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Section 1: Introduction

The International Curricula Task Force (ICTF) was appointed in October 2011, by the Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, with the following charge:

“Review Auburn’s current offerings and make recommendations on the best way to meet our students’ need for increased global opportunities.”

Additionally, the task force was directed to:

“…help coordinate the international curricular initiatives various units on campus are sponsoring or planning, so that we don’t duplicate efforts and to ensure that our students have the most seamless access to our programs as possible”

To fulfill this charge, the International Curricula Task Force met ten times between December 2012 and June 2012. Members discussed various topics related to internationalization efforts in US academic institutions, and reviewed Auburn’s efforts in this area.

As Southeastern Conference (SEC) and Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB) peer institutions were not extensively representative, the task force opted to review fourteen (14) institutions from the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (http://www.aplu.org/). The task force assigned review of universities in each of four regions to separate committee members, with the intent of identifying a select group of institutions whose internationalization efforts were particularly noteworthy. The subsequent review of internationalization efforts was limited to curricular initiatives in the selected institutions with a specific focus on academic programs, processes and systems.

Report Structure

This report summarizes the findings of the task force related to the international curriculum development at Auburn University (Section 2), summarizes models from fourteen (14) public and land grant universities (Section 3), and provides considerations as well as immediate and aspirational recommendations (Section 4). Descriptions of the fourteen (14) reviewed institutions are provided as Appendix A; documentation of the curriculum approval process at Auburn University, and forms associated with that process, are included as Appendix B.
Section 2: International Curricula Development at Auburn University

Auburn University’s curriculum development and approval process begins at the department/program level with course, academic minor, and degree program requests. For new degree program requests and new minor requests, a Preliminary Proposal form is completed and must be approved by the Provost as a first step. If the proposal is approved, the request then follows the University Curriculum Committee process described below.

The basic approval process for new or revised program/course requests follows the workflow outlined below:

1. Department Approval;
2. College Approval (may also involve a College Curriculum Committee);
3. University Curriculum Committee Approval (comprised of representatives from all academic units);
4. Graduate Council Approval (only if course/degree is at the graduate level);
5. Office of the Provost Approval;
6. President/Board of Trustees (only if new degree, degree deletion, or substantive revision to programs); and
7. Alabama Commission on Higher Education (degree program additions/major revisions and renaming are decision items; minor revisions/deletions are information items).

See Appendix B for samples of the forms/documentation required as part of Auburn University’s curriculum development and approval process.

Recommendations for Curriculum Process

Auburn University’s current curriculum approval process for new degree programs is appropriate to evaluate proposed international curricular requests with limited suggested recommendations for revision. The International Curricula Task Force’s recommendations regarding the curriculum development and approval process are included in Section 4 of this document.
Section 3: Models of International Curricula Development at Land-Grant and Public Institutions

Please see Appendix A for a listing of all fourteen (14) universities included in the International Curricula Task Force’s examination of internationalization efforts among peer institutions.

For purposes of this discussion, an international program is defined as: a major, minor, certificate, or any other named plan of study whose focus is on global / international cultures, issues, or other topics; study abroad experiences may or may not be included in these operational definitions. Further, an administrative unit would include (but not be limited to): Office of the Provost, Office of International Studies, etc.; an academic unit would refer to any specific college, school, or department, or any combination thereof.

The task force met with Constance Relihan, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, and consulted with colleagues and peers at institutions selected for further review. The task force classified the underlying frameworks or models guiding the internationalization efforts in the reviewed institutions as centralized, localized or hybrid.

Centralized Model
(Examples: Colorado State University, Washington State University)
A centralized model for administration of international programs is one that places responsibility for oversight and/or a common body of coursework for the program with an administrative unit rather than an academic unit. Discipline-specific coursework relevant to the student’s major would originate within an academic unit, however a common core of courses with an international/global focus would be included in the student’s plan of study. Under a centralized model, any academic unit may incorporate the common core of internationally-/globally-focused coursework into an existing plan of program, provided that the requisite approvals have been obtained.

