

**Texas A&M University - Commerce Department of
Sociology & Criminal Justice
Expectations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review
Approved by Department: April 15, 2020**

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Our expectations are rooted in:

1. University Procedure 12.01.99.R0.01, Academic Freedom, Tenure and Responsibility
2. The statement of Expectations for Tenure and Promotion of the College of Arts and Sciences
3. The department's mission statement, which reads: "The mission of the department is to equip students with the social, intellectual, leadership, and critical thinking skills necessary for success in a diverse society and a variety of careers."

B. Guidance for potential applicants:

1. These tenure and promotion guidelines are set forth for faculty, who were hired on or after August, 2017.

C. The Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice is committed to promoting a well-rounded, dynamic colleague; one who has a solid foundation in teaching, research, and service to the department, college, and university. Therefore, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to minimally meet the following criteria in the three areas described, below: Teaching; Research, Scholarship & Creative Activity; Service.

II. GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE

A. GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR TEACHING:

1. The department takes its commitment to superior teaching seriously. Therefore, we expect all faculty to be conscientious and effective in fulfilling their teaching responsibilities. For both probationary and tenured faculty, we expect continuous activity and currency in the development of courses and pedagogical skills. Evidence of successful **teaching** will be demonstrated through:
 - a. Organization - Well developed course syllabi with clearly articulated course goals; course delivery applying appropriate modes of instruction for course type; pacing that allows for student engagement and understanding of material; definition of skills, attitudes, and knowledge that will result from completion of the course
 - b. Assessment - Frequent and timely feedback of student work through a learning outcome assessment based on articulated course goals; use of grading rubrics where appropriate.
 - c. Rigor - Demand and level of challenge that is appropriate for skill and knowledge development consistent with departmental expectations
 - d. Presentation - Clearly understandable communication in both oral and written form; welcoming attitude of student questions and feedback
 - e. Currency- Demonstration of continual course development; use of technologies in promoting the learning environment
 - f. Mentoring - Supervision of Thesis, Non-Thesis and Honor's Thesis and other student projects

g. Learning - Participation in disciplinary or pedagogical workshops and

conferences

- h. Student evaluations of teaching (See **Appendix A** for more information).
- i. Peer observations of teaching (See **Appendix Band Appendix D** for more information).
- j. The department head and senior faculty will encourage mentorship in teaching by matching junior faculty with a senior faculty member of similar areas of expertise or discipline.

B. General Expectations for Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA)

1. All faculty members are expected to be engaged in Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Work [RSCA] throughout their academic careers. Candidates for tenure and post-tenure review should demonstrate sustained activity throughout their evaluation period. These activities shall demonstrate engagement to expanding the scholarship or creative work in one's field or discipline through dissemination in appropriate scholarly outlets.
2. For the purposes of tenure, promotion and post-tenure review, all RSCA will be evaluated by categorizing the activity in one of three categories, explained below:

CATEGORY A

The emphasis on publications in Category A is on major publications involving peer reviewed, original research that contributes to the existing literature in the discipline in novel **ways**.

- Full-length academic book or monograph (cannot be self-published, or published in a vanity press)
- Peer-reviewed article published in a scholarly journal
- Chapter in a scholarly book
- Externally-funded Research Grant
- Editor of a scholarly, peer-reviewed journal
- Agency or research Report contributing original knowledge for a grant funded agency

CATEGORY B

Items in Category B are smaller in scope and impact; they also may or may not involve both peer-review and/or serve as original research.

- Textbook
- Book review
- Encyclopedia entry
- Edited book
- Research note
- Agency report
- Articles in non-refereed scholarly journals
- Published proceedings
- Applied scholarship (oral history, local impact studies)
- Unfunded major research grant proposal (only one of these may be counted)

CATEGORY C

Items in Category C demonstrate active engagement in the discipline, but may not involve written publication

- Conference presentation
- (Funded) **Mini** Grant through Graduate School
- Manuscript reviewer
- Professional development of research skills (i.e. attendance at NIH workshop)
- Organizer of panel or discussant in roundtable at academic conference
- Invited professional and academic speeches

3. An item can count only once.
4. An **additional** accomplishment over and above the minimal requirements from Category A may be counted as also fulfilling the requirement for Category B. An **additional** accomplishment over and above the minimal requirements from Category B may be counted as also fulfilling the requirement in Category C. Items from Categories B and C **cannot** be counted as an accomplishment or fulfill a requirement in Category A.
5. Faculty undergoing probationary tenure review should secure at least two external, objective reviewers that can attest to the quality of their RSCA (See **Appendix C** for more information).
6. The department head and senior faculty will encourage mentorship by matching junior faculty with a senior faculty member with similar research agendas or publishing agendas.
7. It is duly noted that each faculty member's research agenda is unique, and it is the responsibility of each candidate to make a case that their work is of high quality and that it meets the requirements as set forth by these guidelines.

