**New Program Development: Stage 1 Review Checklist**

Academic Planning and Program Development

Sam Houston State University

**Administrative**

Proposed Program Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Reviewer: Choose an item.

Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

**Format**

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  Program title matches THECB required format |
|[ ]  Typeface is consistent  |
|[ ]  Margins are consistent  |
|[ ]  All tables/figures are labeled appropriately  |
|[ ]  All tables/figures are referenced correctly in content  |
|[ ]  All data is cited appropriately  |
|[ ]  Formatting is consistent, clean, and easy to read |
|[ ]  The form has been updated to the most recent OAPA version |

**Format Comments:** Enter comments here.

**Mechanics**

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  Copyedit conducted |
|[ ]  All acronyms/abbreviations are explained upfront |
|[ ]  Free of awkward/unclear sentences |
|[ ]  Active verbs are utilized |
|[ ]  Free of passive language  |
|[ ]  Free of incomplete sentences |
|[ ]  Degree programs are spelled out first and then abbreviated appropriately (i.e., B.S. not BS) |

**Mechanics Comments:** Enter comments here.

**Content**

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  Identified CIP Code is appropriate for proposed program / CIP Code title is present |
|[ ]  Internal data verified via EPA report |
|[ ]  External data verified via source provided |
|[ ]  All data is within 12 months of the proposal (free of stale data) |
|[ ]  Data between table/graphs and content are consistent and accurate |
|[ ]  Data sources are not used in cross-comparison (i.e., comparing 2020 Emsi data with 2021 BLS data) |
|[ ]  All unfavorable data is addressed |
|[ ]  Enrollment data for all relevant SHSU programs are included |
|[ ]  Non-traditional degree plans (i.e., 4+1 or 3+1) are fully explained for laymen’s comprehension |
|[ ]  All interdisciplinary stakeholders have signed off |
|[ ]  All required review/approval signatures are present |
|[ ]  All generalized statements are clarified/expanded upon for relevance |
|[ ]  All concentrations/areas of focus are identified upfront |
|[ ]  Summary paragraphs are strong (i.e., tie data to the strategic plan, curriculum, program purpose, etc.) |
|[ ]  Delivery method is addressed when conflicting with data (i.e., virtual vs in-person) |
|[ ]  Program level is addressed when conflicting with data (i.e., undergraduate vs graduate dominance in Texas/U.S.)  |
|[ ]  The proposal presents a compelling argument, including sufficient data, for the proposed program |

**Content Comments:** Enter comments here.

**Additional Comments**

Click or tap here to enter text.