses (State Regents’ policy 3.16.5.E).

F. Advertising. The institution must provide adequate and accurate information to students including but not limited to admission requirements, equipment standards, estimated or average program cost, and other services available. What methods are employed to ensure adequate and accurate information? (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.F)
G. Learning Resources. Students shall have access to facilities and learning materials on essentially the same basis as students in the same program or course taught at the main campus. Describe the resources that are available to distance learning students. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.G)

H. Academic Calendar Requirements. The standards observed relating to the number of course meetings and total time spent in the course or in satisfying the course requirements shall be comparable to those observed on the main campus. An exception to course meeting time is allowed as defined in the Competency-Based Learning (CBL) section in the State Regents’ Academic Calendars policy. Institutions utilizing this exception must have documented and validated methods for students to demonstrate competencies, student assessment, and awarding academic credit as required by the CBL section. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.H)

I. Admission, Retention, Assessment. Describe the standards used for online student admission, retention, and assessment. Standards shall be the same as those standards observed for the same courses or programs on the originating campus. Similarly, the applicable concurrent enrollment policies apply (see the State Regents’ Institutional Admission and Retention and Assessment policies). (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.I)

J. Student Services. Students shall have access to program guidance and academic support services, including admissions, enrollment, academic advisement, financial aid, and related services on the same basis as the students located on the main campus. Online programs must make these services available to students in electronic format using the working assumption that these students will not be physically present on campus. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.J)

K. Technical Support System. Students in electronic media off-campus courses or programs and faculty shall have access to appropriate technical support services. Describe the technical support system that is available for all hardware, software and delivery systems specified by the institution as required for the courses and program. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.K)
L. Equipment and Software/Tools. Students must be informed in clear and understandable terms of the electronic or computer resources necessary for successful completion of the class, including, but not limited to, word processing and other productivity tools, e-mail, and Internet services. (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.5.L)

3.16.11 Approval of Subsequent Online Programs

The process for requesting additional existing programs (new programs must be requested through the Academic Program Approval policy) through online delivery or other computer-mediated format is for the President to send the following information to the Chancellor: 1) letter of intent 2) the name of the program, 3) delivery method/s, 4) information related to population served and student demand, 5) cost and financing.

The letter of intent must have been submitted to the Chancellor prior to filling out the request form.

2. Delivery Method

Electronically Delivered Programs must also describe the delivery method that will be used to deliver the program content (e.g., Blackboard, Desire2Learn, etc.) and the major features that will facilitate learning. (State Regents’ policy 3.16.11.B.2)

3. Demand for the Program

Proposed programs must respond to the needs of the larger economic and social environment. Thus, the institution must demonstrate demand for the proposed program. (State Regents’ Policy 3.4.5.F)

The proposal should show evidence of sufficient student and/or employer need for the program in this learning mode. Evidence should also demonstrate employer’s preference for graduates of the proposed program and target audience (State Regents’ Policy 3.16.11.B.3) especially in the five workforce ecosystems developed by the State Department of Commerce that includes aerospace and defense, energy, agriculture and biosciences, information and financial services, and transportation and distribution.

7. Cost and Funding of the Proposed Program

The resource requirements and planned sources of funding of the proposed learning mode must be detailed in order to assess the adequacy of the resources to support a quality program. This
assessment is to ensure that the program will be efficient in its resource utilization and to assess the impact of this proposed learning mode on the institution's overall need for funds. (State Regents' Policy 3.16.11.B.7)

Provide productivity goals related to the cost and funding of the proposed program.