C. General Expectations for Service

1. Faculty members are expected to contribute service at all levels: departmental, college, university, to their profession and to the larger community. Their level of contribution should be reflective of their level of rank. Probationary faculty should display a willingness and diligence to serve primarily on departmental-level committees. Senior faculty should strive to serve as leaders within the university and as role models within the department.
2. Documentation of active involvement takes precedence over mere membership in any committee or organization.
3. It should be duly noted that faculty members may request to join university-level committees but do not get chosen; this should not be held against them. However, service both within the department and outside of it is a requirement.
4. Examples of Service include:
 - a. Undergraduate or graduate advising
 - b. Department, college or university committees
 - c. Faculty senate
 - d. Offices and committee appointments in local, state, regional and national professional associations
 - e. Presentation of programs and workshops on campus and in the community
 - f. Non-remunerated professional consulting
 - g. Community outreach
 - h. Serving as advisor for student organizations

III. REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE

A. TEACHING: A candidate for tenure must demonstrate excellence in teaching based on the expectations stated above. The candidate meet ALL of the following requirements:

1. In the broadest sense, we expect to see:

- a. A willingness to teach and develop courses to meet departmental needs. A willingness to teach in a variety of formats (e.g., face to face, online, distance education, weekend) as deemed necessary by the department
 - b. A willingness to assist students beyond simply lecturing in the classroom. Candidates should be willing to meet with students during posted office hours.
 - c. Evidence of on-going self-assessment leading to refinement and modification of instructional materials and pedagogical strategies over time.
 - d. Participated in the development and implementation of the departmental curricula and pedagogy in course presentations
2. Regarding evaluations of teaching, we expect to see:
- a. Generally positive evaluations of teaching from open-ended questions on the student evaluation instrument. (See **Appendix A** for more information).
 - b. Quantitative student evaluation scores that are within an acceptable range of departmental norms (See **Appendix A** for more information).
 - c. Positive peer observation of teaching reports in years 1, 3 and 5 for probationary faculty. The Department Head and/or senior faculty will conduct evaluations of online courses, as well. (See **Appendix D** for more information). Senior faculty shall have peer observations of teaching performance at least once every five years.
3. We also expect each class taught will have:
- a. A developed, thorough and well-organized syllabus
 - b. Assessment based in frequent and timely feedback of student work based on articulated course objectives and learning outcomes.

B. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY: A candidate for tenure must demonstrate **ALL** the following:

1. **THREE items from Category A**, listed in the expectations above
 - a. One published book will fulfill all requirements in Column A.
 - b. The candidate must be sole author or first author on at least one of these publications.
 - c. Publications "in press," that is, accepted for publication without further revision will be counted even if they are not yet in print.
2. **ONE item from Category B**
 - a. Publications "in press," that is, accepted for publication without further revision will be counted even if they are not yet in print.
3. **THREE items from Category C**
4. Confirmation from at least two objective, external reviewers that the candidate's research is of an acceptable standard and is congruent professional scholarship in the discipline. (See **Appendix B** for more information).
5. NOTE: A faculty member may offer alternative proof of RSCA in lieu of the criteria set forth above. These alternative proofs shall be reviewed and approved/disapproved by the department in consultation with

other tenured faculty. Agreements should be preserved in writing, with both parties maintaining a signed copy.

C. SERVICE

1. In general, we expect to see evidence of:
 - a. A willingness to volunteer for a fair share of service responsibilities at the department level
 - b. A willingness to accept and diligently perform assignments made by the department head or other university officials
 - c. Professional engagement with the discipline, such as belonging to academic organizations and associations.
 - d. Attendance at convocation and commencement ceremonies.
 - e. Participation in departmental, college and university faculty meetings and assemblies.
 - f. Effective performance on at least one college or university-level committee or task force, or serving as committee chair on at least one departmental committee for the period of at least one year.

D. ELIGIBILITY: Candidates applying for tenure must meet the expectations and eligibility requirements established in this document, along with the expectations established at the University and College

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

A. A candidate who has met all requirements for tenure in the areas of Teaching, RSCA and Service has also met all requirements for promotion to Associate Professor.

