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**I.** **Overview of Foundational Component Sub-Committee Review Process**

 The chair of the Core Curriculum Redesign Task Force Committee, Jerry Moller (Dean of Arts and Sciences), appointed various members of the core curriculum redesign task force and other AC faculty to serve on Foundational Component Sub-Committees.

 The purpose of the sub committees is to use a help sheet containing links and THECB definitions in order to complete a checklist evaluation for each course submitted through the “[Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/433)” process. Each committee member is expected to view and evaluate each course submitted for inclusion into their assigned foundational component area.

 Based on the responses given via checklist evaluation, each core curriculum proposal contact (i.e. person who submitted a course for core curriculum consideration) will either have their course passed on to the next, higher-level course approvers or will be asked to make revisions in order to clearly comply with THECB and AC requirements prior to their proposal being passed on for the next level of approvals.

 As a proposal contact edits their proposal to comply with the committee evaluation, the checklist evaluation and notes in the “Reason for “No Rating…” area will be erased or updated by the sub-committee and/or Director of Institutional Effectiveness to reflect the degree to which the updated submission meets/does not meet the requirements.

 Part I of each evaluation form (i.e. “Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content) is evaluated solely by the sub- committee and Part II of each evaluation form (i.e. “Assessment Evaluation) is evaluated by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. However, the sub-committees will lead the charge in providing feedback for all parts (including assessment) in this process.

**II.** **Foundational Component Sub-Committee Members**

The following core curriculum redesign task force and AC faculty members were assigned to each foundational

 Component sub-committee:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Foundational Component Areas** | **Sub-Committee Members\*** |
| Communication (Core 10) | * Lynae Jacob (**Chair**) – Speech Dept. Chair;
* Dan Ferguson –English/Modern Languages Dept. Chair
 |
| Mathematics (Core 20) | * Doug Adcock (**Chair**) –EMSP Asst. Professor;
* Kathy Wetzel –Math/Engineering Dept. Chair;
* Edie Carter –Mathematics Professor;
* Kim McGowan –Mathematics Professor;
* Shannon Cornell –Mathematics Professor;
 |
| Life and Physical Sciences (Core 30) | * Becky Burton (**Chair**) – Radiography Asst. Professor;
* Kathy Wetzel –Math/Engineering Dept. Chair;
* Emery Shier – Physical Sciences Instructor;
* Brandon Moore – Biological Sciences Asst. Professor;
* Claudie Biggers – Biological Sciences Associate Professor
 |
| Language, Philosophy, and Culture (Core 40) | * Dan Ferguson (**Chair**) –English/Modern Languages Dept. Chair;
* Kristin Edford – Humanities Instructor;
* John Gladstein – Modern Language Instructor
 |
| Creative Arts (Core 50) | * Steve Weber (**Chair**) – Music Professor/New Dept. Chair;
* Vicky Taylor-Gore – Art Dept. Chair/Asst. Professor;
* Jim Rauscher – Music Instructor/Retired Dept. Chair;
* Monty Downs – Theatre Arts Instructor;
* Ray Newburg – Theatre Arts Asst. Professor
 |
| American History (Core 60)  | * Dan Ferguson (**Chair**) –English/Modern Languages Dept. Chair;
* AC Redesign Team led by Cara Crowley – Title V/HSI STEM
 |
| Government (Core 70) | * Dan Ferguson (**Chair**) –English/Modern Languages Dept. Chair;
* AC Redesign Team led by Cara Crowley – Title V/HSI STEM
 |
| Social and Behavioral Sciences (Core 80) | * Bruce Moseley (**Chair**) – Legal Assisting Dept. Chair/Asst. Professor;
* Craig Clifton – Physical Education Dept. Chair/Instructor;
* Jason Norman – Director of Advising;
* Toni Gray – Director of Criminal Justice Programs;
* Steven Beckham – Business Administration Instructor;
* Deborah Harding – Psychology & Social Sciences Asst. Professor
 |
| Component Area Option (Core 90) | * Lana Jackson (**Chair**) – 1st Year Experience Dept. Chair/Professor;
* Lynae Jacob – Speech Dept. Chair;
* Craig Clifton – Physical Education Dept. Chair/Instructor
 |
| \*The committee chair is responsible for leading their committee’s evaluation process and sharing materials with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness also serves on the committees to assist with the assessment process. |

**III. Initial Sub-Committee Evaluation Timeline**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DATE** | **DEADLINE INFORMATION\*** |
| May 10, 2013 | Deadline – Course Submission to Core Curriculum Committee |
| June 14, 2013 | Deadline – First Review by Sub-Committee |
| July 12, 2013 | Deadline – Second Review (if necessary) by Sub-Committee |
| \*Late submissions and edits can be accepted at the discretion of the Core Curriculum Redesign Task Force Chair (e.g. 9 month employees may be given some leniency with the submission deadline).Any course not submitted, reviewed, and approved prior to the review by the AC review committees (e.g. Dean’s Council/Curriculum Committee), will not be eligible for consideration into 2014 Core Curriculum.  |

**IV.** **Final Edits**

On October 18, 2014, AC submitted the 2014-2015 Core Curriculum courses/proposal. The proposal stated that
 all approved courses would be fully THECB compliant (e.g. all “Yes” evaluations) by fall 2014. The THECB approved AC’s assessment plan on January 17, 2014.

