

Approved by the Full Faculty on April 22nd, 2015

SFTV Curriculum And Assessment Committee Guidelines for Curriculum Proposals: New courses, modification to existing programs and new program proposals

The primary purpose of the SFTV Curriculum and Assessment Committee is to ensure that curricular changes meet applicable university-wide standards, to provide a thorough review of curricular changes and/or new program proposals that might have an impact on departments or programs other than the one proposing the change, to ensure that all stakeholders have a voice in the process of curricular changes, and to provide better communication across the School. Specifically the committee:

- a) Provides a place for tracks (departments and programs) to share assessment and program review efforts in order to ensure collaboration across SFTV.
- b) Reviews all proposed modifications to existing programs to ensure adherence to APRC guidelines and to help ensure a successful APRC review
- c) Reviews all new program proposals to ensure adherence to APRC guidelines and to help ensure a successful APRC review

1. Modification to existing programs: The SFTV Curriculum and Assessment Committee and the SFTV School Council review all proposed modifications to existing programs per the APRC definitions. Proposals to modify existing curriculum should follow the APRC guidelines (appendix).

The University Academic Planning and Review Committee require that any department or program proposing modifications to their curricula consult with the APRC. Changes in the content of existing individual courses do not constitute program modifications and thus do not require consultation with the APRC unless a course is altered so much that it no longer meets its previously intended role in the curriculum.

Examples include: a) changing the total size of a program's curriculum (either in terms of the number of courses or the number of credit hours); b) altering the proportion of lower to upper – division courses; c) introducing a new required course for the curriculum or changing an elective course to a requirement; d) shifting all or part of a program off site (to study abroad, for instance, or to a branch or remote campus); d) proposing a new required course or moving an existing required course to an alternative schedule (weekends or summer only, for instance) without an option to take

the course on a traditional schedule; e) migrating a course partially or wholly to an online format (APRC Guidelines for Modification to an Existing Program).

Once a department/ program faculty have discussed and approved a change to the curriculum, even if it involves only one course, the chair/director should contact the chair of the APRC to see if it needs APRC review (query form attached to appendix) and the chair of the SFTV Curriculum and Assessment Committee to see if it needs to be reviewed by the SFTV committee.

All proposals should use the APRC guidelines and include the appropriate signatures (chair/director of the department/program proposing the change, chairs/directors of any program potentially impacted by the proposed change).

When in doubt, contact the SFTV Curriculum and Assessment Committee chair.

In cases requiring APRC approval, the SFTV Curriculum and Assessment Committee review shall be attached to the proposal that goes forward to the dean and the APRC. The review by the SFTV School Council takes place independently of the committee review; its review shall also be attached to the proposal that goes forward to the dean and the APRC.

There may be times when the APRC does not require approval but the SFTV Curriculum committee will require review by the committee. The committee recognizes the authority of individual departments and programs over their own curriculum; however, there may be cases where the committee feels that the proposed course impacts SFTV resources (staffing, faculty, classrooms, and/or equipment) and therefore significantly impacts another SFTV program or programs. There may be cases where a proposed course would naturally draw upon the disciplinary expertise of faculty in several departments. These courses require SFTV committee review to ensure that there is cooperation and discussion between the relevant departments in the development of the course.

2. New Program Proposals:

The APRC requires that the APRC and the Provost approve all proposals for new programs (graduate and undergraduate), including new minors, prior to implementation -- (including bulletin changes) (see guidelines attached to appendices). To ensure a successful APRC process, both the SFTV Curriculum and Assessment Committee and the SFTV School Council shall review all new program proposals. New program proposals should follow APRC guidelines.

The reviews by both the SFTV committee and the SFTV School Council shall be attached to the proposal as it goes forward to the dean and the APRC.

3. Process for submitting proposals to the Committee:

Once a proposal has been approved by the departmental or program faculty, the department chair/program director signs off on the proposal and submits it, in electronic form, to both the Curriculum Committee and the SFTV School Council, on behalf of the departmental/program faculty. The departmental/program faculty, the Associate Deans and the Dean should be cc'd with the proposal.

The Committee and the Council shall conduct independent reviews, simultaneously, and submit independent reports to be attached to the proposal that goes forward to the Dean and the APRC.

Allow 4 weeks for review.

In some cases, the committee may need additional information, including interviews with faculty, chairs and directors; a study of comparator schools, etc. The committee may send the proposal back to the authors for additional information and/or revision.

On completion of the review, the committee chair shall forward the report to the departmental/program faculty, the SFTV School Council, the Associate Deans and the Dean.

Reports shall include a summary of the proposal; strengths; weaknesses; and recommendations to address the weaknesses.

The department/program faculty may write a response to the review. In these cases, the response shall be attached to the proposal that goes forward to the Dean and the APRC. The response should be addressed to the Dean, and cc: the committee, the SFTV School Council, the departmental/program faculty and the Associate Deans.

APPENDIX ONE: APRC GUIDELINES: MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROGRAM

The APRC requires that departments or programs proposing modifications to their curricula consult with the committee after gaining the approval of their dean and the deans of any other impacted schools or colleges. **Changes in the content of individual courses do not constitute program modifications and thus do not require consultation with the APRC, unless a course is altered so much that it no longer meets its previously intended role in the curriculum.**

Intended program modifications should be submitted to the chair of the APRC for consultation in a simplified query (see the link below to “Query to Modify an Existing Program”). The committee will promptly notify the proposal author(s) whether the modification warrants a full review (see the “Modification of an Existing Program” link below) and what steps should be followed to submit a proposal for such a review. Every effort will be made to respond to queries within two weeks. **Please note that not all proposed modifications will require such a full review, but all proposed modifications should be submitted to the APRC for consultation.**

The purpose of APRC oversight of program modifications is to ensure that curriculum changes meet applicable university-wide standards, to provide more thorough vetting of modifications that might have an impact on academic units other than those enacting the change and thus to allow all stakeholders a voice in the process of modification, to track changes over time as a means of limiting program drift, and to provide better communication across the university concerning modifications, especially between academic units and the Registrar.

A program modification is defined as any curricular change that affects a student’s path to completion of a degree, major, minor, or certificate program, as reflected in the CAPP (Curriculum, Advising, and Program Planning) report (please see <http://www.lmu.edu/about/services/registrar/registration/CAPP.htm>), revises the mode of delivery of all or a portion of a degree, major, minor, or certificate program, or alters the name or identity of a department, program, college, or school as stated publicly on the university’s website or in the University Bulletin.

Changes in the content of individual courses do not constitute program modifications and thus do not require consultation with the APRC, unless a course is altered so much that it no longer meets its previously intended role in the curriculum.

Examples of changes that would constitute program modifications include:

- Changing the total size of a program's curriculum (either in terms of the number of courses or the number of credit hours).
- Altering the proportion of lower- to upper-division courses.
- Introducing a new required course for the curriculum or changing an elective course to a requirement.
- Shifting all or part of a program offsite (to study abroad, for instance, or to a branch or remote campus).
- Proposing a new required course or moving an existing required course to an alternative schedule (weekends or summer only, for instance) without an option to take the course on a traditional schedule.
- Migrating a course partially or wholly to an online format.

For questions on the definition of a program modification or the procedures for submitting a query, please contact the chair of the APRC.

APPENDIX TWO: APRC QUERY FOR MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROGRAM**ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW COMMITTEE
QUERY TO MODIFY AN EXISTING PROGRAM**

All proposed modifications to an existing program must be reviewed by the APRC to determine whether or not the modification is substantial enough to warrant a full APRC review. The APRC review of the initial query to modify an existing program should take no more than 2 weeks. In those cases where the APRC determines that the proposed changes are substantial enough to warrant a full APRC review, the authors of the proposal should submit a full proposal, following the APRC guidelines for modifying an existing program.

The APRC review process for the formal modification of an existing program will take approximately 6-8 weeks. Note that programs must be approved by the end of the fall semester to be implemented in the following fall. The APRC recommends that authors submit the initial proposal for the modification of an existing program to the committee by the spring semester prior to a full APRC review and no later than mid-September of the fall semester prior to implementation (for example, if the authors intend to implement the changes in Fall 2015, the initial query should be submitted to the APRC by Spring 2014 and no later than September 15 of Fall 2014). This will allow the APRC time to review the initial query in order to determine whether or not the proposal is substantial enough to warrant a full APRC review.

