

Using AI to Pre-Review Program Proposals and Assessment Plans

A Resource from the Office of Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Research (OEE)

Purpose

Many of the corrections that come back during OEE's review of a new program or substantive change proposal are consistency and completeness issues rather than substantive judgment calls: a course title that doesn't match the catalog, an assignment name that differs between two documents, a curriculum map missing a required course, budget figures that don't reconcile. These are exactly the kind of checks an AI tool can perform reliably across several documents at once — work that is tedious to do by eye but fairly mechanical to verify.

Running your draft materials through an AI tool before submitting to OEE won't replace OEE's review — judgment calls about program design, PLO quality, and alignment with WSCUC standards still need a person. But it should catch a meaningful share of the mechanical issues before they reach OEE, so that the review conversation can focus on substance rather than typos and mismatched course titles.

What This Can and Can't Do

- Can check: consistency of names, numbers, and figures across multiple documents; whether required elements (formative/summative measures, values alignment, MFL resources) are present somewhere in the packet; obvious leftover template language; whether budget math reconciles.
- Can't replace: OEE's judgment on whether PLOs are well-written and measurable, whether the assessment plan is rigorous enough, or whether the proposal meets WSCUC's substantive expectations. Treat AI output as a first pass, not a sign-off.
- Always do a final human read-through before submitting — an AI tool can miss context that a person familiar with the program would catch immediately.

Recommended Workflow

1. Gather your materials: the draft proposal narrative, curriculum map, assessment matrix/plan, Core Values alignment narrative, MFL Resources document, and budget file.
2. Have the relevant OEE guide on hand (Assessment Guide, Program Review Guide, or Values Alignment Guide, as applicable — available on the OEE website) so the AI tool has the actual standard to check against, not just general knowledge.
3. Upload all of the above to an AI tool (e.g., Claude) in a single conversation, so it can cross-reference between documents rather than reviewing each in isolation.
4. Use the sample prompt below, or adapt it to your program type.
5. Review the output, make corrections, and do a final read-through yourself before sending the packet to OEE.

Sample Prompt

Copy and adapt the text below. Attach your documents and the applicable OEE guide before sending it.

I'm preparing a [new program / substantive change / certificate] proposal for Loma Linda University's Office of Educational Effectiveness (OEE). Attached are our draft proposal, curriculum map, assessment matrix, Core Values alignment narrative, Mission-Focused Learning (MFL) resources document, budget, and the OEE Assessment Guide.

Please review these documents together, not just individually, and check for:

1. Course titles and numbers matching the official catalog and matching each other across every document.
2. Whether every required course (including religion/general education courses) appears in the curriculum map.
3. Whether each PLO has its own distinct measure, and if one assignment serves two PLOs, whether it has separate, named rubric criteria for each.
4. Whether formative and summative assessments are identified for every PLO.
5. Whether the curriculum map uses current I/E/A and B/F/S notation.
6. Whether Values Alignment and MFL Resource Library requirements are addressed explicitly, separate from the PLOs.
7. Whether the budget math reconciles (units × rate = stated tuition figures; narrative enrollment assumptions match the budget table).
8. Any leftover template or placeholder language, typos, or text that looks copied from another program.

Flag anything unclear, inconsistent, or incomplete before I submit this for review.

Common Issues Checklist

A quick-reference version of the same items, useful for a final manual pass or for building your own prompt.

Check	What to look for
Course names and numbers	Match the official catalog exactly, and match each other, across the proposal, curriculum map, assessment matrix, Core Values narrative, and MFL Resources document.
Every required course appears in the curriculum map	Including religion, general education, or service-learning requirements — not just the major/discipline courses.
No phantom courses	Every course referenced in any document actually exists in the approved curriculum list — watch for leftover references from a previous program's template.
Curriculum map notation	Uses the current scales: I / E / A (Introduced / Expanded / Advanced) for instruction, and B / F / S (Baseline / Formative / Summative) for assessment — not older or undefined codes.

Check	What to look for
Formative and Summative present for every PLO	Required regardless of program length. If both fall in the same course, the plan should state the timing (e.g., formative early in the term, summative later) so there's a real window to act on findings.
Shared artifacts have distinct rubrics	If one assignment is used to assess two different PLOs, each PLO needs its own named rubric or clearly separated criteria — a single score should not be counted twice.
PLO count	Five to seven for full degree programs; certificate-length programs may run shorter, but PLOs should still be measurable, not just aspirational.
No deprecated terminology	“Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO)” and references to “WASC” have been replaced institution-wide — use Core Values reporting and the WSCUC name.
Values Alignment addressed on its own	LLU's 7 Core Values are tracked independently of PLOs. This applies to every program and should be documented explicitly, not assumed from a related PLO.
Mission Focused Learning (MFL) documented per course	Every online course needs its own Resource Library entry with actual faith-based/LLU-specific materials, not a general statement that MFL “is integrated.”
Budget math reconciles	Units × per-unit rate matches the stated tuition figures; headcount assumptions in the narrative match the budget table.
No leftover template language	Placeholder instructions, highlighting, or prompts from the original template file should be removed before submission.
Filenames match content	Especially when reusing a document across two similar proposals — confirm the filename reflects the actual program.

Reference Guides

The full Program Review, Assessment, and Values Alignment guides referenced above are available on the OEE website:

<https://llu.edu/academics/office-provost/departments-and-divisions/educational-effectiveness>

Questions

Contact the Office of Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Research with any questions about applying this workflow to your program's proposal.