

Curriculog Proposal Checklist

(Graduate Curriculum Committee's cheat sheet for curriculog originators)

Below is a checklist similar to what the Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) uses when reviewing proposals. The GCC requests that originators use this checklist when preparing their proposals and review it prior to submission. Doing so should save originators time by not having to amend proposals later, aid committees in reviewing proposals, and hopefully, enable proposals to move through the overall review process in the most timely manner.

Modification and rationale

If modifying a course or program, list what modifications are being proposed and provide a clear rationale for each modification

Curricular rationale and context

If proposing a new course or a new program, provide clarification for the need for the addition that is clear and as jargon-free as possible. Keep in mind that the target audience for this text is often faculty outside the discipline (and even the college).

Originators should survey the University Catalog when developing new courses and if course content/titles appear to overlap with curriculum in other units, originators should clarify how the new course will differ. Evidence of communication with those units is also recommended (e.g., upload an email exchange).

Course description

The course description should be clear and accurate and conform to current catalog formatting conventions and sentence structure.

Grading Methods

Cr/NC should NOT be an option for graded courses, except in unique circumstances. Keep in mind that graduate students cannot use Cr/NC grades on their Program of Study, unless Cr/NC is the only option.

Prerequisites

Prerequisites should be logical. At minimum, classified graduate standing should be required.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

SLOs for courses should be clearly stated using action verbs (i.e., Bloom's Taxonomy) that align with the level of the course. For example, 500 and 600 level courses should primarily use action verbs at levels 5 and 6 on this [sheet](#).

500-level courses: Graduate Student requirements

Specific grading standards or additional assignments are required for graduate students in 500-level courses. Graduate students should be required to do more work, and/or have their work scored with a more rigorous rubric. Some items may be differentially weighted for graduate students vs. undergraduates when the final course grade is calculated. Originators should provide at least some specifics: curriculum committees cannot evaluate vague references to “higher grading standards” or “graduate-level responsibilities.”

Grading standards

Points assigned to various components should be clear. Originators should state how total points will be converted to a letter grade. Points should not be given simply for “attendance.” If “participation” is to be used, then it should be scored objectively; include a rubric if it constitutes more than 10% of the course grade. Originators should avoid using “participation” as a large percentage of the total points if possible.

Syllabus. If a new course is being proposed, a syllabus must be submitted.

- Course description should be clear and accurate and ideally use the most current [accessible syllabus template](#)
- Ensure that all student/campus services are mentioned using the most current name (e.g., Student Ability Success Center is updated to Student Disability Services)
- Tentative course schedule that shows weekly activities, assignments, readings (if relevant), and course content
- Clear grading criteria with A-F grading structure
- Each project described, indicates which SLO it supports, and how it fits into the grading structure (% of grade or # points)
- 500's CLEARLY delineate how grads will be graded differently than undergrads