Local (Decentralized) Model
(Examples: University of New Mexico, University of Rhode Island)
A local or decentralized model for administration of international programs includes any model that places responsibility for oversight and/or a common body of coursework for the program with the specific academic unit that houses the program. In such a model, the common core of coursework with an international/global focus may be integrated with the student’s proposed plan of study. A central administrative unit may or may not be involved with the program in some manner; however the responsibility for development, administration, and any necessary revision of the curriculum resides entirely with the academic unit. Under a local model, the responsibility for academic advising also resides with the unit,
involving one or both of the following, as the unit deems appropriate: professional advising or faculty advising (administered individually or jointly).

Hybrid Model
(Examples: All other institutions reviewed)
A hybrid model represents any combination of aspects of the central and local (decentralized) models. Typically, the procedural and administrative services are located centrally and the academic program embedded in the home discipline or program.

The task force selected fourteen (14) member institutions of the Association of Public Land Grant Universities (APLU) from every region of the country, in order to provide a context from which it [the task force] could formulate its considerations and recommendations. APLU member institutions were selected based upon similarity of institutional mission to Auburn University; the list was refined further by focusing specifically on member institutions with an active international enterprise. Upon review of programs at these peer institutions, certain trends and themes began to emerge around innovative programmatic attributes and the structural elements of various international programs. A brief summary of those themes follows.

Structural Elements
Institutions with a strong international enterprise consistently feature internationalization as a distinct and significant aspect of the institution’s vision, mission, and capital campaigns. There are strong indications that institutions with mature and flourishing international programs have given these activities priority and provided resources and incentives to help them thrive.

These institutions also often feature dedicated administrative positions with a clearly defined vision, mission and set of expectations. Some institutions go so far as to establish a university committee representing all its stakeholders in the administration of its international programs (Ohio State University), while others have created extensive administrative guidelines, procedures and forms to provide institutional guidance and focus in the administration of its international efforts (University of Missouri).

A number of institutions provide central oversight and administrative support, but encourage decentralized initiation and implementation of international efforts (particularly in the area of curricular development).

Some institutions create specific centers or units to house international programs (Virginia Tech’s School of Public and International Affairs), while others rely on building programs based on existing course structures in individual units. Quite often these efforts emerge from an institution’s College of Arts and Sciences.
The task force identified three structural elements in its review of case studies that seemed particularly effective regardless of the administrative model employed:

- An institutional map or guide outlining all international efforts on campus (curricular and programmatic) in detail.
- Efforts to create internationalization experiences on campus as well as off campus (University of Arkansas, Colorado State University).
- Curricular development focused on geographic region (such as the Middle East or Eastern Europe), and thematic concentration (such as national and transnational identity, sustainability, culture and arts in global perspective).

In short, a majority of institutions studied reveal structural elements that include a strong commitment to internationalization at the institutional level, a clear sense of mission and expectations, and central administrative support/oversight with the flexibility for decentralized efforts to emerge from various units on campus.

**Innovative Attributes**

Multiple examples of creative and innovate academic programming were found in the case studies review by the task force. The primary examples of this innovation were the implementation of “communities of learners” focused on the pursuit of internationalization. One such example can be found at the University of Arkansas who seeks to foster a sense of an “international community” by implementing a program called the International Living and Learning Community. Currently, there are approximately 140 students who make up an “international community” housed in dedicated facilities on campus. Additionally, the University has provided a support staff and faculty unit, who make up the Global Perspectives Academic Learning Team, to facilitate the academic success of students who participate in this community of learners. Again, multiple institutions in the case studies reviewed by the task force used the “community of learners” format to actively engage and cluster students who were willing to invest in the internationalization mission of the respective academic unit.