B. ELIGIBILITY: Candidates applying for promotion must also meet the expectations and eligibility requirements established in this document, along with the expectations established at the University and College

V. REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

A. TEACHING: The candidate shall demonstrate continuous activity and currency in development of courses, course activities, and pedagogical skills. Candidates for Professor must meet all expectations for Teaching listed under Section IIIA of this document.

B. RESEARCH: We will expect a candidate for Professor to document contribution to the overall discipline/field, demonstrating a level of expertise and well-established reputation in the profession. Since the time of having being promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate will

1. **Publish THREE items in Category A**
2. **Publish ONE item in Category B**
3. **Complete THREE items in Category C**
4. Meet all other requirements for RSCA as stated in the expectations for tenure, including at least 2 letters from external, objective reviewers attesting to the merit and contribution of the candidate's contribution to the discipline.

- C. **SERVICE:** For promotion to the rank of Professor, we will expect from the candidate to have made a significant contribution to the university and his/her profession. In addition to meeting the requirements for tenure in the area of service, candidates must provide evidence of:
1. Documented leadership role in at least five committees and/or other tasks.
 2. Candidates for professor must have served on at least one college or university-level committee for the period of one year or longer.
- D. **ELIGIBILITY:** Candidates applying for promotion must also meet the expectations and eligibility requirements established in this document, along with the expectations established at the University and College

VI. REQUIREMENTS FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. It is understood that senior faculty may wish to shift their priorities upon receiving tenure and/or full professor rank. We urge faculty to plan career trajectories of 5-year increments and note these accordingly in their annual performance evaluations. All senior faculty are encouraged to strive for excellence in one area: Teaching, RSCA or Service. However, they must still meet minimum expectations in the other two areas. Excellence along with minimal expectations in each area are described, below:

B. TEACHING:

1. **Excellence in Teaching:** The "excellent" teacher has demonstrated mastery in pedagogical skills, has contributed richly to curricular development of the department, and maintained superior evaluations by students and peers over time. Excellence in teaching will be measured by:
 - a. Consistent evidence from standardized tests of substantial learning gains by students in multiple course offerings
 - b. Significant curriculum development, including the design of multiple courses and continuous updating and innovation in existing courses.
 - c. Superior evaluations from students and peers, including quantitative evaluations at or below the norm, and excellence noted in open-ended assessments.
 - d. A substantial record of extensive and successful mentoring of students as indicated by 1) active supervision/chairing multiple honors theses, masters theses or nonthesis projects within the department, 2) major participation in student committee outside of the department
 - e. A clear pattern of course and grading rigor, as shown in course syllabi, course requirements and the distribution of course grades.
 - f. Recipient of an external award for teaching from an honorary, learned, professional society and/or a university-wide recognition. [The A&M System Teaching Excellence Award cannot be counted in tenure, promotion or post-tenure review decisions]
2. **Minimum Expectations in Teaching:** Senior faculty shall demonstrate continuous activity and currency in development of courses, course activities, and pedagogical skills. Candidates for Professor must meet all expectations for Teaching listed under Section III. A of this document.

- a. Senior faculty will have their courses (including online courses) evaluated through peer observation of teaching by senior faculty at least once every 5 years. This report will be submitted in their teaching portfolios for post-tenure review.

C. RESEARCH:

1. **Excellence in Research:** The "excellent" researcher has a clear program of scholarship that has gained national recognition for the significant contributions this work has made to a field of study. The significance of this research shall be measurable by:
 - a. Quantity: the faculty member has produced above and beyond the number of Category A publications than is minimally expected.
 - b. Quality: The faculty member has demonstrated the ability to conduct research as the sole or lead author or PI of external research grants and/or the first author in top-tiered publication outlets
 - c. Impact: The faculty member can demonstrate the placement of their published work in top publications, citations and other references to their work, and/or its widespread dissemination to professional audiences.
2. **Minimum Expectations in Research:** Senior faculty are expected to remain engaged within the literature of their discipline. They should strive to make significant contributions and maximum impact in their field of study. At minimum, for each 5 year period of review, senior faculty must:
 - a. Publish **TWO** items from Category A
 - b. Complete **TWO** items from Category C
 - c. It is duly noted that funding for conference presentations and travel to academic meetings is much more difficult to obtain for senior faculty.

