Tips for Successful Course Submissions

What are the most common and/or most important problems in course proposals, i.e., what could cause a proposal to be rejected?

General:
- The proposal is missing a syllabus.
- The syllabus has no stated course goals or intended learning objectives.
- The syllabus does not describe how learning is assessed (i.e., the components that lead to the final grade)
- The submitted syllabus includes no weekly plan.
- The syllabus has no readings listed, i.e., refers only to a course pack.
- The syllabus has no course policies (final exams, attendance/absences, learning disabilities, diversity, etc.) – See ARHU Template!

Additional Gen Ed criteria:
- The syllabus content does not seem to reflect the learning outcomes described in the Gen Ed online submission form.
- The proposal author does not clearly address the prompts for learning outcomes and/or fails to describe how learning will be verified (e.g., assessment – how will instructor know that the learning from the prompt has actually been accomplished?). Note: Each LO starts with “Students will demonstrate...” – this is key, because the emphasis is on learning, from the student’s perspective, not what ‘will be taught’ or what students will ‘learn about’. What are the abilities, experiences, understandings they will gain, and through what means?
- No criteria/overarching questions are mentioned that will guide large assignments or examinations – again, the goal is to link in obvious ways to the stated learning outcomes.

For I-Series:
- There is no ‘Big Question’ driving the course design and content. (I-Series are not topical survey courses!)
- The delivery format is too traditional, i.e. lecture/discussion/exam format. The I-Series Faculty Board expects an approach that includes active student-faculty and student-student engagement (group projects, poster sessions, team work, etc.)
- The instructor is a lecturer and has no prior record of teaching effectiveness.

For Scholarship in Practice:
- The course looks like an introduction to a field rather than a hands-on practice of how scholars/performers work in this field.
- There is no evidence of assessment/grades at regular stages across the semester that reflect the progress of the practice.

For Cultural Competence:
- There is no clear focus on actual negotiation strategies and practice that cross cultural boundaries as a fundamental aspect of the course. It is not enough for students to simply learn about cross-cultural negotiation; they must experience hands-on negotiation practice throughout course.

For Understanding Plural Societies:
- There is no obvious emphasis on the dynamics of the various groups that comprise a pluralistic society (it cannot be, e.g., one single group’s literature or history unless that group’s interaction with others, and the consequences thereof, is a primary focus).