In cases where the APRC deems a full review is necessary, authors should submit the full proposal no later than the end of October of the year prior to the desired implementation.

The committee recommends that authors follow these steps:

- 1) Conduct a thorough conversation with all faculty, chairs, and deans who will be impacted by the modified program. This is especially important when the proposal is interdisciplinary in nature (involving one or more departments and/or Colleges and Schools).
- 2) Once there is a sense of real consensus and support from all stakeholders, contact the chair of the APRC and arrange a meeting to discuss the guidelines and timeline for submission, review, and approval of the proposal.
- 3) Complete the Query to Modify an Existing Program and submit in electronic form to the APRC.
- 4) Following APRC review of the query, the committee chair will contact the author(s) with the Guidelines for the Modification of an Existing program.
- 5) The author(s) complete the proposal, following the guidelines as established by the APRC and taking care to include a full assessment plan, a careful articulation of comparator programs, a detailed budget, and signatures from all chairs and deans involved with and impacted by the proposal.
- 6) Submit the proposal in electronic form to the chair of the APRC, keeping in mind that the APRC review may take 6-8 weeks. Proposals should be submitted one year before the desired

implementation date (for example, for implementation in Fall 2014, proposals must be submitted to the APRC in Fall 2013).

THE COMMITTEE HIGHLY RECOMMENDS THAT THE AUTHOR(S) WORK WITH THE CHAIR OF THE APRC AS EARLY IN THE PROCESS AS POSSIBLE.

GUIDELINES FOR THE INITIAL QUERY:

The Query should be no longer than 5 pages

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

- 1. Name of program**
- 2. Author(s) of proposal**
- 3. Review process** Describe the planning and review process that was used to develop this proposed modification by (1) program faculty, (2) all directly affected programs, (3) all directly affected administrative units, (4) library, and (5) external review unit (if necessary).
- 4. Description of your program, including program goals and student learning outcomes, number of majors and/or minors, relationship to other programs in the School/ College and University at large**
- 5. Description of the impact of the proposed modification on other programs in the School/College and University**
- 6. Description and rationale for the proposed change, including a statement on how the proposed change will benefit students, the discipline, the School/College, the University, the scholarly community, and the community at large**
- 7. Description of modifications to the program prior to the proposed modifications.**
- 8. Description of impact of the change on enrollments, teaching loads and course distribution across fulltime, adjunct and visiting faculty**
- 9. Cover Page and signatures.** Attach a cover page with signatures from all appropriate administrators (for example, deans, chairs, program directors, etc. as referenced in section 2) who will be impacted and/or oversee the new program.

Please note that in its review, the committee may consult with faculty and administrators and may require the inclusion of other stakeholders in the proposal process.

APPENDIX THREE: APRC CHECKLIST MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROGRAM**APRC TIMETABLE AND KEY ELEMENTS FOR PROGRAM MODIFICATION PROPOSALS****Intended start date: Fall 2016**

15-12 months before intended start date (Spring-Fall 2015): meet with interested faculty in home department and other departments with a possible stake and engage in discussions with leadership in home college/school and other potentially involved schools and colleges; contact chair of the APRC; longer lead time for more complex modifications.

12 months before intended start date (early Fall 2015): submit query to APRC for initial review; APRC may request additional information or a fuller revised proposal; all queries must have prior approval of area dean(s) and have gone through prescribed processes at college/school level. APRC will make a recommendation by mid-late Fall semester.

9-6 months before intended start date (Spring 2016): work with Registrar on bulletin adjustments.

All modifications are subject to formal approval by the Provost following APRC recommendation.

Queries concerning program modifications should include the following:

- Clear description of the proposed changes and comparison of how the modified program will be different from the old program.
- Rationale for the intended modifications, addressing how they will strengthen the program, benefit students, and align with university objectives.
- Relationship of proposed modifications to any prior modifications in the program.
- Description of possible effects of the modifications on other programs.
- Discussion of the process by which the modifications were formulated, including dialogue with necessary stakeholders (faculty and administration).
- Explanation of any impact on faculty resources (teaching load or use of contingent faculty, for example).