Another prominent example of innovation was the promotion of “going international at home” in respective domestic but culturally-diverse communities close to institutions. This is demonstrated by the University of Delaware “Global at Home” alternative semester program which provided a multidisciplinary immersive experience for students taking Spanish language coursework. The goal of this program is to provide direct and culturally-sensitive engagement with the Latino/Hispanic community in the greater University community. Also, the University of Central Florida has formal academic experiences in their community that facilitated interactions with diverse populations from throughout the world. These two examples underlined the efforts by institutions to not only seek study
abroad opportunities but to also interact with “international” populations within their respective communities.

Lastly, the task force’s review of case studies pointed out additional innovative efforts and trends that directly facilitate the overall internationalization objective of respective programs:

- Provided the necessary resources for hiring sufficient faculty, administrators, staff, etc. to adequately support academic or administrative units.
- Established internationalization as an institutional initiative with an emphasis on establishing a “global presence”.
- Provided awards and incentives for exemplary efforts to promote internalization from academic units across respective campuses.
- Established benchmarks, guidelines and standards (based on national-level standards) that served to guide and inform institutional internalization efforts.
- Made a concerted effort to increase the number of international students on campus and establish a supportive and nurturing environment for those students.
Section 4: International Curricula Task Force Considerations and Recommendations

As the task force evaluated trends and components relevant to numerous peer institutions, it also engaged in reflection upon the data it had gathered, with the purpose of addressing potential areas of concern in the implementation of an internationalization strategy. Further, in its review of operations at peer institutions, the International Curricula Task Force formulated a number of recommendations, addressing both immediate and long-term (aspirational) aspects of a viable strategy for internationalization efforts at Auburn University.

Considerations

- Strong analysis of the financial- and resource-related implications of an internationalization plan. While much of the task force’s evaluation focused on the logistical aspects of curriculum development and maintenance, consideration of resources was a recurring concern. Auburn University will need to assess the financial parameters of both immediate and long-term aspects of implementation.

- Related to the above is the issue of personnel, which includes faculty (i.e.: funding of new lines, hiring, and qualifications), as well as administrative personnel (i.e.: buyouts for appointments, support staff and administrative professionals, and the training and advising that will likely be an ongoing component of any viable internationalization effort). Auburn University will need to develop a sound infrastructure that clearly delineates the role of central administration and the academic units in whatever plan it chooses to implement. Further, any plan that the university chooses to advance will need to be especially clear about the transitional stages and steps of the development/approval/implementation process.

- Any internationalization efforts undertaken by Auburn University should give serious consideration to the university’s positioning, both geographically and demographically, vis a vis the focus of its efforts. While some peer institutions featured extensive programs with great breadth in a number of locations, in several cases, this was the result of the institution’s proximity to a major metropolitan area (e.g.: University of Central Florida being located in Orlando, University of Colorado being proximate to Denver, etc.). In this same regard, Auburn University’s current international assets (e.g.: Joseph S. Bruno Auburn Abroad in Italy, development of an Auburn University campus in China) should be considered as a factor in any future planning.

- In the establishment of an infrastructure for continued internationalization operations, attention should be paid to the policies and procedures to ensure that they are not only efficient, but also accessible to all stakeholders and participants in the process. Solid central administration, and strong, dedicated efforts from the academic units were both common elements of all hybrid efforts; one challenge
presented by such bilateral participation is the commitment to ensuring that those individuals working through the system – and not as part of it – are not burdened, confused, or intimidated by the requisite policies and processes.

- Following from the establishment of an incentive to internationalize Auburn University’s curriculum is a mandate to ensure that subsequent planning and development is both efficient and purposeful. To this end, the centralized portion of any plan will need to clearly address how issues of overlap and duplication will be identified and addressed (e.g.: review of programs including representation of all academic units, etc.).

- Finally, once Auburn University has clearly established its immediate and long-term goals – as well as addressing the logistics of implementation – a commitment will need to be made to the continued support of the initiative. In addition to funding, and staffing, marketing and continued improvement of the program appear to be common (and critical) elements of similar efforts at peer institutions.