D. SERVICE:

1. **Excellence in Service:** A faculty member who exhibits "excellence" in service will hold leadership roles in numerous organizations of significance, and participate in a number of groups that is above the norm for the department and college. Service excellence will be demonstrated by:
 - a. Chairpersonship of multiple university-level committee or task forces for the period of three or more years.
 - b. Election to an officer position in a regional or national academic or professional organization or association for more than one year.
 - c. A reputation for serving as an effective leader, measurable in unsolicited written commendations from the committee chair, university-wide recognition, and invitations or appointments to serve in a leadership role extended from higher levels of administration
2. **Minimum Expectations in Service:** Senior faculty are expected to serve as leaders within the university, and as role models within their departments. While their service may be skewed to certain activities and organizations of their choosing, they are still expected to meet minimal expectations for service, outlined in requirements for tenure stated above.

VII. DOCUMENTATION FOR TENURE, PROMOTION AND POST-TENURE REVIEW: Faculty undergoing review are required to submit teaching, RSCA and service portfolios that document their significant contributions in each of these areas. The necessary elements of these portfolios include the following:

A. TEACHING PORTFOLIO

1. A narrative summary of a teaching philosophy, including one's goals and expectations surrounding teaching. The narrative should highlight innovative pedagogical techniques, and reference efforts to document learning outcomes and articulated goals for courses.
2. A listing of major teaching activities over the evaluation period (including the number of students in each course and the format of the class)
3. Copies of student evaluations (both quantitative and qualitative)
 - a. Probationary faculty shall submit student evaluations from the last two years
 - b. Faculty undergoing Post-tenure review shall submit student evaluations from the last five years.
4. Peer observation of teaching reports
 - a. Probationary faculty should have peer observations of teaching reports for years 1, 3 and 5
 - b. Faculty undergoing post-tenure review should submit at least one peer review of teaching from the last 5 years.
5. Copies of course materials (syllabi, handouts and assignments, exams, readings).
6. Documentation of teaching workshops and/or training attended.
7. Any other evidence the faculty deems appropriate for measuring teaching effectiveness (e.g. unsolicited student comments, evidence of development in new/existing courses, artifacts of student work)

B. RESEARCH PORTFOLIO

1. Narrative and self evaluation of RSCA
2. A listing of major research activities (e.g. complete bibliographic citations and titles of awards, publications, presentations, research grants) with some explanation of the quality/impact of the journal, and the contribution of the author, if a co-authored publication.
 - a. Probationary faculty shall include only those publications completed while employed at this institution (unless there is written documentation of years of service from another institution that has been granted)
 - b. Faculty going up for promotion should emphasize publications attained since their last promotion.
 - c. Faculty undergoing post-tenure review shall emphasize publications from the last five years.
3. Copies of published research publications (copies of the first three pages of the article, book or grant should suffice)
4. Letters of invitations, acceptance and commendations/awards
5. Copies of papers and programs of conference presentations

6. For probationary faculty, external letters from at least two external, objective reviewers.
(See Appendix C)

C. SERVICE PORTFOLIO

1. Narrative and self evaluation of service
2. A listing of major service activities, years served, and one's role (e.g., member, chair) within each of the following areas: a) department, b) college, c) university, d) profession, e) community. It is expected that the objectives of the committee and the frequency by which the committee meets will be noted.
3. Letters from the committee chair certifying/commending participation

D. OTHER REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

1. Service report required for tenure and promotion as stated in university policy
2. Annual faculty performance evaluations
3. Curriculum Vitae

APPENDIX A: Student Evaluation Instrument

The following instrument will be used in evaluating face to face student evaluations to evaluate, in part, the effectiveness of a faculty member's teaching:

Evaluation of Your Instructor

Respond to each statement as it applies to this course or your instructor by indicating whether you:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	S
A	B	C	D	t r o n g l y D i s a g r e e E

1. Course materials were well-prepared.
2. The course adequately followed stated course objectives (i.e., course syllabus).
3. Feedback on examinations/graded material was valuable.
4. Method of evaluating student's work was fair and appropriate.
5. Examinations/graded materials covered course content as emphasized by the instructor.
6. Examinations/graded materials were returned in a timely basis.
7. Required and recommended readings/text was valuable.
8. Readings, homework, etc., contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject.
9. Instructor's explanations of assignments were clear.
10. The course has stimulated critical thinking.
11. Instructor was enthusiastic about the course.
12. Instructor's style of presentation held my interest during class.
13. Instructor was adequately accessible to me during office hours or after class.
14. Instructor presented points of view other than her/his/own when appropriate.
15. Instructor's knowledge of the course material was excellent.

