

Principles Governing Criteria for Review

The review process will ensure consultation with relevant academic stakeholders to ensure transparency, inclusion, and broad-based input into decisions. By the time a proposal reaches the Dean for review, all units that are affected by the changes should have the chance to review and comment. Administrators will reduce unnecessary or redundant layers of review to streamline the process and expedite time to implementation without compromising quality. It is recognized that these criteria may be subject to different standards and expectations at different levels of the university (e.g., department/program, School/College, Provost's Office, or University). That is, approval of a proposal based on one or more of these criteria at one level does not necessarily render unnecessary the review of the proposal using the same criteria at another level (e.g., review for Additionality should take place at the department/program, School/College and Provost levels).

- Academic Quality: The proposal must demonstrate high standards of academic rigor, relevance, and excellence. The process will uphold a strong commitment to trusting the specialized knowledge of faculty, recognizing their critical role in creating and maintaining the curriculum and in academic decision-making.
- Additionality: The proposal should add meaningful value to current academic offerings, present unique elements as compared to current academic offerings, and/or clearly integrate with existing programs. The proposal should avoid duplication of existing content and remove redundancies.
- Mission Fit: The proposal must support and advance the mission and strategic plan of the institution.
- Policy Alignment: The proposal must align with the established policies of the relevant Program, Department, School, and the broader University.
- Student Success: The proposal should, at a minimum, maintain and ideally enhance student outcomes, including academic achievement, career readiness, and personal development. The proposal should be reviewed to consider the extent to which it intersects with and impacts efforts to support student success across the institution (e.g., in Student Development, Student Success).
- Viability: The process will ensure assessment by qualified stakeholders, governance, and administrative bodies of whether the anticipated benefits justify the investment of resources. As relevant, the proposal must be assessed for sufficient enrollment demand, both independently and in relation to the resources required to implement the content of the proposal. The proposal will include language to indicate how the administration will know when it is no longer viable and should be sunset.

	Criteria for Review					
Administrative or Governance Body	Academic Quality	Additionality	Mission Fit	Policy Alignment	Student Success	Viability
Faculty Proposer	√	√	√	√	√	√
Chair ¹	√	√	√	√	√	√
Academic Council	√	√	√	√	√	√
Dean	√	√	√	√	√	√
Operational Subcommittee				√	√	√
BUS/GSCB		√		√	√	
Faculty Council		√			√	√
Provost		√	√	√	√	√
President			√	√	√	√
BOT Committee/s			√			√
BOT			√			√
HLC, IBHE, DOE				√		

¹ As appropriate, the Chair will receive recommendations from one or more of the following governance bodies within the academic unit: Undergraduate/Graduate Program Director, Curriculum Committee, Faculty Committee.