

General rubric for evaluating proposals for all objectives

1. Is the course at the 100-200 (lower-division) level?
2. Is the proposal complete and consistent with the form's guidelines?
3. Does the proposal give us a good idea of what will happen in the classroom? What will students be reading, doing, talking about? What will they be doing in class day-to-day? (Sample assignments, text/resources help here.)
4. How does the course align with the bulleted items in the description of Objective X?
 - Catalog description is aligned?
 - Learning objectives are aligned?
 - Course activities are aligned?
 - Assessment is aligned?
5. Is there adequate rigor?
 - Level: Learning objectives should include something beyond the lowest level of Bloom's taxonomy (memorization and acquisition of facts).
 - Well-formed learning objectives: The completion of an assignment is not a learning objective ("complete a term paper.")
 - Volume: A minimum amount of assessment through exams, quizzes, etc. should be done. Is volume and nature of student work to be evaluated appropriate for the type and level of the course?
6. Are broad issues addressed? Skills and thought processes should be transferrable across disciplines in line with the overall Philosophy of General Education in the Undergraduate Catalog.
7. Assessment. Does the proposal specify
 - (A) How *students'* progress toward the *course's* learning objectives will be assessed? This question is relevant to GERC's understanding of how the course operates and the level of rigor in the course, and it should be addressed in the description of the course. When addressing this question, it may be useful to distinguish between "formative assessment" and "summative assessment:"
 - **Formative assessment** gives the student and the instructor feedback on what the student knows and can do, and its primary goal is to improve the student's learning experience as the course progresses. Graded homework, projects, quizzes and papers may all fall into this category.
 - **Summative assessment** is primarily oriented to evaluating students' knowledge and abilities for the purposes of assigning course grade (e.g. the final exam).
 - (B) How the *course's* efficacy at meeting the *Gen Ed Objective* will be measured? The question "How will you assess the course's ability to meet the Objective's student learning outcomes" on the application is Question (2).
8. Are we using the current instructor as a factor in our decision? Would we still make the same judgments if we knew that the course were to be taught by an unknown adjunct instructor three years from now?
9. Is our decision consistent with our previous decisions?