16. I found the course challenging and stimulating.

17. I have learned something in this course which I consider valuable.
18. Students were encouraged to participate in class discussion.
19. Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers.
20. The instructor showed concern about the students' understanding of the material.

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Both complimentary and/or critical comments are encouraged. Feel free to use the other side of this page if you need additional room for your response.

1. Please comment on aspects of the course that were most beneficial to you.
2. Please comment on specific aspects of the course that need improvement.
3. What would you like your instructor to know about your experience in this class?

APPENDIX B: Procedures for Peer Observation of Teaching

Peer observation of teaching is meant to serve as a constructive process in which faculty can receive quality feedback on their pedagogical techniques and classroom management from their colleagues. Probationary faculty should have peer observation performed in at least years 1, 3, and 5. Tenured faculty should have peer observation of teaching performed at least once every 5 years. The process of peer observation of teaching will be supervised and initiated each year by the Department Head.

Online courses should also be evaluated on the same schedule as face to face courses. During evaluation periods, the Department Head will be enrolled as a "ghost" instructor to monitor and evaluate the course. A written report by the department head or senior faculty member will conform to the criteria used to evaluate face to face courses.

The following instrument will be used to conduct peer observations of teaching:

PROCEDURES:

Peer observation of teaching is one vehicle through which colleagues can learn from each other and share in the art of classroom instruction and thereby deepen the culture and collective commitment to teaching excellence.

It is suggested that the evaluator have a pre-observation meeting with the faculty member to discuss:

- Goals for class/ learning objectives
- Plan to achieve goals
- Teaching/learning activities
- General philosophy of teaching and approach toward students

The peer evaluator is expected to: (a) set the date of the observation in advance and in agreement with the professor to be observed, on a day that a fairly typical class will be conducted (b) be as unobtrusive as possible during the visit; (c) complete the peer observation of teaching form within two weeks of the observation; (d) provide the professor evaluated with a copy of the report and offer to discuss the report with that professor. The peer evaluator's report shall be placed in the faculty member's annual evaluation file.

The procedures outlined above have been adapted from those used at Cornell University:

http://www.cte.cornell.edu/campus/teach/faculty/peer_review.html

INSTRUMENT:

The instrument to be used is meant to provide constructive feedback, noting the areas that are currently being handled very well, and providing suggestions for alternative strategies or pedagogical techniques to improve in other areas.

The following instrument has been adapted from the one used at Bemidji State University

http://www.bemidjistate.edu/faculty_staff/professional_development/PDF/Peer_Observation_.pdf

Peer Observation of Teaching Form

Professor's Name _ _ _ _ _

Observer's Name _ _ _ _ _

Course being observed: _

Date: _

Area of Observation	Feedback
<p>Prepares the class for the session In this area consider whether the professor: *Provides an overview of what is planned for the session * Tries to focus initial student attention * Announces the topic * Connects the class session to the previous class session (Note: not every class session needs this done)</p>	<p>1. Comments and Examples:</p> <p>2. Suggestions for improvement (if any):</p>
<p>Presents in an organized fashion Consider appropriate elements such as: *Class starts and ends on time * The professor presents in such a manner that the students can take good notes if they wish * Uses cues to emphasize more important points * Clearly defines new vocabulary * Summarizes from time to time * Gets back on track if student questions lead them astray * Class seems well paced for students. {Note: There are different ways of organizing material. Is this teacher's way clear and easy to understand?}</p>	<p>1. Comments and Examples:</p> <p>2. Suggestions for improvement (if any):</p>
<p>Pedagogical techniques Which of the following does the professor use: *Maintain eye contact with students * Use movement, gesture and voice in a way that adds interest to the presentation * Uses humor appropriately * Provide examples or other means of increasing interest in the presentation *Provide the lecture in a tone that can be clearly heard and understood effectively (Note: What visual aids are being used, and is this being done in a way that adds to student understanding?)</p>	<p>1. Comments and Examples:</p> <p>2. Suggestions for improvement (if any):</p>

Classroom relationships, management, interaction

Note the extent to which the teacher responds to students in the class. Specifically:

- *Are opportunities for students to ask questions?
- * Does professor check for comprehension

