All proposals for program changes and new programs must be submitted to the Curriculum Committee for full review and comment. The Curriculum Committee will evaluate all proposals prior to submission to the Dean; only proposals that are approved in principle result in letters to the Dean. Those proposals that are not approved result in letters to the proposer(s) with requests for further documentation, suggestions for clarification, and other comments and questions designed to assist the proposer in achieving approval. A proposer may continue to re-submit their proposal with appropriate response to the Committee’s suggestions/requirements.

Procedures:

1. Copies of proposals for changes to existing programs should be submitted to all committee members NO LESS THAN TWO WEEKS prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Committee.

2. Copies of proposals for new programs should be submitted to all committee members NO LESS THAN FOUR WEEKS prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Committee for new programs.

3. Proposals are placed on the Committee agenda in the order they are received. Proposals that are not received in the time frame indicated above will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

4. The appropriate cover sheet should be obtained* and filled out completely.
   a. “Change of Program” includes any change such as changing the title, credit hours or content of a one or more existing courses; increasing/decreasing the number of credit hours necessary to complete a program; adding, deleting or replacing existing courses; or any other definitive change in a program
   b. “New Program” is reserved for the proposal of a new program.
   c. *Cover sheets have been provided electronically to all SOE faculty.

5. Appropriate supporting documentation is required. Such documentation should clearly support the proposal; examples may include, but are not limited to:
   a. Expansion of the rationale for the proposal
   b. Syllabi that indicate the changes or represent the new course(s)
   c. All syllabi of classes in a proposed change in program or new program
   d. An outline of the proposed program compared to the old program
   e. Evidence of acknowledgement (letters of support) from any other programs affected by the proposed changes, or from relevant offices within the SOE or University (i.e., Certification Office indicating alignment with state competencies).
   f. New proposed title/catalog description/course description
   g. Copies of documents from professional agencies (such as WAC codes, CACREP, NASPE, etc.) that support the rationale for change
   h. Particularly in the case of the new program, documentation/support indicating the need for the program (needs assessment), as well as projections about continuing need for/student interest in the program
   i. Documentation outlining budgetary needs/changes/ or impacts on budget
   j. Other evidence
In essence, the documents should clearly and extensively support the proposal; such documents provide the Committee with the evidence they need to support a clear and objective decision.

Proposals are not always approved on first reading. There may be requests for further documentation, or a need for more extensive discussion by the committee. Proposers should not assume that approval is automatic at the first meeting. The initial meeting is designed to be an information gathering session for the Committee members. Final recommendations or decisions are often NOT made by the conclusion of this initial meeting. Particularly in the case of new program proposals, several meetings and requests for further documentation should be expected.

Once a proposal is received by the Committee members and placed on the agenda, the members are charged with carefully reading/reviewing the material. In general,* the consideration of a proposal in meeting follows the following protocol:
*A minor change to a program with sufficient supportive documentation may not require the following protocol.

1. The Committee members spend 30-45 minutes discussing the proposal, electing a point person** who will be the primary contact/information center for that proposal, organizing a line of questions and concerns, etc.
2. The proposer is then invited into the meeting to synopsize the proposal, answer any questions, and receive feedback/input from committee members. The Committee MAY indicate at this time the potential approval and recommendation OR the need for further documents/discussion to the proposer.
   a. After the proposer is excused, the Committee makes motions regarding the approval or non-approval at that time; the point person is charged with the drafting of a letter to the proposer indicating approval and recommendation to the Dean, OR a letter listing the recommendations/requirements needed for the proposal to be resubmitted to the Committee.
      i. Should a consensus on approval of the proposal be reached, the point person drafts a letter of recommendation, copies of which are forwarded to the proposer, the Chair of the appropriate department, and the Dean.
      ii. Should the committee find that further documentation is required before approval of a proposal, the point person shall act as the primary liaison between the proposer and the committee.

**The point person may NOT be a member of the same department as the proposer. The point person is responsible for drafting all memos and letters to the proposer and gaining committee approval and signatures for such documents prior to sending them to the proposer. The point person may also serve as a resource for a proposer to gain feedback as he/she continues a revision process.

The Committee attempts to draft and forward a letter within two weeks after initial review. Should the committee require further review of a proposal. The proposer will be notified. It is the duty of the proposer(s) to address the issues/suggestions raised by the Committee and resubmit the proposal. It is the proposer’s responsibility to request a meeting with the Dean once the Committee has provided the letter of approval.