New Program Case Statement Template

I. Program Relevance

- How is this program consistent with the mission of Florida Tech?

- How is this program consistent with the mission of the department/college?

II. Program Demand

- Market:
  - What is the local market for this program?
  - What is the national market?
  - What is the international market?

- New Students:
  - How many new full-time/part-time students are expected to enroll in the first year?
  - How many new domestic and international students are expected to enroll in the first year?
  - What is the enrollment outlook five years from now?

- What other universities offer this program? How large (enrollment) are those programs?

- Are there current trends or forecasts for interest in this program? If so, what are they and what are your sources of information.
• Will this program be offered to a “non-traditional” audience (part-time students, evening/weekend classes, distance learning, other)? Please indicate all that apply.

• What are the employment opportunities after graduation?

• If this is an undergraduate program, what are the graduate program opportunities?

• Is internship part of the program? If so, will it be required? Will the internship be paid or unpaid?

III. Academic Requirements/Considerations

• What are the entrance requirements (GPA, SAT, math/science, etc.)?

• Is the proposed program a substantive change according to SACS?

• Is the proposed program in line with departmental/college accreditation?

• What impact will the program have on existing programs? For example, will it replace an existing program or complement/compete with another program? Which programs will be affected?
• How will the new program be financially assessed?

• Student-Learning Assessment (see the APAC Policies and Procedures document at www.fit.edu/apac for the required number and type of assessment items. These must be approved by the APAC before the program is reviewed by any curriculum committees. Refer to the approval procedure flowchart on page 9 of this document.
  o In what courses will the students be assessed for program-level student learning?

  o List the program-level student-learning Outcomes, Measures, and expected Targets for this program

• Programmatic Accreditation:
  o Is programmatic accreditation required or proposed for the program? If so, what are the minimum requirements for accreditation? What is the timetable for achieving accreditation status?
V. Financial Resources/Uses

- Can the program support itself financially (provide detailed estimates)?

- Will there be any assistantships or fellowships available?

- What new courses (department and/or service) if any, will be required?

- What new faculty (departmental and/or service), if any, will be required?

- Will new support staff be required?

- Will new GSAs or adjuncts be required?

- What new equipment, labs, or other facilities are required?

- What new library resources will be required?
Signature Page for initial approval of proposed program:

__________________________________________________  ___________________
Department Head/Program Chair                      Date

__________________________________________________  ___________________
Dean or Associate Dean                               Date

__________________________________________________  ___________________
Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer     Date
Flowchart for Approval Procedure of Assessment Items: New Undergraduate Majors and Graduate Programs

Originator creates Assessment Map and draft PLOs, Measures, and Targets\(^3\) with input from Assessment Coordinator (AC), Faculty, and Department/Academic Program Chair

AC contacts Institutional Effectiveness Specialist (IES) about setting up new program in WEAVE\(^*\); IES labels program as “(proposed)” and sets read/write permissions, if necessary

AC uploads PLOs, Measures, and Targets into WEAVE\(^*\); AC also uploads Assessment Map in the “Document Management” site on WEAVE\(^*\)

AC notifies Divisional Review Committee (DRC) co-Chairs to begin review process; co-Chairs assign DRC members as reviewers

If all items are marked “Acceptable” or “Exemplary”

Using the approved rubric form\(^2\), reviewers rank PLOs, Measures, and/or Targets as “Developing”, “Acceptable”, or “Exemplary”; completed rubric form is uploaded in the “Document Management” site on WEAVE\(^*\); Reviewers inform DRC co-Chairs and AC when complete

If any item is marked “Developing”

Items marked “Developing” or “Not endorsed” are reworked by Originator and AC; Revised items are uploaded into WEAVE\(^*\)

“Not endorse”

APAC Chair assigns reviewers from the APAC committee who will make recommendation to “endorse” or “not endorse”

“Endorse”

APAC Chair notifies DRC Chair, who notifies AC

AC informs Originator; DRC co-Chairs notify Asst. VP, Assessment who coordinates with APAC Chair

“Not endorse”

PLOs: Program-level student learning outcomes
AC: Assessment Coordinators
DRC: Divisional Review Committee
APAC: Academic Program Assessment Committee

\(^3\)See “APAC Policies and Procedures” at www.fit.edu/apac
\(^2\)See “Assessment Evaluation Rubric” at www.fit.edu/apac

*Contact the Institutional Effectiveness Specialist for any assistance needed with WEAVE