I. Comments and Examples:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Does professor notice student questions * Notice non-attending behaviors for signs of confusion *Call on volunteers as well as non-volunteers *Handle classroom disturbances effectively *Answer student questions and checks that the student is *Encourages and guides critical thinking *Prevents or terminates discussion monopolies *Makes sure questions and comments can be heard by all *Checks to see whether answers has been understood <p>(Note: Does the professor seem to be able to modify the presentation to take into account the audience? Does the teacher pace the presentation well?)</p>	<p>2. Suggestions for improvement (if any):</p>
<p>Class content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Is the selection of course material appropriate in terms of depth, breadth, and complexity * Does the professor demonstrate command of the subject * Is the content coherently related to the subject, the discipline and the learning objectives of the course? 	<p>1. Comments and Examples:</p> <p>2. Suggestions for improvement (if any):</p>

APPENDIX C: Procedures for External Review of RSCA

Outside reviewers for tenure and promotion decisions are distinguished individuals who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's academic record. The particular process of selecting outside reviewers and their specific tasks include the following:

- The candidate will develop a list of potential reviewers at the beginning of the academic year under which they will be evaluated. The list will include at least four names of candidates. The candidate will present a list of at least four potential reviewers which includes their contact information, their expertise, and a disclosure of the candidate's relationship with these people. Potential reviewers will be from outside the university and should have no close personal or professional relationship with the candidate. Dissertation/thesis advisors and all research collaborators are strongly discouraged as external reviewers.
- The department head will solicit potential reviewers at the beginning of the academic years under which the candidate will undergo review. The department head will email potential reviewers to see ascertain their willingness and availability. The department head will request a CV from the reviewer.
- Once at least two outside reviewers agree to participate, they will be mailed a copy of the 1) departmental tenure and promotion guidelines, 2) the candidate's vita, 3) the service report for tenure and promotion required by the university, and 3) copies of publications written by the candidate
- In their evaluation of the candidate for promotion and tenure, reviewers will be asked to answer the following questions 1) the nature of his/her relationship to the candidate, 2) the significance of the candidate's work in terms of its quality and impact
- External reviewers will **not** be asked to comment on the candidate's teaching or to make recommendation for or against promotion.
- Reviewers will be asked to complete their reviews by February 1. If a reviewer fails to submit the evaluation by the deadline, the department head will write or email the reviewer to request an immediate submission. A reviewer's complete failure to submit an agreed-upon review will not prejudice nor delay the candidate's application for promotion. The chair will place a letter in the candidate's portfolio explaining the absence of the review.
- Reviews are part of the open-records act, but reviews will not be routinely shared with candidates.

Appendix D: Peer Observation Form for Online Courses

Standard	Possible Points	Points	Comments:
1.1 Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components. 1.2 A statement introduces the student to the purpose of the course and to its components; in the case of a hybrid course, the statement clarifies the relationship between the face-to-face and online components. 1.3 Etiquette expectations (sometimes called "netiquette" for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication are stated clearly. 1.4 The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and available online. 1.5 Students are asked to introduce themselves to the class. 1.6 Minimum student preparation, and, if applicable, prerequisite knowledge in the discipline is clearly stated. 1.7 Minimum technical skills expected of the student are clearly stated.	3 3 1 1 1 1		
2.1 The course learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable. 2.2 The module/unit learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives. 2.3 All learning objectives are stated clearly and written from the student's perspective. 2.4 Instructions to students on how to meet the learning objectives are adequate and stated clearly. 2.5 The learning objectives are appropriately designed for the level of the course.	3 3 3 3 2		
3.1 The types of assessments selected measure the stated learning objectives and are consistent with course activities and resources. 3.2 The course grading policy is stated clearly. 3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of students' work and participation. 3.4 The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and appropriate to the content being assessed. 3.5 "Self-check" or practice assignments are provided, with timely feedback to students.	3 3 3 2 2		
4.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit objectives. 4.2 The relationship between the instructional materials and the learning activities are clearly explained to the student. 4.3 The instructional materials have sufficient breadth, depth, and currency for the student to learn the subject. 4.4 All resources for student interaction are clearly articulated.	3 3 2 1		
5.1 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives. 5.2 Learning activities foster instructor-student, content-student, and if appropriate to the course, student-student interaction. 5.3 Clear standards are set for instructor responsiveness and availability (turn-around time for email, grade posting, etc.) 5.4 The requirements for student interaction are clearly articulated.	3 3 2 2		
6.1 The tools and media support the learning objectives, and are appropriately chosen to deliver the content of the course. 6.2 Navigation throughout the online components of the course is logical, consistent, and efficient. 6.3 Instructions on how to access resources at a distance are sufficient and easy to understand. 6.4 The course design takes full advantage of available tools and media.	3 3 1 1		

