Curricular Review Checklist for the Dean

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 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Dean - Program Review** |
| **For consideration…** | **Yes** | **No**  | **Partially** | **N/A** |
| 1. Does the program request include all the appropriate attached documents?
	1. Graduate or Undergraduate Catalog Degree Requirements Checklist (or a line item edit of University Catalog degree requirements if an existing program)
	2. Marketable Skills Documentation (new major or stand-alone certificate)
	3. Requests for any New Courses or Change of Existing Courses for the program
	4. 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 request form and additional documentation consistent and accurate? Does it represent the quality and professionalism of your school?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the originator 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 program request meet the School’s goals and objectives?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the School have funding to support the hire of faculty to teach for the program?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Will faculty have appropriate course loads to support the program?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there evidence that this program be self-sustainable? Is there information that supports a sufficient return on investment for the University?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Do the faculty listed in the proposal have the appropriate credentials to implement and maintain the program of study? Do they meet teaching qualification standards according to SACSCOC and University policy? (See [Faculty Credentialing Guide](https://www.untdallas.edu/sites/default/files/faculty-credentialing-guide_2023-03-21.pdf))
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the University have the appropriate space to accommodate this program? Offices, classrooms, labs, computer labs, etc.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the University own the appropriate equipment and/or will funding be secured for its purchase?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 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. Is there sufficient evidence that the new program or change in an existing program shows evidence of easy alignment and transferability from our community college partners?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If the program plans to prepare students for external professional credentialing, does this program offer appropriate justification and documentation that this can be accomplished by students who complete this the program of study?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If a new program (i.e., a major or stand-alone certificate) is approved by the Academic Council, the Provost’s Office must send out a 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. Does the new course or change in an existing course show evidence of easy alignment and transferability from our community college partners?

*Failure to provide sufficient information to make an informed judgment should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Will this program contribute to preparation for external professional credentialing? If so, is there adequate evidence that objectives will be met in this class?
 |  |  |  |  |
| ***For Accelerated Graduate-Undergraduate Programs*** |  |  |  |  |
| 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 of 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.) |  |  |  |  |

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

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Dean - 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? Does it represent the quality and professionalism of your school?

*Failure to answer all the questions or sufficient information to make an informed judgment should result in sending the Request back to the originator for further development.* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Will distance learning be implemented for this course? If so, is there time for quality course development and faculty training with DLIT?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Will adding this course to a program negatively impact teaching loads?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the School have funding to support the hire of faculty to teach this course?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does this course require additional course fees to sustain adequate pedagogy? Has that been discussed/approved with the CFO and Budgets offices?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Do faculty have the appropriate credentials to meet teaching qualification standards according to SACSCOC and University policy? (See [Faculty Credentialing Guide](https://www.untdallas.edu/sites/default/files/faculty-credentialing-guide_2023-03-21.pdf))
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Are additional library resources needed for the proposal?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the University have the appropriate equipment needed to teach this course? Will funding need to be secured for the purchase of equipment needed?
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the University have the appropriate space to accommodate this class? Offices, classrooms, labs, computer labs, etc.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the new course or change in an existing course show evidence of easy alignment and transferability from our community college partners?

*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 warrants 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.* |  |  |  |  |