There are three different mechanisms for submitting a proposal for a new graduate program, depending on the type of program:

- Most Master’s programs use an abbreviated proposal format
- Master’s programs in Engineering and/or Master’s programs in any discipline that are likely to exceed $2 million in the first five years require a notification of planning and a full-proposal
- All doctoral programs require a notification of planning and a full-proposal

The sections below outline the internal and external steps involved for each of these proposals.

You are encouraged to contact the Curriculum Director at anytime for questions related to requirements, forms, and processes or for assistance reviewing documents.

**Master’s Program: Abbreviated Procedure**

1) Seek administrative input and guidance (**Duration: program dependent**)
   a) Follow this procedure for proposing master’s programs:
      i) that are not in engineering, and
      ii) whose costs in the first five years will not exceed $2 million.
   b) Review:
      i) [UT system Program Proposal site](#).
      ii) [THECB New Programs Request Website](#)
      iii) the [Certification Form](#), which will be advanced to the UT System and THECB
      iv) the [Full Request Form](#), which is required by the UT System
   c) Consult with Academic Dean and, if applicable, Department and/or College committee(s)
   d) Inform Dean of the Graduate School
      i) Graduate Dean will provide guidance and share the spreadsheet that is used for budget review
      ii) Proposed interdisciplinary programs that span multiple colleges should start with Graduate Dean who will work with relevant academic deans
      iii) Graduate Dean informs Provost

2) Prepare Documents (**Duration: program dependent + 1 month for Academic Dean and Dean of Graduate School**)
   a) Complete Program Proposal Documents
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i) the Certification Form
ii) the Full Request Form

b) Send documents to Curriculum Director for review

c) Budget Spreadsheet Template (provided by Graduate Dean)
   i) Work with College CAO to develop budget spreadsheet

d) Seek administrative input on Program Proposal and Budget Documents prior to advancing documents for review by relevant committees
   i) Department Chair (if applicable)
   ii) College Dean
   iii) Dean of the Graduate School

3) Send to Curriculum Director for review

4) Meet with Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness to discuss SACSCOC prospectus

5) Review Process (Duration: 2 months + 1 month for public notification)
   a) Academic Review: Department > College > Graduate Council > Signed Action Report
      i) Provost's office notifies Texas public institutions of higher education within a 50 mile radius (EPCC and TTUHSC). This adds 30 days to the process to allow time for comment before the proposal can be advanced to the UT System.

   b) Budget Review: University Budget Committee
      i) The Provost will work with the academic Dean to schedule a review of the budget template in the University Budget Committee
      ii) Budget Review must be completed before the Provost and President sign the Action Report from the Graduate Council

Master’s Programs: Engineering and/or High Cost Planning Authority Proposal

1) Seek administrative input and guidance (Duration: program dependent)
   a) Review:

Revised 1/22/2021
i) UT system Program Proposal site
ii) THECB New Programs Request Website
iii) Full Request Form

b) Consult with Academic Dean and, if applicable, Department and/or College committee(s)

c) Inform Dean of the Graduate School
   
i) Graduate Dean will provide guidance and share the spreadsheet that is used for budget review
   
   ii) Proposed interdisciplinary programs that span multiple colleges should start with Graduate Dean who will work with relevant academic deans
   
   iii) Dean of Graduate School informs Provost

2) Prepare Documents (*Duration: program dependent + 1-2 months for reviews by Business Affairs, Academic Dean and Dean of Graduate School*)

   a) Prepare a memo that outlines the rationale for the program
      
a) This memo should briefly address major sections of the Full Request Form and any significant costs
      
b) Send to Curriculum Director who will use memo to draft a letter to the UT System that requests planning authority

   b) Work with College CAO to prepare Budget Proposal
      
i) Use spreadsheet provided by Graduate Dean
      
   ii) Preparation can be done in conjunction with the memo that outlines the rationale of the program, after the initial meeting with Dean of the Graduate School.
      
