

In addition to comments reflected in the February 28, 2019 GSC meeting minutes, re: the inclusion of information on criteria checksheets, as it relates to linking course material with the course syllabus learning outcomes and objectives; how students engage with course material; and, the purpose and point of assignments, additional comments are as follows:

- one thing that seems to be missing is that when proposals include textbook information, they usually include photo copies of the table of contents of the textbook. However, I don't think this is useful unless the departments designate which sections of the book the students are actually reading and interacting with. Without this, it's just a list of readings that the students have access to, but it's not clear which parts they're actually reading and using in the course. A breakdown in the syllabus with reading assignments would be more useful than just seeing the table of contents so we could get a better idea of the actual content that students are studying.
- from the perspective of the Historical Awareness subcommittee, we've frequently either rejected or asked for revisions based upon a lack of clarity in the syllabus about how students are held accountable for historical knowledge within a course.
- in almost every proposal that I have evaluated as "revise and resubmit," the issue was that the proposal did not include enough information about the assignments and how students engage with the material. Hopefully, adding this wording will lead to more comprehensive proposals and we will not have to recommend so many courses for "revise and resubmit."
- might help if all applications had wording that strongly encouraged submitters to include supplementary materials, including actual assignments/lab instructions, rubrics, etc., to provide evidence for each criteria.