

Miami Plan Course Proposal Review Form (10/09)
THEMATIC SEQUENCES

Date _____ Reviewer _____ Course _____

Rubric Summary. Circle your ratings

Your Recommendation:

1. Critical Thinking	4	3	2	1	_____ 5 - Denied
2. Understanding Contexts	4	3	2	1	_____ 4 - Resubmit
3. Engaging with Other Learners	4	3	2	1	_____ 3 - LEC
4. Reflecting and Acting	4	3	2	1	_____ 2 - Reviewers
5. Assessment	4	3	2	1	_____ 1 - Approve
6. Course Rigor	4	3	2	1	
7. Linkages between courses	4	3	2	1	

Thematic Sequence Requirements

- a) 6 or more hours at the 200-level or above? YES NO
 b) Circle: Includes Capstone does NOT include Capstone

Strengths of Proposal

Weaknesses of Proposal

Specific Recommendations to Proposer

	5-denied or 4-resubmit Rating = 4	4-resubmit or 3-LEC Rating = 3	3-LEC or 2-reviewers Rating = 2	2-reviewers or 1-approved Rating = 1
<u>1. Critical Thinking</u>	Reviewer does not clearly discern definition for critical thinking or indications that critical thinking is part of the course.	Reviewer finds only limited of critical thinking's role in the course and/or cannot determine where critical thinking is defined for students or evident on syllabus.	Critical thinking is defined on application form, but reviewer cannot determine where it is described to students and/or where it is clearly reflected in course pedagogy.	Critical thinking clearly defined on application form and how it will be fostered is described to students and reflected in course pedagogy.
<u>2. Understanding Contexts</u>	Reviewer cannot discern clear description of understanding contexts nor indications that understanding contexts is part of the course.	Reviewer finds only limited evidence of understanding contexts' role in the course and/or cannot determine where understanding contexts is defined for students or evident on the syllabus.	Understanding contexts is defined on the application form, but reviewer cannot determine where it is described to students and/or where it is clearly reflected in course pedagogy.	Understanding contexts is clearly defined on the application form and how it will be fostered is described to students and reflected in course pedagogy.
<u>3. Engaging with Learners</u>	Reviewer cannot discern how students will interact nor opportunities for interaction.	Applicant indicates students will interact, but reviewer determines the syllabus does not indicate opportunities for interaction.	Applicant indicates students will interact, but the reviewer determines opportunities are limited and/or are not clear to students.	How students will engage with one another is described on the application form, is clear to students, and is evident in course activities on the syllabus.
<u>4. Reflecting and Acting</u>	Reviewer cannot ascertain how course will lead to reflecting and acting nor where the syllabus addresses reflecting and acting.	Reviewer finds only limited evidence of reflecting/ acting's role in the course and/or cannot determine where reflecting and acting is defined for students or evident on the syllabus.	Reflecting and acting is defined on the application form, but reviewer determines it is not described to students and/or is not a clear element of the course.	Reflecting and acting is clearly defined on the application form, to students, and is an element of the course as determined by the syllabus.
<u>5. Assessment Plan</u>	No assessment plan is provided.	Reviewer believes assessment plan provided is incomplete, includes only instructor grading or student perceptions.	Partial assessment plan provided, but reviewer determines it needs to include additional assessment measures.	The assessment plan includes faculty analysis, valid measures of student perceptions, and student learning outcomes.
<u>6. Course Rigor</u>	The sequence does not appear to be rigorous as determine by the quality and quantity of assignments and activities.	The course may be rigorous, but the reviewer does not discern rigor demonstrated through a clear explanation of assignments and activities.	The course has a degree of rigor, but reviewer determines assignments and activities need revision to reach the level of rigor expected in MP courses.	The quality and quantity of assignments and the daily activities indicate a rigorous MPF class.
<u>7. Linkages among courses</u>	The reviewer discerns no apparent relationship or links between courses in the sequence.	Reviewer finds rationale unclear for how courses are related and linked.	Reviewer determines rationale adequate, but missing some detail.	Clear rationale for how courses are related and linked.