   iii) Have Business Affairs review budget spreadsheet

   c) Seek administrative input on Memo and Budget Documents prior to advancing documents for internal review
      
i) Department Chair (if applicable)
      
   ii) College Dean
      
   iii) Dean of the Graduate School

3) Internal Review (*Duration: 1 to 3 months*)
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a) Extended Dean’s Council (deans, associate provosts, Vice President of Research, Vice President of Business Affairs, Associate Vice President of Planning, Director of Library)

Note: An Extended Dean’s Council review is required only for programs that are projected to cost more than $2 million in the first five years. Engineering Programs that are expected to cost less than $2 million go directly to Budget Committee Review.

i) Academic dean requests that Provost schedule review of Planning Authority Proposal by Extended Dean’s Council

ii) Presentation and discussion led by program director, chair, and academic dean

iii) Provost solicits written input from all participants (following presentation)

   1) Ratings and input on each major topics (need, academics, faculty & resources)

   2) Alignment with UTEP’s mission and strategic plans(s)

   3) Relevance and connections to existing or planned doctoral programs

iv) Provost, Academic Dean, and Graduate Dean discuss feedback and next steps (e.g., advance to Budget Committee, request revision, request external review).

b) Budget Committee

c) President

4) Submit Planning Notification to UT System (Duration: 3 to 5 months)

a) Curriculum Director prepares letter to UT System that requests planning authority

b) UTS Board of Regents’ approval

c) UTS notifies THECB of approval

d) THECB acknowledges receipt

Full Proposal

1) Review Requirements:

   a) THECB New Programs Request Website

b) Texas Administrative Code for Doctoral Programs

2) Work with Graduate Dean and Curriculum Director to Prepare Proposal (Duration: program dependent)

   a) Use the Full Request Form located on the THECB Proposal website
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3) Internal Review (Duration: 2 months + 1 month for public notification)
   a) Budget Review (if necessary)
      
      Note: Budget review is required only if there have been significant changes from the budget review that occurred in the Planning Authority Proposal
   
   b) Send documents to Curriculum Director for review
   c) Meet with Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness to discuss SACSCOC prospectus
   d) Academic Review: Department > College > Graduate Council > Signed Action Report
   e) Provost’s office notifies Texas public institutions of higher education within a 50 mile radius (EPCC and TTUHSC). This adds 30 days to the process to allow time for comment before the proposal can be advanced to the UT System.

4) UTS Board of Regents' approval (Duration: 4-5 months)

5) THECB Review (Duration: 1-3 months)
   a) Staff Review
   b) THECB staff make recommendation to the Commissioner
   c) If Commissioner approves, recommendation to THECB Board

Doctoral Programs

Planning Authority Proposal
1) Seek administrative input and guidance (Duration: program dependent)
   a) Review:
      i. UT system Program Proposal site
      ii. THECB New Programs Request Website
      iii. Texas Administrative Code for Doctoral Programs
      iv. Characteristics of Doctoral Programs
      v. Proposal for a Doctoral Program Form
   b) Consult with Academic Dean and, if applicable, Department and/or College committee(s)
   c) Inform Dean of the Graduate School
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i. Graduate Dean will provide guidance and share the spreadsheet that is used for budget review

ii. Proposed interdisciplinary programs that span multiple colleges should start with Graduate Dean who will work with relevant academic deans

iii. Graduate Dean informs Provost

2) Prepare Documents  
    (Duration: program dependent + 1-2 months for reviews by Business Affairs, Academic Dean and Dean of Graduate School)

   a) Work with Graduate Dean and Curriculum Director to prepare the Planning Authority Proposal  
      (Duration: program dependent)

   i) Use UT System form that is on the UT System Planning website (link to word document)

      (1) Critical elements in proposal: need, cost, quality, duplication

      (2) Program’s relevance to UTEP’s mission and UTEP/College strategic plan(s)

   ii) Primary sections of Planning Authority Proposal

      (1) Program Description: Describe proposed program, discuss accreditation (if applicable), review related & supporting programs (e.g., master’s and/or doctoral programs in same department), and other doctoral programs at UTEP that might be impacted by proposed program

      (2) Need: analyze job market for graduates, discuss student demand, provide enrollment projections, and discuss similar programs in region (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona)

      (3) Resources: faculty and staff, facilities, library holdings, student financial support, and other areas critical to the success of a high-quality doctoral program

         (a) Current resources that will be "re-allocated" to proposed program (e.g., faculty FTE, TAs, endowments to support program/students, etc.)

