

## CGEIP New Course Proposal Evaluation Criteria

CGEIP Member:

Date:

CGEIP Member Department:

Please indicate if the proposal successfully meets the criteria below by circling either "yes" or "no." If the proposal does not meet one of the criteria, please provide a rationale under "Notes," objectively stating in which ways the proposal fails to meet that specific criterion.

| Criteria  | Meets the criterium? |    |
|---|----------------------|----|
|   | yes                  | no |
| 1. The proposal includes a complete sample syllabus   | yes                  | no |
| 2. The proposal demonstrates well-planned and articulated incorporation of <b>at least one</b> Faculty Senate-Approved General Education Learning Goals and Specific Learning Outcomes as part of the course learning outcomes and objectives                   | yes                  | no |
| 3. The proposed assessment plan is clearly presented, defines measurable outcomes, adopts adequate assessment instruments, and includes sample instruments and/or evaluation rubrics  | yes                  | no |
| 4. The assessment plan addresses the measurement of student achievements relative to <b>at least one</b> of the General Education Learning Goals and Specific Learning Outcomes   | yes                  | no |
| 5. The proposal includes the description of instructional methods that support student success  | yes                  | no |
| 6. The proposal demonstrates how the proposed course incorporates High Impact Educational Experiences (HIEE) such as service learning, learning communities, internships, linked courses, interdisciplinary courses, team-taught courses, and education abroad. | yes                  | no |
| 7. The proposal shows the course <b>is/can be</b> offered in more than one modality   | yes                  | no |
| 8. The proposal provides evidence that there is <b>demand</b> for the proposed course   | yes                  | no |
| 9. The course goals and objectives align with the university's public affairs mission   | yes                  | no |
| 10. The proposal defines a course coordinator   | yes                  | no |
| 11. The proposal presents evidence of the coordinator's ability to maintain quality of the course (e.g. completion of Gen. Ed. Assessment training <b>&lt;include a few more examples&gt;</b> )   | yes                  | no |
| 12. The proposed course is consistent with the MSU General Education mission values, and <b>identity?</b>   | yes                  | no |
| 13. The proposal includes a statement of support from the applicable Department Head  | yes                  | no |
| 14. The proposal includes a statement of support from the applicable Dean   | yes                  | no |
| 15. The proposal and its content comply with all applicable university policies, as described in <b>&lt;include name of documents and links to where such policies can be found&gt;</b>   | yes                  | no |

Notes

**Commented [MLL1]:** I based this on your comment last Friday that the reports need to show data supporting learning outcomes related to at least one goal, so I'm assuming this applies to new proposals as well, but I'm not sure if the application for new Gen Ed courses needs to address more than that. I think it is important to be consistent regarding what we ask for the approval of new courses and for the review of existing courses, though.

**Commented [MLL2R1]:** This is what says on the "Call for Proposals" page: Well-planned and articulated incorporation of Faculty Senate-Approved (October 2, 2012) [General Learning Goals and Specific Learning Outcomes](#) according to the [General Education Structure](#) (Minimum Specific Learning Outcomes for each of the General Learning Goals are: minimum of two Specific Learning Outcomes for General Goals 2, 7, 12, 13, & 15; minimum of three Specific Learning Outcomes for General Goals 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 14; and minimum of four Specific Learning Outcomes for General Goal 5; First-year seminar is only required to address one specific learning outcome for each of its general goals listed as instructed in the General Education Structure).

**Commented [MLL3]:** The "Call for Proposals" page asks for the information about modalities, but does not specify what CGEIP is looking for. I assumed here that we are looking for courses that are offered in more than one modality for flexibility, giving students more options

**Commented [MLL4]:** Again, it is not clear from the form or the "Call for Proposals" page if CGEIP is looking for courses with high or low demand, or what high and low demand means. It just asks for number of students. I'm assuming that we want courses that are popular among students to be included, but I'm not a 100% sure

**Commented [MLL5]:** This criterium only makes sense if we can define our Gen Ed identity in concrete terms to evaluate how well a course fits our Gen Ed. Identity. If we don't have anything concrete, measurable, than I would leave this out