 This version of the proposal document showcases only the courses that were actually approved by the THECB

 and the most up-to-date content/assessment evaluations.

**Communication (Core 10)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

Communication

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

Courses in this category focus on developing ideas and expressing them clearly, considering the effect of the message, fostering understanding, and building the skills needed to communicate persuasively.

Courses involve the command of oral, aural, written, and visual literacy skills that enable people to exchange messages appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience.

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Personal Responsibility | to include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making |
| Teamwork  | to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 1301 - Composition I

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Communication

**Component Sub-Committee:** Lynae Jacob (Chair) and Dan Ferguson

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | x |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 1302 - Composition II

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Communication

**Component Sub-Committee:** Lynae Jacob (Chair) and Dan Ferguson

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | x |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2311 - Technical and Business Writing

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Communication

**Component Sub-Committee:** Lynae Jacob (Chair) and Dan Ferguson

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | x |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Mathematics (Core 20)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

Mathematics

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

Courses in this category focus on quantitative literacy in logic, patterns, and relationships.

Courses involve the understanding of key mathematical concepts and the application of appropriate quantitative tools to everyday experiences.

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Empirical and Quantitative Skills | to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 1314 - College Algebra

**Proposal Contact:** Kimberly McGowan

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 1316 - Trigonometry

**Proposal Contact:** Penelope Davies

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 1324 - Mathematics for Business Decisions I

**Proposal Contact:** Monique Dupuis

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X  |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 1325 - Mathematics for Business Decisions II

**Proposal Contact:** Monique Dupuis

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 1332 - Contemporary Mathematics

**Proposal Contact:** Ashley Dyer

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 1342 - Statistics

**Proposal Contact:** Tammy Holmes

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 1414 - College Algebra for STEM Majors

**Proposal Contact:** Amanda Wheeler

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 2413 - Calculus I

**Proposal Contact:** Amanda Wheeler

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MATH 2414 - Calculus II

**Proposal Contact:** Amanda Wheeler

**Foundational Component Area:** Mathematics

**Component Sub-Committee:** Doug Adcock (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Edie Carter, Kim McGowan,
 Shannon Cornell

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Life and Physical Sciences (Core 30)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

Life and Physical Sciences

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

Courses in this category focus on describing, explaining, and predicting natural phenomena using the scientific method.

Courses involve the understanding of interactions among natural phenomena and the implications of scientific principles on the physical world and on the human experiences.

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Empirical and Quantitative Skills | to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions |
| Teamwork | to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 1406 - Biology I

**Proposal Contact:** Dan Porter

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 1407 - Biology II

**Proposal Contact:** Dan Porter

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 1408/BIOL 1308 - Life Science I (for non-science majors)

**Proposal Contact:** Dan Porter

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 1409/BIOL 1309 - Life Science II (for non-science majors)

**Proposal Contact:** Dan Porter

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**Be careful to distinguish between the assessment methods and the benchmarks— they seem to be repetitive.  |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 1411 - Botany

**Proposal Contact:** Brandon Moore

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 1413 - Zoology

**Proposal Contact:** Brandon Moore

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 1414 - Introduction to Biotechnology I

**Proposal Contact:** Dan Porter

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**The committee requests more delineation in assessment and benchmark areas. What will be “appropriate conclusions”? |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 1415 - Biotechnology II

**Proposal Contact:** Dan Porter

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 2306 - Environmental Science

**Proposal Contact:** Brandon Moore

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART:**  |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment**Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 2316/2416 - Genetics

**Proposal Contact:** Nichol Dolby

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**Committee requests specific assignments to assess if they will meet the objectives. Perhaps give examples of specific lab activities that may be used in assessments. Also in regard to peer evaluations, how will they be used in the assessment method? |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X  |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 2401/BIOL 2301 - Human Anatomy and Physiology I

**Proposal Contact:** Susan Burgoon

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? |  | X |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? |  | X |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? |  | X |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X  |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? |  | X |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 |  | X |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**  |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 2402/BIOL 2302 - Human Anatomy and Physiology II

**Proposal Contact:** Susan Burgoon

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? |  | X |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? |  | X |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? |  | X |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X  |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X | X |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 |  | X |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 2404 –Anatomy & Physiology

**Proposal Contact:** Claudie Biggers

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 2420/BIOL 2320–Microbiology for Non-Science Majors

**Proposal Contact:** Claudie Biggers

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BIOL 2421 - Microbiology

**Proposal Contact:** Brandon Moore

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CHEM 1305 - Introductory Chemistry I

**Proposal Contact:** Jennifer Rabson

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x – See Notes |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**How will topic be determined? More specific. Define rubric or elaborate more on assessment methods. The assignment is extremely general.   |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CHEM 1311 - Principles of Chemistry I

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? |  | X |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**Please provide at least one example of something that may appear on the rubric to measure an objective.**Teamwork**: Will the team be assessed on their ability to work together (cooperation), their ability to work individually (contribution), or a combination of areas?**Note:** Make sure you look at “Core Objective Descriptions” when you form your rubric. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CHEM 1312 - Principles of Chemistry II

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x  |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**NOTE: Great Critical Thinking and Empirical/ Quantitative assignments |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? |  | X |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**Please provide at least one example of something that may appear on the rubric to measure an objective.**Teamwork**: Will the team be assessed on their ability to work together (cooperation), their ability to work individually (contribution), or a combination of areas?**Note:** Make sure you look at “Core Objective Descriptions” when you form your rubric. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CHEM 1406/CHEM 1306 - General Organic & Biological Chemistry

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x – See Notes |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**Would like to see more specific details.  |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? |  | X |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**Please provide at least one example of something that may appear on the rubric to measure an objective.**Teamwork**: Will the team be assessed on their ability to work together (cooperation), their ability to work individually (contribution), or a combination of areas?**Note:** Make sure you look at “Core Objective Descriptions” when you form your rubric. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CHEM 1419 - Introductory Organic Chemistry

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x – See Notes |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**More specificity requested—assignments vague.Committee recommend a specific list for students to choose topics from for consistency across the board and meeting the required objectives |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? |  | X |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**Please provide at least one example of something that may appear on the rubric to measure an objective.**Teamwork**: Will the team be assessed on their ability to work together (cooperation), their ability to work individually (contribution), or a combination of areas?**Note:** Make sure you look at “Core Objective Descriptions” when you form your rubric. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CHEM 2323 - Organic Chemistry I

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x – See Notes |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**Needs more specificity. |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? |  | X |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**Please provide at least one example of something that may appear on the rubric to measure an objective.**Teamwork**: Will the team be assessed on their ability to work together (cooperation), their ability to work individually (contribution), or a combination of areas?**Note:** Make sure you look at “Core Objective Descriptions” when you form your rubric. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CHEM 2325 - Organic Chemistry II

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x – See Notes |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**Needs more specificity. |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? |  | X |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**Please provide at least one example of something that may appear on the rubric to measure an objective.**Teamwork**: Will the team be assessed on their ability to work together (cooperation), their ability to work individually (contribution), or a combination of areas?**Note:** Make sure you look at “Core Objective Descriptions” when you form your rubric. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** FORS 2440 - Forensic Science I

**Proposal Contact:** Dan Porter

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** GEOL 1303 - Physical Geology

**Proposal Contact:** Richard Hobbs

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:****Teamwork Example**: Will the team be assessed on their ability to work together (cooperation), their ability to work individually (contribution), or a combination of areas? Make sure you address these things and elaborate on how the assessment was conducted in your results. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** GEOL 1304 - Historical Geology

**Proposal Contact:** Richard Hobbs

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** GEOL 1445 - Oceanography

**Proposal Contact:** Richard Hobbs

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**NOTE: webquest activity seemed to be for Meterology not Oceanography |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

.

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** GEOL 1447 - Meteorology

**Proposal Contact:** Richard Hobbs

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore,
 Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**NOTE--- committee liked the webquest assignment |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 1303 – Stars and Galaxies

**Proposal Contact:** Richard Hobbs

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | x |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 1304 – Solar Systems

**Proposal Contact:** Richard Hobbs

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x  |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | x |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 1305 - Introductory Physics

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x  |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**It should be made clear exactly how individual student skills are being assessed.  |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**When you submit your sample artifacts and assessment instrument, make sure to explain how the embedded questions address the CT and EQS objectives. Also, make sure there is a way to evaluate if team members did not contribute equally on the waiver. We recommend you use the 70% benchmark for this objective (separate from the report) as well. For example, you could give each group something like [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/439) or [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/438) to complete so that you could truly assess whether or not the teamwork objective was accomplished. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 1315 - Concepts of Physical Science I