At the university level, there are several approaches to originating and guiding academic initiatives. Some institutions, depending upon size, mission, or other attributes, create new courses, minors, or majors centrally; others do so in a decentralized fashion, with academic initiatives originating with departmental faculties. Still others undertake curricular design, planning, and reform using both approaches, depending on the need and comprehensive nature of the initiative. With international curricula, many institutions find that courses and whole curricula exist when undertaking new initiatives centrally. In such cases, central initiatives can complement existing efforts, or override them – that is, they can re-create academic outcomes with a central model.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1**

With international curricula, Auburn should retain a ‘hybrid’ (as defined earlier in this document) approach to developing options for all students. For example, Auburn has a number of existing international minors, with units debating the addition of others. A new, central effort can be created to complement these existing efforts, to service units that do not yet have this choice for students. Duplication can be avoided by tailoring offerings to the respective student populations. Further, creation of a central option does not need to preclude later, degree-specific formulation of international minors.

Review of curricular procedure found that a suitable process to review international curricular additions exists at Auburn, with oversight by the University Curriculum Committee. However, guidelines for the materials required for submission must be updated to reflect the initial need for screening within the Provost’s Office to preclude duplication of effort or resource use.
Recommendation 2
Expand the new course/curriculum submission forms to include space for more information on existing courses and possible duplication, and a question on the exploration of resource needs outside the home unit. Specific changes recommended include:

*Proposed Preliminary Undergraduate and Graduate Program Proposal Form*
1. In the event of potential overlap, require explanation of program niche or unique characteristics of program related to discipline/program. *(Recommend insertion following Field 7)*
2. Add question of whether other resource needs from outside the home unit (i.e. support courses) have been explored and supported. *(Recommend integration with Field 8)*

*Recommendations for Undergraduate and Graduate Program Proposal Form*
1. Add supporting documents from support units (i.e.: approval to add course from outside home unit to course requirements for proposed degree).
2. Add question of potential duplication of other programs within the institution; and in the event of potential overlap, require explanation of program niche or unique characteristics of program related to discipline/program. *(Recommend integration with Field 10)*

Campus understanding of current policies and procedures for creating international curricula, both on- and off-campus, is limited. Information on needed practices and procedures can be found in several locations, and often the correct path to developing curriculum and courses is unclear.

**Recommendation 3**
Clear communication strategies should be implemented to assist faculty and staff who are working to internationalize their programs. Benchmarking against peer and aspirational institutions found varied and interesting initiatives for internationalizing courses and curricula, many of which could be used as a launching point for implementation of such strategies.

**Recommendation 4**
Auburn University should explore these and other approaches to internationalizing the curriculum as part of its comprehensive, internationalization strategic planning effort in 2013, arranged by the Office of International Programs. This strategic planning effort will be an 18-month process facilitated by the American Council on Education.

**Appendix A: Case Studies**
The International Curricula Task Force focused on fourteen (14) Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU) institutions with an established international enterprise, in order to establish a context for considering both short and long-term recommendations for Auburn University. The task force’s evaluation determined that among the fourteen (14) institutions, two (2) operated under a centralized system, two (2) operated under a localized system, and ten (10) operated under a hybrid system. A brief summary of those institutional practices follows:

**Auburn University**
Auburn University operates as a hybrid model, with centrally-administered study abroad and exchange programs, as well as international campuses in Rome and Arricia, with international curricular programs housed in various academic units.

**Clemson University**
Clemson University operates under a hybrid model, with the Office of International Affairs (OIA) coordinating: 1) international activities and collaborative efforts on Clemson's campus; and 2) efforts around the world (e.g.: study abroad, services for international students, partnerships with overseas institutions). Curricular programs are housed in various academic units.

**Colorado State University**
Colorado State University operates under a central model. The Office of International Initiatives oversees curricular efforts, including minors with an international focus as well as core courses with “regional specializations” (ranging from Asian Studies to Caribbean Studies). The centerpiece of the institution’s international enterprise is its partnership with the Peace Corps, which has produced four cooperative Master's Degree programs since its inception in 1988.

