Rubric for Evaluating a Course Proposal A tool for faculty to self-check and Senate Curriculum Committee Members

Course number and title:

Course Catalog Elements

	Meets	Does not meet
Title	The title reflects the objectives of the course and adheres to the University guidelines (see Course Title Guidelines)	The title is not appropriate:
Credit hours	The number of credit hours reflects the expected effort. For conventional delivery formats, this is one hour of instruction and two hours of out-of-class work per credit hour over a 15- week semester. See Course Credit Hour Guidelines for guidelines for non-traditional formats.	The credit hours is not appropriate for the level of effort:
Prerequisites	 The prerequisites are: Clearly and unambiguously stated. Backed by letter of support if offered by another unit. 	The prerequisites are not clear or there is no letter of support (if offered by another unit):
Catalog Description	The catalog description clearly and succinctly describes the course.	The description is not adequate or too verbose:

Curriculum-Based Rationale

	Meets	Does not meet
Curriculum-based rationale	The rationale is curriculum- based and offers a compelling argument for why the course needs to be added to the university's curriculum. The rationale explains what program or programs the course supports.	The rationale is not curriculum-based:

Expected Learning Outcomes

	Meets	Does not meet
Learning Outcomes	 The learning outcomes are: "Action-oriented" (see Bloom's Taxonomy) Measurable Consistent with the level of the course 	The learning outcomes need to be revised:

Syllabus

	Meets	Does not meet
Content—basic information	The syllabus includes all of the necessary elements including: Course title* Course number* Credit hours* Format or Method of instruction* Instructor name and contact information (e-mail, phone, and office hours) Course pre-requisites* Expected learning outcomes* Textbook and other materials (specify if required or optional) *The elements are consistent with those entered into CIM.	The syllabus is missing one or more of these items: Items in the syllabus are not consistent with the elements entered into CIM:

Elements for grade/Assignments/ Assessments	 The composition of the final grade is clear: The assignments are clearly explained The grading criteria are presented, either fully (e.g., a rubric is included) or more generally (i.e., "Your project will be evaluated on content, organization, and clarity) 	One or more of the elements for the grade are unclear or are not consistent with the level of the course:
Points/percentages	 The points or percentages are clear, logical, and consistent The final grading scale is included The grade type is clear; e.g., standard letter grades, pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory 	The points or percentages are not clear, logical, and correct:
Attendance policy	If attendance is part of the grade: The attendance policy is clearly stated and the consequences of missing class are clearly defined The attendance policy is separate from the participation grade if there is a grade for participation A statement about excused, university-sanctioned absences (or days of special concern) is included	The attendance and/or participation policy is unclear:
Optional syllabus statements	If the syllabus includes the optional statements, they are the correct and up-to-date	An incorrect or out-of- date statement was given and must be updated:
Overall	 The syllabus is clear, well organized, easy to follow and consistent with the level of the course The tone of the syllabus is positive, clear, and inviting 	The syllabus is difficult to follow, is inconsistent, is not well organized, or is not inviting: