# GCAC Review Criteria for New Program

**Program Name:** ___________________________  **Date reviewed:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>GCAC Proposal Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **RATIONALE, NEED, AND CONTEXT**  
   a. The rationale for the program is aligned with the university’s mission and relates to specific institutional strengths and/or Strategic Goals.  
   b. Impacts on and/or overlap with other programs/departments have been addressed.  
   c. Evidence is provided that there is:  
      i) a need for this program at this level  
      ii) workforce or other demand for program graduates  
      iii) a source of students interested in the program  
   d. If the program duplicates other degree programs in Chicago/Illinois, a convincing rationale for doing so is provided and/or evidence that a novel/unique niche would be filled by the program is provided.  
   e. The proposal indicates steps to be taken to achieve a diverse student body. | Met with Strength:  
   Met:  
   Met with Weakness:  
   Unmet:  
   Cannot evaluate: |
| 2. **COURSE OF STUDY / ACCREDITATION**  
   a. The proposal describes an appropriate and sequenced course of study, including a 5-yr schedule of course offerings with faculty assignments.  
   b. Admissions and graduation criteria are clearly specified and appropriate.  
   c. The course of study and credit hours required may be satisfied within a reasonable time to degree.  
   d. In cases in which accreditation is needed, evidence is provided that the program has started the accreditation process or a rationale is provided as to how accreditation will be sought. | Met with Strength:  
   Met:  
   Met with Weakness:  
   Unmet:  
   Cannot evaluate: |
| 3. **LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT**  
   a. The proposal provides learning objectives and methods and means of evaluation.  
   b. Evidence of how the program will be assessed is provided. | Met with Strength:  
   Met:  
   Met with Weakness:  
   Unmet:  
   Cannot evaluate: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>GCAC Proposal Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4. PREPAREDNESS OF UNIT HOSTING PROGRAM**  
a. Evidence is provided that a critical mass of faculty members and/or staff is available to initiate the program based on estimated enrollments.  
b. If appropriate, there is a commitment to hire additional faculty members and/or staff in later years, based on estimated enrollments.  
c. The proposal provides evidence that the academic unit(s) associated with this new degree have been productive in teaching, research, and service.  
d. If there have been program reviews or accreditation activities in the discipline or related disciplines pertinent to the proposed program, the proposal provides evidence that progress has been made in implementing the recommendations from those reviews. | Met with Strength:  
Met:  
Met with Weakness:  
Unmet:  
Cannot evaluate: |
| **5. OTHER RESOURCES**  
Evidence is provided that the necessary resources are sufficient and established to initiate the program:  
a. Library resources  
b. Computing resources  
c. Teaching space(s)  
d. Office space(s)  
e. Equipment  
f. Clinical, practicum, research, and/or internship sites/opportunities  
g. Fellowships, scholarships, and graduate assistantships  
h. Other: | Met with Strength:  
Met:  
Met with Weakness:  
Unmet:  
Cannot evaluate: |
| **6. BUDGET AND BUDGET JUSTIFICATION**  
a. The proposal provides a complete and realistic budget for the program, which reflects the text of the proposal.  
b. The proposal contains realistic estimates of headcount and FTE students who will graduate from the proposed program.  
c. The proposal provides a convincing argument that the output of the program justifies the investment. | Met with Strength:  
Met:  
Met with Weakness:  
Unmet:  
Cannot evaluate: |
| **7. SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION**  
a. The proposal includes quantitative data that provide evidence for claims made in the proposal.  
b. The proposal provides letters/memos of support to substantiate the information provided in the proposal. | Met with Strength:  
Met:  
Met with Weakness:  
Unmet:  
Cannot evaluate: |