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013 - Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 1401 - College Physics I

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x  |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**When you submit your sample artifacts and assessment instrument, make sure to explain how the embedded questions address the CT and EQS objectives. Also, make sure there is a way to evaluate if team members did not contribute equally on the waiver. We recommend you use the 70% benchmark for this objective (separate from the report) as well. For example, you could give each group something like [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/439) or [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/438) to complete so that you could truly assess whether or not the teamwork objective was accomplished. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 1402 - College Physics II

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**When you submit your sample artifacts and assessment instrument, make sure to explain how the embedded questions address the CT and EQS objectives. Also, make sure there is a way to evaluate if team members did not contribute equally on the waiver. We recommend you use the 70% benchmark for this objective (separate from the report) as well. For example, you could give each group something like [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/439) or [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/438) to complete so that you could truly assess whether or not the teamwork objective was accomplished. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 1415 - Physical Science I

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x  |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 1417/PHYS 1317 - Physical Science II

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x  |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**When you submit your sample artifacts and assessment instrument, make sure to explain how the embedded questions address the CT and EQS objectives. Also, make sure there is a way to evaluate if team members did not contribute equally on the waiver. We recommend you use the 70% benchmark for this objective (separate from the report) as well. For example, you could give each group something like [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/439) or [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/438) to complete so that you could truly assess whether or not the teamwork objective was accomplished. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 2425 - Principles of Physics I

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**When you submit your sample artifacts and assessment instrument, make sure to explain how the embedded questions address the CT and EQS objectives. Also, make sure there is a way to evaluate if team members did not contribute equally on the waiver. We recommend you use the 70% benchmark for this objective (separate from the report) as well. For example, you could give each group something like [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/439) or [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/438) to complete so that you could truly assess whether or not the teamwork objective was accomplished. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHYS 2426 - Principles of Physics II

**Proposal Contact:** Emery Shier

**Foundational Component Area:** Life and Physical Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Becky Burton (Chair), Kathy Wetzel, Emery Shier, Brandon Moore, Claudie Biggers

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**When you submit your sample artifacts and assessment instrument, make sure to explain how the embedded questions address the CT and EQS objectives. Also, make sure there is a way to evaluate if team members did not contribute equally on the waiver. We recommend you use the 70% benchmark for this objective (separate from the report) as well. For example, you could give each group something like [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/439) or [this](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/438) to complete so that you could truly assess whether or not the teamwork objective was accomplished. |

**Language, Philosophy, and Culture (Core 40)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

Courses in this category focus on how ideas, values, beliefs, and other aspects of culture express and affect human experiences.

Courses involve the exploration of ideas that foster aesthetic and intellectual creation in order to understand the human condition across cultures.

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Personal Responsibility | to include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making |
| Social Responsibility | to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ANTH 2302 - Introduction to Archeology

**Proposal Contact:** Iva Coberley

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X (update course description) |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**  |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ANTH 2346 - General Anthropology and the Humanities

**Proposal Contact:** Iva Coberley

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**  |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** COMM 1307 - Introduction to Mass Communication

**Proposal Contact:** Jill Gibson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**  |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment**Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | x |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2322 - British Literature I

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2323 - British Literature II

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2326 - American Literature

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2328 - American Literature II

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2331 - Non-Western World Literature

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2332 - World Literature I

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2333 - World Literature II

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ENGL 2341 - Selected Studies in Literature

**Proposal Contact:** Daniel Ferguson

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** HIST 2311 - Western Civilization I

**Proposal Contact:** James Powell

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**Good! Just remember that when the course is selected for assessment, I will need to be able to see on the rubric how each area including personal and social responsibility was assessed. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** HIST 2322 - World Civilizations II

**Proposal Contact:** James Powell

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**Good! Just remember that when the course is selected for assessment, I will need to be able to see on the rubric how each area including personal and social responsibility was assessed. |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** HUMA 1301 - Introduction to the Humanities I

**Proposal Contact:** Kristin Edford

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** HUMA 1302 - Introduction to the Humanities II

**Proposal Contact:** Kristin Edford

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

PART III: Next Steps

* **“YES” EVALUATION** – If you received all “YES” evaluations, your form will be passed on to the Dean’s Council and Curriculum Committee for further review. If passed on to the THECB, the THECB will give final approval.
* **“NO” EVALUTION** - If you receive a “NO” evaluation, please edit your form by **7/1/13**. Then, notify the committee chair (listed at top) via e-mail that you have made the necessary edits. Each person who submits a form will have **1 more** opportunity to receive all “YES” ratings for Parts I and II. If you do not receive a copy of this form showing that you have all “YES” ratings, your form will not be passed on to the Dean’s Council and will not be considered for inclusion in the fall 2014 core curriculum.

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** HUMA 1315 - Fine Arts Appreciation

**Proposal Contact:** Kristin Edford

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** HUMA 2323 – World Cultures

**Proposal Contact:** Kristin Edford

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHIL 1301 - Introduction to Philosophy

**Proposal Contact:** Jerry Klein

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X (update course description) |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHIL 1304 - Introduction to World Religions

**Proposal Contact:** Kristin Edford

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X (update course description) |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHIL 2303 - Logic

**Proposal Contact:** Jerry Klein

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X (update title of course and description) |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHIL 2306 - Introduction to Ethics

**Proposal Contact:** Jerry Klein

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X (course description needs to be updated) |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHIL 2307 - Introduction to Social and Political Philosophy

**Proposal Contact:** Jerry Klein

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X (course description needs to be updated) |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHIL 2321 - Philosophy of Religion

**Proposal Contact:** Jerry Klein

**Foundational Component Area:** Language, Philosophy & Culture

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Kristin Edford, John Gladstein

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X (update course description) |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X (be sure rubric proves this area) |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:**  |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Creative Arts (Core 50)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

Creative Arts

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

Courses in this category focus on the appreciation and analysis of creative artifacts and works of the human imagination.

Courses involve the synthesis and interpretation of artistic expression and enable critical, creative, and innovative communication about works of art.

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Social Responsibility | to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities |
| Teamwork | to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ARTS 1301 - Art Appreciation

**Proposal Contact:** Victoria Taylor-Gore

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ARTS 1303 - Art History I

**Proposal Contact:** Victoria Taylor-Gore

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ARTS 1304 - Art History II

**Proposal Contact:** Victoria Taylor-Gore

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ARTS 1311 - Design I

**Proposal Contact:** Victoria Taylor-Gore

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ARTS 1316 - Drawing I

**Proposal Contact:** Victoria Taylor-Gore

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ARTS 2346 - Ceramics I

**Proposal Contact:** Victoria Taylor-Gore

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ARTS 2356 - Fundamentals of Photography I

**Proposal Contact:** Victoria Taylor-Gore

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** COMM 2366 – Introduction to Film

**Proposal Contact:** Don Abel

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** DRAM 1310 - Introduction to Theatre

**Proposal Contact:** A. Newburg

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X  |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** DRAM 1330 - Stagecraft I

**Proposal Contact:** A. Newburg

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** DRAM 1341 - Stage Make-up

**Proposal Contact:** A. Newburg

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** DRAM 1342 - Introduction to Costume

**Proposal Contact:** A. Newburg

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**  |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** DRAM 1351 - Acting I

**Proposal Contact:** Monty Downs

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X  |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** DRAM 2331 - Stagecraft II

**Proposal Contact:** A. Newburg

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MUSI 1303 - Fundamentals of Music

**Proposal Contact:** James Rauscher

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MUSI 1306: Music Appreciation

**Proposal Contact:** James Rauscher

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MUSI 1308: Introduction to Music Literature

**Proposal Contact:** James Rauscher

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** MUSI 1310 - American Music

**Proposal Contact:** James Rauscher

**Foundational Component Area:** Creative Arts

**Component Sub-Committee:** Steve Weber (Chair), Vicky Taylor-Gore, Jim Rauscher, Monty Downs,
 Ray Newburg

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility** Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Teamwork**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**American History (Core 60)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

American History

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

Courses in this category focus on the consideration of past events and ideas relative to the United States, with the option of including Texas History for a portion of this component area.

Courses involve the interaction among individuals, communities, states, the nation, and the world, considering how these interactions have contributed to the development of the United Stated and its global role.

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Personal Responsibility | to include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making |
| Social Responsibility | to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** HIST 1301 - United States History I

**Proposal Contact:** Linda Powell

**Foundational Component Area:** American History

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Redesign Team

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** HIST 1302 - United States History II

**Proposal Contact:** Linda Powell

**Foundational Component Area:** American History

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Redesign Team

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | x |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Government (Core 70)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

Government/Political Science

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

Courses in this category focus on consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states, with special emphasis on that of Texas.

Courses involve the analysis of governmental institutions, political behavior, civic engagement, and political and philosophical foundations.

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Personal Responsibility | to include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making |
| Social Responsibility | to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** GOVT 2305 - United States Government

**Proposal Contact:** Linda Powell

**Foundational Component Area:** Government/Political Science

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Redesign Team

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X (update title of course) |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** GOVT 2306 - Texas Government

**Proposal Contact:** Linda Powell

**Foundational Component Area:** Government/Political Science

**Component Sub-Committee:** Dan Ferguson (Chair), Redesign Team

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | x |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | x |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | x |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Personal Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | x |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Social and Behavioral Sciences (Core 80)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

Courses in this category focus on the application of empirical and scientific methods that contribute to the understanding of what makes us human.

