Curricular Review Checklist for School Committees

Academic Affairs recognizes that committees may have criteria that they choose to use in order to review curriculum documents. This checklist is not meant to replace established criteria, but rather enhance what may be used and offer some standardization of curriculum review at each level of the process across the institution. The questions and materials noted in this checklist should serve as supplemental items for consideration. Cases in which raters consistently answer “No” or “Partially” to items based on the content of the curriculum requests may be grounds for return to the Originator with feedback for editing and clarification.

Program Name Reviewed \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Committee \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **School Committee - Program Review** |
| **For consideration…** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Partially** | **N/A** |
| 1. Does the program request include all the appropriate attached documents?
	1. Requests for any New Courses or Change of Existing Courses for the program
	2. Master’s Accelerated Pathway Application for accelerated pathway programs (See [Curriculum Review Guide](https://www.untdallas.edu/provost/academic-affairs/curriculum-review-resources.php) for more information.)

*Failure to include all the documents fully completed should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the information presented in the proposal and additional documentation consistent and accurate? Could you advise a student on what courses to take to complete the program?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the author answer all the questions posed on the request form sections thoroughly? Does the proposal represent the quality and professionalism of your school?

*Failure to answer all the questions or provide sufficient information to make an informed judgment should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the program request meet the School’s goals and objectives?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the request include data or information that supports the need for the new program or change in program?

*Failure to answer questions related to the employability, graduate education preparation, or student demand should result in sending the request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are resources available to support the new program? (i.e., funding for faculty, space, library, IT resources, etc.)
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Has there been consultation with other departments on campus to determine if there would be an impact on their programs or course offerings or other possible concerns because of this new program or change in program? Any benefits/possibilities of collaboration across departments or divisions?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the program demonstrate coherence and meet general degree requirements for graduation with a degree? See appropriate [Catalog](http://catalog.untdallas.edu/index.php) for general graduation requirement information and the Catalog Degree Requirements section of the form.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Do committee members have any questions about the courses taken for the program and/or how the program is structured based on the Catalog Degree Requirements section of the form? Will the program be offered within 120 hours (or in accordance with approved THECB exceptions)?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Have issues of double-dipping and other program completion requirements been clearly addressed for documentation in the University Catalogs?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Has the department reviewed the [THECB Field of Study (FOS)](https://www.highered.texas.gov/our-work/supporting-our-institutions/program-development/texas-transfer-framework/), if applicable. Is there appropriate alignment to make transfer easier for students and meet State FOS requirements?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there evidence indicating that this curriculum change or new program is beneficial to students?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. For a new program, does the assessment plan provide adequate detail to be implemented and maintained? Are there clear Program Learning Outcomes (not course outcomes)? Are courses in the program identified to provide the assessment for the PLOs?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the plan for this program to prepare students for external professional credentialing? If so, are all the course/learning outcomes included that would meet outside credentialing requirements? Are those outcomes evident in the syllabi of courses for the program and the program learning outcomes?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If proposed changes may impact a current students’ ability to graduate as described in previous or current catalogs, what teach out plans are proposed so that students may still graduate in a timely manner?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If a new program (i.e., major or stand-alone certificate) is approved by the Academic Council, the THECB will send out notification to all schools within a 50-mile radius to determine if there is a perceived conflict with a program they are offering at their institution. Has sufficient research been conducted to determine if there are competing programs within the radius and if the program being proposed is “different enough” from possible competitors to survive final THECB approval?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If the new program or change in existing program proposes double dipping in which graduate courses may apply to undergraduate degree completion, are there clear student performance indicators that signal student preparedness to engage in graduate courses?
 |  |  |  |  |
| ***For Accelerated Graduate-Undergraduate Programs*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the program plan for completion of both programs meet the credit hours needed to meet federal and accreditation requirements for an undergraduate degree (120 hrs.) and master’s degree (at least 30 hrs.)? A program plan with less than 150 hours would have to be justified for external entities. (See the [Curriculum Review Guide](https://www.untdallas.edu/provost/academic-affairs/curriculum-review-resources.php) for information on Accelerated Pathway Programs to ensure all requirements are met.)
 |  |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Course Number Reviewed \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Committee \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **School Committee - Course Review** |
| **For consideration…** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Partially** | **N/A** |
| 1. Does the program request include all the appropriate attached documents?
	1. Syllabus that reflects student learning outcomes for the course, evaluation methods, and general course activities and content coverage.
	2. Requests for New Program or Change in Existing Program documentation related to the course

*Failure to include all the documents fully completed should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the information presented in the request form and additional documentation consistent and accurate?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the author answer all the questions posed on the request form sections thoroughly?

*Failure to answer all the questions or provide sufficient information to make an informed judgment should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the course request meet the School’s goals and objectives?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the request include data or information that supports the need for the new course or change in an existing course?

*Failure to answer all the questions or provide sufficient information to make an informed judgment should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is it clear how the course contributes to the program of study?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are resources available to support the course? (i.e., funding for faculty, space, library, IT resources, etc.)
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Has there been consultation with other departments on campus to determine if there would be an impact on their programs or course offerings or other possible concerns because of this new course or change in an existing course? Any benefits/possibilities of collaboration across departments or divisions?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How will this course align with transfer courses from our community college partners? Will we accept lower-level courses from the community college to meet requirements for this course? If so, how does that impact student completion of the program?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Has the department reviewed the THECB Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM) to determine appropriate alignment for a Texas Common Course Number (TCCN) to make transfer easier?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there reasonable justification for proposed prerequisites, corequisites, and rules (e.g., majors only or senior standing only)? Has justification for prerequisites and corequisites been provided to show that students need particular course content to be successful in the course? Has justification for rules been provided that may restrict access to the course to certain student populations, like “seniors only” because the course is meant as a capstone or “majors only” due to faculty resources?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the prerequisite and corequisite courses presented in alignment with program requirements in cases in which the course contributes to a new program or change in an existing program?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the request form and syllabus provide enough detail to support a well-planned course?

*Failure to provide sufficient information to make an informed judgment should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the course content and rigor seem appropriate for the level of the course? (i.e., 1000-2000 level, 3000-4000 level, 5000 level, etc.) (See [Curriculum Review Guide](https://www.untdallas.edu/provost/academic-affairs/curriculum-review-resources.php) for information on Level of Course Credit)
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the course duplicate content offered in another course offering? If so, what is the necessity for offering this version?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Will the course be offered regularly to warrant a course number?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Will the course rotation support student completion of a program of study? For instance, are required courses for a major offered more regularly than courses that may contribute to concentrations or electives?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the plan for this course to prepare students for external professional credentialing? If so, are all the course/learning outcomes included that would meet professional credentialing requirements? Are those outcomes evident in the syllabus for the course?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is this course going to be cross-listed with another department? Is there supporting documentation from the other department? Does the faculty member teaching the course have the appropriate expertise to teach the course according to SACSCOC faculty qualifications and University policy?

*Failure to provide sufficient information to make an informed judgment should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If a new course will be offered at the graduate and undergraduate levels, does the proposal clearly delineate the differences in content, assignments, and rigor that warrant the differentiation in credit?

*A course that could be offered at both levels would need to be approved by both the UCC and GC to ensure appropriate rigor for each level.* |  |  |  |  |
| ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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