**Michigan State University**
Michigan State University operates under a hybrid model, featuring centrally-administered study abroad programs and internationally-focused academic majors; program specializations and certificate programs are housed in various academic units, according to their focus and educational goals. In addition to degree programs, the university provides non-degree and certificate opportunities designed specifically for international students and professionals.

**Ohio State University:**
Ohio State University operates under a hybrid model with strong central focus (including a dedicated International Affairs Committee). The university offers eleven majors and ten minors, extensive study abroad programs, and boasts more than 100 active agreements with institutions around the world. Academic units offer more than 800 courses with international content, and over 30 languages are offered in more than 600 language courses. The flagship Undergraduate International Studies Program, housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, provides a holistic, interdisciplinary, and cross-cultural foundation in international studies.
University of Arkansas
The University of Arkansas operates under a hybrid model. Study abroad programs are administered centrally, while specific curricular concentrations are housed in academic units. The university places a strong emphasis on its International Living and Learning Community, which provides an on-campus global experience through a 140-member co-educational community for students from all over the world.

University of Central Florida
The University of Central Florida operates under a hybrid model, with centralized services and curricular activities embedded in the disciplinary home. A central office of International Studies, an International Services Center, and a Center for Multilingual and Multicultural Studies co-exist with academic units’ efforts to internationalize the core curriculum and provide internationally themed majors, minors, and certificate programs.

University of Colorado
The University of Colorado operates under a hybrid model. While the institution offers study abroad programs that are administered centrally from the Office of International Education, individual degree programs are administered and housed within academic units. The university has an extensive number of firmly-established academic certificate, majors and minors programs. One highlight is the Global Residence Academic Program, which provides freshmen interested in international studies a shared learning and living experience (learning community) as well as a core of classes and relevant academic programming.

University of Delaware
The University of Delaware operates under a hybrid model. The university’s Path to Prominence is an initiative with a goal of meeting multiple objectives related to globalization including: 1) expanding the global experience on campus; 2) creating an actively welcoming environment for all students; and 3) positioning the institution as a national leader in study-abroad programs. Additionally, the Center for Global and Area studies works to facilitate partnerships across a diverse array of academic units with a goal of implementing joint academic conferences, dual degree, study-abroad and exchange programs and multiple college or department based research centers. The university recently conducted a self-study titled “Creating a More Welcoming and Supportive Campus for International Students,” which led to multiple policy and administrative changes to campus activities focused on supporting international students.

University of Missouri
The University of Missouri operates under a hybrid model with extensive central support and monitoring of campus units, but relevant curricular decisions and implementation processes resting with academic units. The International Center’s website provides extensive flowcharts, policies, guidelines, and recommendations for academic units to access. Two long-standing university-wide committees, the Council for International Relations, and the Study Abroad Advisory Council form the core of the International
University of New Mexico
The University of New Mexico operates under a local model, highlighted by the International Studies Institute, an umbrella organization for the three interdisciplinary undergraduate programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. Three academic disciplines form the core of the ISI: International Studies, European Studies, and Asian Studies (including the Middle East). The program provides opportunities to enroll in either an International Studies major or minor. Moreover, the program allows for the combining of academic studies in the foreign languages, humanities, and the social sciences with fine arts, architecture, education which can result in an interdisciplinary and integrated undergraduate academic concentration.

University of Rhode Island
The University of Rhode Island currently operates under a local model; but the institution appears to be moving towards more of a hybrid model. The university has many academic units that feature internationalization as their primary focus. Additionally, multiple academic units sponsor or co-sponsor various international and globalization-themed events, activities, and academic programs. The institution recently conducted a self-assessment and the University of Rhode Island Academic Planning Task Force on Global Education produced a final report that included recommendations such as the creation of a Vice Provost or Dean for Global Education (an individual to spearhead future fundraising, policy development, or administrative support efforts).

