

**ALABAMA COUNCIL of GRADUATE DEANS
NISP AND FULL PROGRAM PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCEDURES**

1. General Principles:

To facilitate distribution as email attachments, all NISPs, full program proposals, and response forms must be submitted by the proposing institution as PDF documents which do not exceed 5mb in size. The ACHE NISP form, the NISP response form, and the full Proposal for a New Graduate Degree Program form will be provided to all schools as PDF documents into which information about the program can be entered. In streamlining the process, it is the intent of the Alabama Council of Graduate Deans to facilitate full participation in the review process by all members of the Council.

2. Submission of a NISP:

The purpose of a NISP will be primarily to indicate that a full proposal will eventually follow; no formal response will be required. However, where appropriate, all institutions are encouraged to comment on a NISP to the proposing institution and to ACHE if issues of conflict or duplication exist, or to provide constructive suggestions.

NISPs should be submitted to ACHE and to the current ACGD Chair simultaneously as PDF documents which cannot be modified. Upon receipt, the ACGD Chair will then distribute the NISP and the NISP Response Form as email attachments directly to the ACGD membership with a due date for voluntary responses of 3 weeks from the email date.

3. Submission of Full Proposals:

a. Including the ACHE instructions for the proposal, the body of full program proposals must be limited to 16 pages or less. If necessary, additional explanatory information can be provided in Appendix F (Costs and Financial Support of the Program), and other Appendices as is appropriate.

b. Full proposals, including all Appendix materials must be incorporated into a single, unmodifiable PDF document of 5 mb or less and submitted simultaneously to ACHE and to the current ACGD Chair. If necessary, to stay under the 5 mb limit for the full proposal, Curriculum Vitae of faculty who will be participants in the proposed program should be amalgamated into a separate single PDF that is also less than 5 mb in size for submission. It is often possible to reduce the storage size of a PDF document by using the "Reduce File Size" command in Adobe Acrobat. Submissions should be limited to no more than two files, each of which is less than 5 mb in size. We encourage institutions to provide appropriate web links wherever possible in lieu of replicating the same documents within the proposal (e.g., CVs, accreditation standards, etc.).

- c. The ACGD Chair is then responsible for distributing the proposal PDF by email attachment to each ACGD member and alternate member at the voting institutions along with a PDF that mimics the “Evaluation Form for Proposed Programs” currently on the ACGD web site. The Chair indicates in the email message that responses are to be entered on the PDF response form and sent by email attachment back to the Chair’s designated representative with a response deadline of 3 weeks from the email date. Upon receipt of materials from the Chair, the Communications Officer will post the proposal to the ACGD website and notify the membership by email that the posting has been made. The Chair’s designated representative will collate the comments and the votes and remove any indication of institutional identification before passing the results on to the ACGD Chair.
- d. After receipt of the responses from which institutional identities have been removed by the chair’s designate, the Chair then has one week to send the results to both the proposing school and to ACHE. The proposing school is asked to respond to the comments and suggestions within 2 weeks from that email date using a PDF document.
- e. Once the proposing school responses have been received, the Chair distributes the responses to the ACGD membership for review. Included as an attachment is a PDF that mimics the “Voting Form For Proposed Programs” currently on the ACGD web site with a request for final votes to be entered on that form and returned to the Chair’s designate within one week of that email date.
- f. After receipt, the Chair’s designate collates the votes and any comments, removes school identifiers, and forwards the anonymous results to the Chair who then provides the results to ACHE, to the proposing school, and to the ACGD membership.

Caveat: The timeline for review of NISPs and full Proposals submitted in the summer months can be protracted at the Chair’s discretion in view of the fact that some faculty who are on 9 or 10 month appointments, and those on vacation, may not be available to assist with internal reviews.

Approved by unanimous vote of the ACGD membership in attendance at the 5 November 2008 Council meeting at UAB.