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

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 are not appropriate for the level of effort:
Repeatability *Maximum attempts in CIM refers to the maximum 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 Maximum Attempts given are total number of times taken rather than number of repeated times.
Prerequisites	The prerequisites are: ☐ Clearly and unambiguously stated. ☐ Letter grade required is given ☐ Backed by letter of support if offered by another unit.	The prerequisites are not clear No support letters (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 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:

Program Learning Outcomes

	Meets	**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.	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
Assessment		
Short Descriptions of and 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 information 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, and correct:

Mid-semester Grade (undergraduate courses only)	At least 20% of the courses total grade is identified to be used in calculating the midterm grade. Assessments to be used for calculation are clearly stated.	No statement given Less than 20% of total grade listed Timeline does not support assessments being done before midsemester.
Topics Covered (formerly schedule)	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 or satisfactory/unsatisfactory	Final Grading scale is not given or is incorrect based on other information in syllabus