CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Academic Standards Committee

PRIOR TO SUBMISSION: Before submitting proposal to the ASC, it is strongly suggested that proposers consider the following. This list is provided only as a courtesy and may not include all items for consideration, but it is designed to give proposers a general idea of criteria considered by the ASC. (*Note that not all criteria will be appropriate for all proposals and that this list is not exhaustive.*)

For new program proposals:
- Clear rationale for developing the program (market research, reviews by off-campus consultants, accrediting requirements, etc.)
- Clarity and correctness of grammar and syntax
- Well-planned vertical curricula and course designs (and syllabi for any new courses), including conformance to any external regulations or accrediting agencies
- Clear statement of resources (personnel, monetary, infrastructure), both existing and yet to be obtained, in order to initiate the program
- Discussion of any potential impact of the new program on existing programs, including potential overlaps in courses, subject matter, and shared personnel or resources. If courses in other programs or departments will be required for your program, the appropriate Department Chairs should be aware of that possibility and signatures obtained as appropriate.
- Startup plan, including a compensation plan for any missing or shared resources
- Collection of all required signatures/clearances up to the level of ASC

For new course proposals:
- All pedagogical issues (appropriateness, course content, contribution to academic program/curriculum, etc.) with rationale clearly provided or attached as a separate document to the form
- Clarity and correctness of grammar and syntax
- Placement of course within the degree program and any associated adjustments to the degree program
- Alignment with all appropriate SLOs
- Appropriate number and/or prefix obtained by the registrar
- Description for catalog including all pre-/co-requisites
- Collection of all required signatures/clearances up to the level of ASC

For new policy proposals:
- Importance of policy to the function of the university
- Need for the policy to be implemented (accreditation, safety, academic consistency, etc.)
- Collection of all required signatures/clearances up to the level of ASC
- Impact of new policy (implementation plan, effect on other areas, etc.)

If any of the above are not completed, then it is highly likely that the proposal will be sent back without review. Once the issues are corrected, the proposal may be resubmitted for review. All reviews are performed on completed proposals in the order received.

ASC can be expected to review all completed proposals for the following:
- Clarity and completeness of the above (may require submitted evidence: meeting notes, letters of support, etc.)
- Identification and resolution of potential overlaps with existing courses or programs in other Schools/Colleges
- Potential personnel, funding, IT, and/or library concerns
- The rationale provided for all proposals, including appropriate explanations and support for the proposal (background information, factors considered, need, resources, outcomes, impact on other departments, library resources, faculty needed, technology, etc.
- Syllabi/curricula that adhere to University standards/best practices
- Academic rigor
- Measurable and appropriate objectives
- Fit of the course or program in the existing and future plans of the university
- For programs, likelihood to advance the overall status of the university academically
- For policies, the impact of the policy on the overall infrastructure of the university operating procedures, safety, governance, academic integrity, and accreditation measures.

**AFTER SUBMISSION:** The ASC will consider new and revised course, program, and policy proposals with the following criteria in mind. Representatives submitting proposals should be prepared to answer questions concerning these issues, and present/discuss evidence of having fulfilled these requirements.

1. Need

The area of need is one that is driven from the administration, faculty, staff, or students of B-CU.

a. The new course, program, policy or revision should satisfy an identifiable need within the mission of the University.
b. The new or revised course should not duplicate curriculum already available.
c. For new course proposals that may have overlap with courses in other departments, evidence should be presented that those departments have been contacted and that the overlap is minimal or that the perspective is significantly different to merit a new course. Departments may want to consider enrollment restrictions and the feasibility of course cross listing. Course revisions that may result in significant overlap with courses in other departments should be accompanied by similar evidence.
d. The role of the course or program should be carefully considered, including requirement in major or minor programs within and external to the department. If the course will significantly impact other departments or programs, submitters are encouraged to include evidence of communication with the other programs/departments.
e. Rationale for the development of a course, program, or policy must be addressed and/or included in the proposal/prospectus (ex. market research, review by consultants, accreditation requirements, etc.)

2. Quality

The quality of a proposal is the responsibility of the developers of the proposal and should be carefully considered before submission to the ASC. This includes all pedagogical issues, grammar, and alignments with all PSLOs and SLOs of the appropriate College or School.

a. The new course, program, policy, or revision should be well conceived and well organized. Revisions resulting in substantial changes to course content or new course proposals should include a sufficient outline of the course material and pattern to demonstrate these requirements.
b. The level of rigor should meet current standards for a university course or program, and the number of credits awarded should be reflective of the amount of work required in the course.
c. The new or revised course should have appropriate prerequisites.
d. The new or revised policy must be in-line with the institutional goals and standards set forth by the current administration.

3. Resource Needs

While the ASC recognizes that a signature on the proposal form certifies the Dean's willingness to support a course, program, or policy, there are course design issues that can significantly impact the quality of a course offering and the experience for the students. Therefore, submitters may be asked to discuss the following:

a. The department must have sufficient faculty/staff resources and qualifications for the new course or program or to make the proposed changes in an existing course or program. Departments submitting multiple proposals for new courses should consider whether there are infrequently offered courses that could be deleted.
b. The support infrastructure must be adequate (sufficient laboratory facilities, sufficient library resources, availability of required internships, etc.) to offer the course/program in the long term.

4. Records

a. The course number should be consistent with the level of work required in the course and obtained directly from the registrar.
b. The course or program description should be clear and accurate with all requirements identified and/or explained.
c. The syllabus/prospectus should be appropriate and accurately described and include all supporting documentation/evidence.

5. Signatures

Obtaining signatures signifies that the new course, program, policy, or revision meets all criteria in the appropriate areas, and that they support the proposal for submission to the ASC.

a. The proposal must include all appropriate signatures pertaining to the proposal and indicate consultation with all appropriate bodies (General Education, Online College, etc.) in addition to the representative Dean.
b. A signature indicates that the appropriate authorities have taken the necessary steps to ensure that the proposal is ready for review. This includes any steps needing further justification from an outside source (ex. SACS or other accrediting agencies)

Questions involving course and/or program revisions will generally be limited to those sections pertaining only to the revision. However, presenters should give consideration to how the proposed changes may impact the other aspects of the course or program that have not been selected for revision, and be prepared to address questions from ASC members as necessary.

Expedited Agenda

With the consent of the ASC, very minor changes may be handled through an "**Expedited Agenda**", including items which are presented to the ASC that are time sensitive or part of an emergency session called by the Provost. Such items are reviewed more carefully at the first ASC meeting, but if passed do not require a second reading. However, during deliberation, any ASC member with concerns about an item on the Expedited Agenda may request a vote to have that item pulled from the Expedited Agenda for a normal first and second reading at future meetings. Generally only minor, uncontroversial changes will be considered as possibilities for an expedited agenda item. (*Note that placement on an Expedited Agenda does not guarantee passage of the measure by ASC, only that it is eligible for a shortened timeframe for review.*)

1. Reasonable items for consideration on the Expedited Agenda:

   ● Course deletions (with clear rationale included)
   ● Changes in prerequisites within the proposing department
   ● Administrative action

2. Possible items for consideration on the Expedited Agenda: Proposers may request these items to appear on the Expedited Agenda if these changes are minor. Rationale for these items must be clear enough to justify whether or not changes are minor.

   ● Course number
   ● Changes in course description
   ● Changes in course title
   ● Changes in number of credits

3. Other situations that could lead to an expedited process may include:
   ● Sufficient support from ASC to render a second read unnecessary (as determined by vote)
   ● A proposal that requires immediate attention as determined by the administration