Rubric for Evaluating a Course Proposal		
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 are not appropriate for the level of effort:
Repeatability Max. attempts in CIM refers to the max. number of times the course can be repeated. Value should not include the initial attempt.	- Course is repeatable for an additional attempt to appear on the transcript (not a grade replacement) - Number of repeats is commensurate with total number of credits the course can be used for. (4 cr.hr. course taken multiple times for 12 total credits on transcript: Initial Attempt: 1; Maximum (Repeat) Attempts: 2; Total credits = 12)	Repeatability is incorrectly selected Attempts or total credits are incorrect Max. Attempts given are total number of times taken rather than number of repeated times.
Prerequisites	The prerequisites are: - Clearly and unambigiously stated Letter grade required is given - Backed by a letter of support if offered by another unit.	- The prerequisites are not clear No support letter (if offered by another unit)
Catalog Description	The catalog description clearly and succinctly describes the course.	The description is not adequate or too verbose.
	Expected Learning Outcom	nes
Meets Does Not Meet		
Learning Outcomes	The learning outcomes are: - Action Orientation (see Bloom's Taxonomy) - Measurable - Consistent with the levels of the course.	The learning outcomes need to be revised.
	Dreaman Learning Outer	
	Program Learning Outcome Meets	es Does Not Meet
	Middle	Does Not Meet

Program Learning Outcomes	Program(s) being served by the course is clear.Outcomes listed are consistent with those listed on the catalog page for the	- Program learning outcomes are a repeat of Expected Learning Outcomes Discussion of why course is proposed given in lieu of listing outcomes.	
Syllabus Sections for Review			
	Meets	Does Not Meet	
Course Number and Title	Matches the information in CIM	One or both in syllabus do not match CIM entry.	
Short Descriptions of Grading Criteria for Major Assignments or Assessments	- The assessments to be used for grading are listed with a brief explanation 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)	Assessments not described fully when more uinformation should be provided. (More explanations may not be needed for things like exams or common types of assessment.	
Distribution of Course Points	Points or percentages are clear, logical, and consistent	The Points or percentages are not clear, logical, or consistent.	
Mid-Semester Grade (UG Courses Only) (8-week courses are excluded)	 At least 20% of the courses total grade is identified in calculating the midterm grade. Assessments to be used for calculation are clearly stated. 	- No Statement Given - Less than 20% of the total grade listed - Timeline does not support assessment being done midsemester.	
Topics Covered	Topics to be covered are listed (This could be in a schedule format or just a list)	Topics to be covered are not given.	
Final Grading Scale	 The final grading scale is included. The grade type is clear (e.g., standard letter grades, pass/fail, satisfactory/unsatisfactory) 	Final grading scale is not given or is incorrect based on the other information in the syllabus	