Virginia Tech
Virginia Tech operates under a hybrid model, featuring administrative support from the university’s central office, but with globalization initiatives being developed, implemented, and supported within academic units. The institution’s International Strategic Directions Team developed a strategic plan (for 2004-2011), highly-detailed and specific in its goals and recommendations, which presented 15 goals and objectives to direct institutional globalization efforts.

Washington State University
Washington State University operates under a centralized model, highlighted by the International Programs office. Five programs form the core of the International Programs office: 1) Global Studies, 2) Office of International Students and Scholars, 3) International Enrollment, 4) Intensive American Language Center, and 5) Education Abroad. The International Programs office serves as the “international/globalization face” and advocate of the university.
Appendix B:

Auburn University Curriculum Development and Approval Documentation
Simple Curricular Revisions

- Add New Undergraduate/Graduate Course
- Delete Existing Undergraduate/Graduate Course
- Revise Existing Undergraduate/Graduate Course
- Revise Existing Undergraduate/Graduate Certificate

College/Department Curriculum Committee(s) → Graduate Council Only if course/certificate/degree/option is at the graduate level. → University Curriculum Committee → Inclusion in AU Bulletin

Preliminary Procedure for New Degree Proposals

This newly-implemented process will need to be followed for all new degree proposals that a unit wishes to submit for curriculum approval process. Please note that the review of the proposal by the Graduate School and/or Office of Undergraduate Studies concurs with review of the proposal by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Following review by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, a program prefix will be assigned to the program for the duration of the planning process. Once the planning documentation has completed this process, it will need to be submitted for approval via the process shown below (see: Substantive Curricular Revisions).

Planning Faculty Member(s) → Department Chair → Dean of College/School → Dean of Graduate School/Office of Undergraduate Studies (as applicable) → Office of the Provost → Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

Substantive Curricular Revisions

- Add Distance Education to Existing Undergraduate/Graduate Program**
- Add Graduate Certificate*
- Add Undergraduate/Graduate Degree**
- Add Undergraduate/Graduate Option**
- Add Off-Campus Undergraduate Program**
- Add Off-Campus Instructonal Site**
- Delete Existing Undergraduate/Graduate Certificate*
- Delete Existing Undergraduate/Graduate Degree*
- Delete Existing Undergraduate/Graduate Option*
- Rename Existing Undergraduate/Graduate Degree*
- Rename Existing Graduate Degree (Doctoral-Level)**
- Revise Off-Campus Instructional Site**
- Departmental Reorganization or Renaming*
- School or College Reorganization of Renaming**

College/Department Curriculum Committee(s) → Graduate Council (Only if course/certificate/degree/option is at the graduate level) → University Curriculum Committee → Office of the Provost → President → Board of Trustees → Alabama Commission on Higher Education → Inclusion in AU Bulletin

* = Approval necessary contingent upon level of resources required.

Preliminary Proposal For New Undergraduate And Graduate Programs

This document should not exceed 3-5 pages in length.

1. Proposing College / School: _______________________________

   Department: ___________________________________________

2. Proposed Program Title: ______________________________________

3. CIP Code of Proposed Program: ____________

4. Proposed Implementation Date: ___________________________

5. Relationship of Proposed Program to the Auburn University Mission Statement and Strategic Plan:

   (Auburn University’s mission statement may be accessed at the following site: http://www.auburn.edu/administration/trustees/policymanual/Vision_and_mission.html; Auburn University’s strategic plan may be accessed at the following site: http://occ.auburn.edu/strategic_plan/)

6. Expected Program Outcomes and Assessment Methods:

   (Expected outcomes must be stated clearly and must include student learning outcomes and an assessment plan for ascertaining the extent to which the expected outcomes are achieved and for designing improvements based on analysis of assessment results.)

7. Relationship of Proposed Program to Other Auburn University Programs:

   (If "yes" for either item, please provide explanation in the space provided below.)

