

**New Program Review Committee:
STAGE 2: FEASIBILITY REVIEW FORM of the Master's in Public Administration
September 7, 2011**

This new program proposal shows sufficient evidence of the feasibility of the program to warrant moving forward to faculty governance review.

The New Program Review Committee's review of the Master's in Public Administration centered around the view that the proposal for the MPA program shows promise as a new program in which GU could invest resources, provided that the necessary resources are available and not diverted from programs of proven value. However, the committee was uncertain about the potential feasibility (both external and internal) of the MPA program because of the limited evidence provided in the program proposal, particularly in the areas of viability.

I. Justification for the development of this program:

- The justification demonstrates the connection to the University's mission, vision, and strategic plan and provides anecdotal and some quantitative evidence of the demand for the program. The under-representation of deaf employees in the higher ranks of Federal government certainly suggests that there is a need for some intervention to improve the professional advancement of deaf individuals. However, the proposal does not provide evidence that the cause for under-representation is related to, or dependent upon, having or not having a master's degree in public administration. A stronger demonstration of cause and effect would make the case for this program stronger. Further, the justification describes that the potential pool of students can include deaf individuals in non-profit, state and local governments, and other organizations, yet, little is discussed about those pools. Based on documentation provided, it appears that the initial focus for recruiting students to this program will begin with deaf Federal employees. The NPR committee recommends that additional data on the other pools be collected to assess the potential growth of the program.

II. Evidence of external viability of the program (demand):

- The proposal provided anecdotal and quantitative data on the numbers of employees with disabilities in the Federal government who may benefit from this program. However, that data lacked: 1) specific quantitative data on the numbers of qualified deaf Federal employees, and 2) potential demand from non-profit organizations, state and local governments, and potential hearing Federal employees. Without "testing" the potential market through a survey, it is difficult to ascertain whether we can truly yield 15 enrolled students per year for the foreseeable future. It is unclear if D/HH in government employees (the target audience) require an MPA for advancement. Would a certificate (rather than a degree) or simply some course work be sufficient? The concept for the program was supported and resulted in development of this proposal prior to formal approval of the new program review process when there was no requirement for the standard for proof of external viability. Therefore the proposal lacks essential and factual evidence to the best possible extent that there is a demand for the program and it has not been demonstrated that there is actual demand for this program.

III. Evidence of internal viability of the program:

- Viability considers the interdependency of several factors – do we have sufficient human, financial, and physical resources (including technical and space) to support the program? Does the program depend on direct support from other departments or organizations (e.g., for providing service courses)? Does the institution have the expertise (e.g. faculty) to support and sustain the program? The proposal offers a budget with estimations of revenue and budget for a multi-year period. It describes the faculty that are currently willing to commit to the program and recommends hiring 2 tenure track faculty. The internal viability of the program, at the current time, rests on the shoulders of 1 tenured faculty member, whose qualifications are primarily in educational administration. Evaluation of this criteria is based on the premise that at least 1 additional well-qualified tenure-track faculty be hired as soon as possible to ‘shore up’ the program and that the program can be run with two faculty. Even with that, previous analyses have raised concerns about program viability with very small departments (eg., two faculty members) with reference to PPTF comments about the lack of viability of existing programs with limited numbers of faculty.

IV. Documentation of required resources:

- Resources needed are more clearly stated now than in the original submission but the source of resources for the program is unclear. Are the resources better invested in a successful program that could easily expand such as the MA in Sign Language Teaching?

V. Interdisciplinary program defined (if applicable):

- This proposal was put forward as one that is not interdisciplinary. The committee had questions about whether that would, in fact, be true given the wide-ranging content, and the limited number of faculty members proposed for operating the program.