Courses involve the exploration of behavior and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, and events, examining their impact of the individual, society, and culture.

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Empirical and Quantitative Skills | to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions |
| Social Responsibility | to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ANTH 2351 - Cultural Anthropology

**Proposal Contact:** Iva Coberley

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** BCIS 1305 - Business Computer Applications

**Proposal Contact:** Alleta Buse

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:**NOTE: Since you have the same notes written for the “Critical Thinking Skills” and “Social Responsibility” Outline of Assessment Method(s), make sure you set up your rubric criteria so that you can evaluate these two objectives separately (e.g. benchmark and results for CT Skills and benchmark and separate results for SR). |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CRIJ 1301 - Introduction to Criminal Justice

**Proposal Contact:** Toni Gray

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** CRIJ 1307 - Crime in America

**Proposal Contact:** Toni Gray

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ECON 2301 - Principles of Macroeconomics

**Proposal Contact:** Steven Beckham

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** ECON 2302 - Principles of Microeconomics

**Proposal Contact:** Steven Beckham

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHED 1301 - Introduction to Physical Fitness and Sport

**Proposal Contact:** Craig Clifton

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X  |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHED 1304 – Concepts of Healthful Living

**Proposal Contact:** Craig Clifton

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | XName of course is not the same in AC Catalog as in ACGM |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PHED 1346 - Drug Abuse & Use

**Proposal Contact:** Craig Clifton

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X  |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PSYC 2301 - General Psychology

**Proposal Contact:** Deborah Harding

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PSYC 2306 - Human Sexuality

**Proposal Contact:** Margaret Vitale

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | XCourse Description is consistent with but not the same as ACGM |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PSYC 2308 - Child Psychology

**Proposal Contact:** Deborah Harding

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PSYC 2314 - Life-Span Developmental Psychology

**Proposal Contact:** Elizabeth Rodriguez

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | XName of course is not the same in AC Catalog as in ACGM |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PSYC 2315 - Human Behavior and Personal Adjustment

**Proposal Contact:** Jeffery Kee

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | XCourse Name is not the same in AC Catalog as in ACGM |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? |  XCourse Description is not the same as ACGM |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** SOCI 1301 - Introduction to Sociology

**Proposal Contact:** Deborah Harding

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | XName of course is not the same in AC Catalog as in ACGM |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** SOCI 1306 - Modern Social Problems

**Proposal Contact:** Debra Avara

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | XName of course is not the same in AC Catalog as in ACGM |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | XCourse Description does not match ACGM |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** SOCI 2301 – Marriage and the Family

**Proposal Contact:** Deborah Harding

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | XName of course is not the same in AC Catalog as in ACGM |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** SOCI 2319 - Minority Studies

**Proposal Contact:** Debra Avara

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? |  | XCourse description doesn’t match |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | XThe description of the assignment is possibly too vague. What kind of lab will address all of these outcomes? |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** PSYC 2326 - Social Psychology

**Proposal Contact:** Deborah Harding

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** SOCI 2336 - Criminology

**Proposal Contact:** Deborah Harding

**Foundational Component Area:** Social and Behavioral Sciences

**Component Sub-Committee:** Bruce Moseley (Chair), Craig Clifton, Jason Norman, Toni Gray, Steve Beckham,

 Deborah Harding

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Foundational Component Area**Does this course align with the Foundational Component Area description? | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **Communication Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Critical Thinking Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Social Responsibility**Does the assignment and/or activity align with the core objective description? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Component Area Option (Core 90)**

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Supporting Materials for Initial Evaluation**

**Foundational Component Area:**

Component Area Option

**Foundational Component Area Description:**

**a.** A minimum of 3 SCH must meet the definition and corresponding Core Objectives specified in one of the foundational component areas.