         (b) Requested resources

            (i) Include plan for paying tuition for PhD students (new PhD proposals)

   b) Work with College CAO to prepare Budget Proposal

   i) Use spreadsheet provided by Graduate Dean

   ii) Start working on this once major parts of the Planning Authority document are sufficiently developed to allow budget estimates

   iii) Have Business Affairs review budget spreadsheet
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c) Seek administrative input on Planning Authority and Budget Documents prior to advancing documents for internal review
   i) Department Chair (if applicable)
   ii) College Dean
   iii) Dean of the Graduate School

3) Internal Review (*Duration: 1 to 3 months*)

a) Extended Dean’s Council (deans, associate provosts, Vice President of Research, Vice President of Business Affairs, Associate Vice President of Planning, Director of Library)
   i) Academic dean requests that Provost schedule review of Planning Authority Proposal by Extended Dean’s Council
   ii) Presentation and discussion led by program director, chair, and academic dean
   iii) Provost solicits written input from all participants (following presentation)
      (1) Ratings and input on each major topics (need, academics, faculty & resources)
      (2) Alignment with UTEP’s mission and strategic plans(s)
      (3) Relevance and connections to existing or planned doctoral programs
   iv) Provost, Academic Dean, and Graduate Dean discuss feedback and next steps (e.g., advance to Budget Committee, request revision, request external review).

b) Budget Committee

c) President

4) Submit Planning Notification to UT System (*Duration: 3 to 5 months*)

a) UTS Board of Regents’ approval
b) UTS notifies THECB of approval
c) THECB acknowledges receipt

Full Proposal

1) Review Requirements:
   a) [THECB New Programs Request Website]
   b) Texas [Administrative Code] for Doctoral Programs
   c) [Characteristics of Doctoral Programs]
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2) Work with Graduate Dean and Curriculum Director to Prepare Proposal *(Duration: program dependent)*
   a) Use the [Proposal for a Doctoral Program Form](#) located on the THECB Proposal website

3) Internal Review *(Duration: 2 months + 1 month for public notification)*
   a) Budget Review (if necessary)
      
      *Note: Budget review is required only if there have been significant changes since the budget review that occurred in the Planning Authority Proposal*

4) Send documents to [Curriculum Director](#) for review

5) Meet with Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness to discuss SACSCOC prospectus
   a) Academic Review: Department > College > Graduate Council > Signed Action Report
   b) Provost’s office notifies Texas public institutions of higher education within a 50 mile radius (this adds 30 days to the process to allow time for comment before the proposal can be advanced to the UT System)

6) UTS Board of Regents’ approval *(Duration: 4-5 months)*

7) THECB Review *(Duration: 6-10 months)*
   a) Staff Review
      i) Staff recommendation to Commissioner whether to proceed with a site visit
      ii) If Commissioner approves, THECB staff work to find external reviewers and to schedule a site visit at the institution
   b) Site visit by THECB staff and external reviewers
   c) Written report after site visit
   d) UTEP response to site visit report
   e) THECB staff make recommendation to the commissioner
   f) Commissioner decides if the proposal goes to Committee on Academic Workforce and Success (CAWS) and THECB Board Agenda
   g) CAWS approval
   h) THECB Board approval
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UT System and THECB Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due to UTS</th>
<th>UTS Meeting</th>
<th>THECB Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revision History

- 11/11/20 – Initial version that was shared with Academic Deans in Dean’s Council
- 1/22/20  
  - Added steps to contact Curriculum Director to assist with proposal development  
  - Added steps to contact Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness to discuss SACSCOC prospectus  
  - More closely integrated proposal and budget processes. This helps ensure that proposal and budget are aligned and prevent instances where proposal is advanced without budget, which then slows approval.
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