Proposal Review Guidance

Thank you for agreeing to review the proposal for a California State University degree program. A copy of the proposal accompanies these guidelines. Additional information may be available on the campus Web pages: [http://www.calstate.edu/search_find/campus.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/search_find/campus.shtml)

The categories below are the primary review criteria we consider when evaluating proposed degree programs. System-level review seeks to assist constructively in the program development process, identifying through outside perspectives any areas in which the proposal should be strengthened. We ask that reviewers not impose their own preferences for program design but instead analyze whether disciplinary standards are upheld, if a need for the program has been demonstrated, and whether the requisite institutional resources are in place.

Each review category appearing below lists questions that are intended to be a helpful guide for considering the proposal. The questions are not necessarily exhaustive, nor must all questions be addressed, and we welcome any comments or questions that you might have in response to the proposal. Reviews tend to run from two to four pages long.

Your identity will be kept in confidence; a summary of comments from multiple reviewers will be conveyed to the campus.

Faculty

- Does the faculty appear qualified to offer this program and at this level? Does the faculty expertise span all appropriate specializations, and are there sufficient faculty members for the projected size of the program? Do they appear to have appropriate research or professional experience? Are the arrangements for administering the program sufficient to ensure that it will operate effectively?

Curriculum

- Does the curriculum have appropriate breadth, depth, and coherence for an undergraduate or a graduate program in this field? Is it up to date, incorporating the
most recent developments in the field? Is it consistent with any pertinent recommendations of professional organizations? Is it responsive to employment opportunities for graduates? If it is a baccalaureate program, would it constitute desirable preparation for graduate or doctoral study in the fields indicated in the proposal?

**Resources**

- Does the description of facilities, equipment, and information resources indicate that the campus has the resources (or reliable access to resources) that will be needed for a high-quality program? If not, what information would be minimally necessary to assure that the resources are adequate?

**Assessment of Program Quality and Student Learning**

- Does the proposal provide an assessment plan that identifies program and student learning goals? Do the student learning outcomes match with the curriculum? Are goals measurable, and will the assessment process be manageable? Is the process meaningful, with assessment results be used to influence changes in the curriculum or pedagogy?

**State Need and Student Demand**

- Do you believe that a program of this kind is needed in California? Is there convincing evidence provided in the proposal to demonstrate student interest in the program and employer demand for graduates? Are the sources of information on need current and credible? If you think that the information on need for the program is not adequate, what other information might we suggest that the campuses include in the proposal?

You have our gratitude for your participation in this essential phase of program development.