**b.** As an option for up to 3 semester credit hours of the Component Area Option, an institution may select course(s) that:

 **(i)** Meet(s) the definition specified for one or more of the foundational component areas; and

 **(ii)** Include(s) a minimum of three Core Objectives, including Critical Thinking Skills, Communication Skills, and one of the remaining Core Objectives of the institution’s choice.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component Area** | **Component Area Definition** | **Core Objective Requirements** |
| Communication | Courses in this category focus on developing ideas and expressing them clearly, considering the effect of the message, fostering understanding, and building the skills needed to communicate persuasively. Courses involve the command of oral, aural, written, and visual literacy skills that enable people to exchange messages appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience. | COM, CT, PR, TW |
| Mathematics | Courses in this category focus on quantitative literacy in logic, patterns, and relationships.Courses involve the understanding of key mathematical concepts and the application of appropriate quantitative tools to everyday experiences. | COM, CT, EQS |
| Life and Physical Sciences | Courses in this category focus on describing, explaining, and predicting natural phenomena using the scientific method.Courses involve the understanding of interactions among natural phenomena and the implications of scientific principles on the physical world and on the human experiences. | COM, CT,EQS, TW |
| Language, Philosophy, & Culture | Courses in this category focus on how ideas, values, beliefs, and other aspects of culture express and affect human experiences.Courses involve the exploration of ideas that foster aesthetic and intellectual creation in order to understand the human condition across cultures. | COM, CT,SR, PR  |
| Creative Arts | Courses in this category focus on the appreciation and analysis of creative artifacts and works of the human imagination.Courses involve the synthesis and interpretation of artistic expression and enable critical, creative, and innovative communication about works of art. | COM, CT,TW, SR |
| American History | Courses in this category focus on the consideration of past events and ideas relative to the United Stated, with the option of including Texas History for a portion of this component area.Courses involve the interaction among individuals, communities, states, the nation, and the world, considering how these interactions have contributed to the development of the United Stated and its global role. | COM, CT,PR, SR |
| Government/ Political Science | Courses in this category focus on consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states, with special emphasis on that of Texas.Courses involve the analysis of governmental institutions, political behavior, civic engagement, and political and philosophical foundations. | COM, CT,PR, SR |
| Social and Behavioral Science | Courses in this category focus on the application of empirical and scientific methods that contribute to the understanding of what makes us human.Courses involve the exploration of behavior and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, and events, examining their impact of the individual, society, and culture. | COM, CT,EQS, SR |

**Academic Course Guide Manual:**

[ACGM Link](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)

**Possible Required Core Objective Descriptions:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Skills (COM) | to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication |
| Critical Thinking Skills (CT) | to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information |
| Empirical and Quantitative Skills (EQS) | to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions |
| Personal Responsibility (PR) | to include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making |
| Social Responsibility (SR) | to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities |
| Teamwork (TW) | to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal |

**Assessment Evaluation:**

* [Direct Outcome Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/425)
* [Benchmark Cheat Sheet](http://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/424)

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** EDUC/PSYC 1100/1200/1300 – First Year Seminar – Learning Framework

**Proposal Contact:** Lana Jackson

**Foundational Component Area:** Component Area Option

**Component Area Fulfillment: Fulfills “A” Requirement:**

Fulfills Social and Behavioral Sciences Component Area /Associated Required Objectives

**Component Sub-Committee:** Lana Jackson (Chair), Lynae Jacob, Craig Clifton

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM?  | X |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **THECB Foundational Component Area Requirement** Does this course fulfill requirement “a” or “b” from the THECB description options? | X |  |
| **Designated or Selected Core Objectives**Do **ALL** of the assignments and/or activities align with the core objective descriptions? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | x |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | x |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | x |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** SPCH 1315 - Public Speaking

**Proposal Contact:** Lynae Jacob

**Foundational Component Area: Fulfills “A” Requirement:**

 Fulfills Communications Component Area /Associated Required Objectives

**Component Area Fulfillment:** Communication – COMM, CT, PR, and TW

**Component Sub-Committee:** Lana Jackson (Chair), Lynae Jacob, Craig Clifton

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM? Course description does not match the ACGM Spring 2013 edition:Application of communication theory and practice to the public speaking context, with emphasis on audience analysis, speaker delivery, ethics of communication, cultural diversity, and speech organizational techniques to develop students’ speaking abilities, as well as ability to effectively evaluate oral presentations.Must be changed through Carol Moore. | X – w/qualification |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **THECB Foundational Component Area Requirement** Does this course fulfill requirement “a” or “b” from the THECB description options? | X |  |
| **Designated or Selected Core Objectives**Do **ALL** of the assignments and/or activities align with the core objective descriptions? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** SPCH 1318 - Interpersonal Communication

**Proposal Contact:** Lynae Jacob

**Foundational Component Area:** Component Area Option

**Component Area Fulfillment: Fulfills “A” Requirement:**

 Fulfills Communications Component Area /Associated Required Objectives

**Component Sub-Committee:** Lana Jackson (Chair), Lynae Jacob, Craig Clifton

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM? Is this course included in the ACGM? Course description does not match the ACGM Spring 2013 edition:Application of communication theory to interpersonal relationship development, maintenance, and termination in relationship contexts including friendships, romantic partners, families, andrelationships with co-workers and supervisors.Must be changed through Carol Moore. | X – w/qualification |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **THECB Foundational Component Area Requirement** Does this course fulfill requirement “a” or “b” from the THECB description options? | X |  |
| **Designated or Selected Core Objectives**Do **ALL** of the assignments and/or activities align with the core objective descriptions? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**Spring 2013**

**Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion Preliminary Evaluation**

**Course:** SPCH 1321 - Business and Professional Speaking

**Proposal Contact:** Lynae Jacob

**Foundational Component Area:** Component Area Option

**Component Area Fulfillment: Fulfills “A” Requirements:**

 Fulfills Communications Component Area /Associated Required Objectives

**Component Sub-Committee:** Lana Jackson (Chair), Lynae Jacob, Craig Clifton

**Assessment Evaluation:** Kristin McDonald-Willey

PART I: Sub-Committee Evaluation of Content

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **ACGM Inclusion**Is this course included in the ACGM? Course description does not match the ACGM Spring 2013 edition:Study and application of communication within the business and professional context. Special emphasis will be given to communication competencies in presentations, dyads, teams andtechnologically mediated formats.Must be changed through Carol Moore. | X – w/qualification |  |
| **Learning Outcomes**Are the learning outcomes consistent (if applicable) with the ACGM? | X |  |
| **THECB Foundational Component Area Requirement** Does this course fulfill requirement “a” or “b” from the THECB description options? | X |  |
| **Designated or Selected Core Objectives**Do **ALL** of the assignments and/or activities align with the core objective descriptions? | X |  |
| **Cohesive Proposal*** Does the information presented make sense?
* Is each assignment and assessment plan cohesive?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART I:** |

PART II: Assessment Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION** | **YES**(Put X if Does Meet Criteria) | **NO**(Put X if Does **Not** Meet Criteria) |
| **Direct Assessment** Is at least one direct assessment method presented for each core objective? | X |  |
| **Brief Outline of Assessment Method**Is a clear assessment plan provided? | X |  |
| **Benchmark/Target*** Is a benchmark/target provided?
* Is it clear what the benchmark/target measures?
 | X |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REASON FOR “NO” RATING (IF APPPLICABLE) FOR PART II:** |

**VI. 2014-2015 Core Curriculum Degree Requirements**

The following tables reflect AC’s final 2014-2015 AA/AS and AAS core curriculum degree requirements based on the approved/denied THECB courses. The evaluated courses in this document would plug into the below tables as appropriate.

General Education Requirements (42 Semester Hours)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CURRENT CORE** | **PROPOSED CORE** |
| **Communication - 9 Hours*** ENGL 1301: Composition I
* ENGL 1302: Composition II
* Speech – 3 Hours
 | **Communication – 6 Hours*** **ENGL 1301: Composition I**
* **ENGL 1302: Composition II**

**Or ENGL 2311: Technical & Business Writing** |
| **Mathematics – 3 Hours** | **Mathematics - 3 Hours** |
| **Natural Sciences - 8 Hours** | **Life & Physical Sciences - 6 Hours\*** |
| **Humanities - 3 Hours** | **Language, Philosophy & Culture – 3 Hours** |
| **Visual & Performing Arts - 3 Hours** | **Creative Arts – 3 Hours** |
| **Social/Behavioral Sciences - 15 Hours*** GOVT 2305: United States Government
* GOVT 2306: Texas Government
* HIST 1301: United States History I
* HIST 1302: United States History II
* Social/Behavioral Science – 3 Hours
 | **American History – 6 Hours****Government/Political Science – 6 Hours****Social & Behavioral Sciences – 3 Hours** |
| **Lifetime Fitness – 1 Hour** | **Component Area Option – 6 Hours*** **Speech – 3 Hours**
* **EDUC/PSYC 1300 – 3 Hours\*\***
 |
|  | **\*Offer 4 hour science courses and move 2 lab hours to Major Requirements (Intent is to offer 3 hour science courses for non-science majors when available in the ACGM)** |

\*\* If EDUC/PSYC 1300 is not required, then student must choose 3 hours from the approved General Education Course List.

**AAS GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | AAS Degrees |
| COMMUNICATION* ENGL 1301: Composition I
 | 3 |
| SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE\* | 3 |
| LIFE & PHYSICAL SCIENCES\*OrMATHEMATICS\* | 3 |
| LANGUAGE, PHILOSOPHY & CULTURE\*OrCREATIVE ARTS\* | 3 |
| COMPONENT AREA OPTION* Speech (Communication foundational component area)

or* EDUC 1300: First Year Seminar
 | 3 |

\*As specified in individual curricula or selected from the General Education Course List.