   Will the program support or be supported by other program(s) at Auburn University?  ○ Yes  ○ No

   Will this program replace any existing program(s), or specializations / options / concentrations within existing program(s) at Auburn University?  ○ Yes  ○ No

8. New or Additional Resources / Resource Shifting Required:

   (If "yes" for any item, please provide explanation in the space provided below.)

   Will additional faculty lines be required?  ○ Yes  ○ No

   Will new or additional space (e.g.: laboratory or classroom) be required?  ○ Yes  ○ No

   Will additional library resources be required?  ○ Yes  ○ No

   Will additional GTA support be required?  ○ Yes  ○ No

   Explanation of or provision for new or additional resources / explanation of program’s support or replacement of other programs:

8. Potential Duplication of Other Programs in the State:

   (If the program would overlap with or duplicate a similar offering at another institution in the state, articulate the program’s necessity and/or any differences from similar programs.)

9. Potential Duplication of Other Programs in the State:

   (If the program would overlap with or duplicate a similar offering at another institution in the state, articulate the program’s necessity and/or any differences from similar programs.)
10. Collaboration With Other Institutions:
(Indicate whether or not the proposed program will -- either immediately or in the future -- involve collaboration with other post-secondary institutions. If so, provide all relevant details.)

11. Distance Education:
(If Distance Education will be incorporated in the delivery of the proposed program, provide details of implementation, scope, etc.)

12. Documented Need for Proposed Program:
(Elaborate upon the methodology used to appropriately assess regional, state, or national need and/or student demand for program.)

13. Employment Opportunities:
(Provide specific examples of employment opportunities anticipated for graduates of the proposed program.)
Approvals

Department Chair / Head

College / School Curriculum Committee

College / School Dean

Dean of the Graduate School (for Graduate Programs)

Assoc. Provost for Undergraduate Studies (for Undergraduate Programs)

Date

Date

Date

Date

Contact Person: __________________________ Telephone: __________________________

E-Mail Address: __________________________ Fax: __________________________
Proposal Of A New Undergraduate Or Graduate Program

This document should not exceed 3-5 pages in length.

1. Proposing College / School: ____________________________
   Department: ________________________________________

2. Proposed Program Title: _____________________________

3. CIP Code of Proposed Program: __________ 4. Proposed Implementation Date: _______________

5. Relationship of Proposed Program to the Auburn University Mission Statement and Strategic Plan:
   (Auburn University's mission statement may be accessed at the following site: http://www.auburn.edu/administration/trustees/policymanual/vision_and_mission.html; Auburn University's strategic plan may be accessed at the following site: http://com.auburn.edu/strategic_plan/)

6. Expected Program Outcomes and Assessment Methods:
   (Expected outcomes must be stated clearly and must include student learning outcomes and an assessment plan for ascertaining the extent to which the expected outcomes are achieved and for designing improvements based on analysis of assessment results.)

7. Degree Requirements (Including All Formal Options):
   (For programs at the undergraduate level, please provide a curriculum model for the program as well as for each formal option.)

8. Specific Admission and/or Continuation Requirements:

9. Existing Courses and New Courses Required:

10. Relationship of Proposed Program to Other Auburn University Programs:
    (If "yes" for either item, please provide explanation in the space provided below.)
    Will the program support or be supported by other program(s) at Auburn University? ☐ Yes ☐ No
    Will this program replace any existing program(s), or specializations / options / concentrations within existing program(s) at Auburn University? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Approvals

__________________________  ____________________
Department Chair / Head  Date

__________________________  ____________________
College / School Curriculum Committee  Date

__________________________  ____________________
College / School Dean  Date

__________________________  ____________________
Dean of the Graduate School (for Graduate Programs)  Date

__________________________  ____________________
Assoc. Provost for Undergraduate Studies (for Undergraduate Programs  Date

Contact Person: ____________________  Telephone: ____________________
E-Mail Address: ____________________  Fax: ____________________