- Signatures of all in leadership positions (department chairs, deans, etc.) who will oversee the program.

Please refer to the APRC Query to Modify and Existing Program Form for more detailed information on the required components. Note that modifications resulting from program review have an expedited process.

APPENDIX FOUR: APRC GUIDELINES FOR NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS

OVERVIEW OF THE REVIEW PROCESS:

All proposals for new programs (graduate and undergraduate), including new minors must be approved by the Academic Planning and Review Committee and the Provost prior to implementation (including bulletin changes). Modifications to or deletion of existing programs must also be approved by the APRC.

Proposals for all new programs, Graduate and Undergraduate, must be submitted to the APRC in electronic form. Once proposals have been submitted to the APRC for approval, a subcommittee will be formed to complete the review. The subcommittee may interview faculty, students, and administrators. It may decide, by majority vote, to request external consultants as part of the reviews of existing programs or of programs proposals. Consultants will be selected from a list of nominees submitted by the department involved. The APRC may also recommend the inclusion of other stakeholders in the proposal process.

Once the subcommittee has completed its review, it will write and submit a report to the full committee. The full committee will review the report and make its recommendation. Please note that the committee may decide to 1) recommend approval of the proposal, with or without qualifications; 2) recommend that the proposal be denied; or 3) return the proposal to the authors with recommendations for further revision.

Once the committee has decided what action it will recommend, the committee chair will write a letter to the Provost, summarizing the committee's findings, including an articulation of perceived strengths and weaknesses of the proposal as well as recommendations. The letter and committee's report will also be forwarded to the authors, Dean (s), and the Associate Provost for Strategic Planning and Educational Effectiveness. In the case of undergraduate programs, copies of the letter and report will be forwarded to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. In the case of graduate programs, copies of the letter and report will be forwarded to the Dean for Graduate Education. The Provost will make the final decision regarding the proposal and will communicate that to all involved as well as to the APRC.

TIMELINE:

The APRC review process will take approximately 6-8 weeks. Note that new programs must be approved by the end of the fall semester to be implemented in the following fall.

The committee recommends that authors follow these steps:

1. Conduct a thorough conversation with all faculty, chairs, and deans who will be impacted by the new program. This is especially important when the proposal is interdisciplinary in nature (involving one or more departments and/or Colleges and Schools).
2. Once there is a sense of real consensus and support from all stakeholders, contact the chair of the APRC and arrange a meeting to discuss the guidelines and timeline for submission, review, and approval of the proposal.
3. Complete the New Program Proposal, following the guidelines as established by the APRC and taking care to include a full assessment plan, a careful articulation of comparator programs, a detailed budget, and signatures from all chairs and deans involved with and impacted by the proposal. The committee advises that you allow twelve months for writing the proposal. We also advise that authors work closely with the APRC during this time.
4. Submit the proposal in electronic form to the chair of the APRC.

GUIDELINES FOR THE PROPOSAL

The entire document should not exceed 15 single-spaced pages, including tables and grids and excluding curriculum vitae. Each proposal for a new program must include the following:

1. Introduction. Provide a short introductory description of your program including the following: (1) name of the program; (2) proposed program administration; (3) author(s) of the proposal; (4) brief statement of the purpose and key features of the program, including program goals and student learning outcomes; (5) brief statement describing the program's relationship to existing programs and (6) brief statement justifying the program, including projected enrollments and statements regarding who the program will serve and how it will benefit students, the discipline, the University, the scholarly community and the broader community.

2. Planning and review process. Describe the planning and review process that was used to develop this program (1) program faculty, (2) all directly affected programs, (3) all directly affected administrative units, (4) library, and (5) external review unit (if necessary).

3. Program Mission, Vision, and Goals.

A. Program Mission Statement: This statement explains why your program exists and what it hopes to achieve in the future. It articulates the program's essential nature, its values, and its work. While anchored in the relevant discipline, this statement should demonstrate how the

program’s mission aligns with the mission and strategic plans of the University and College or School. It should also reflect on how teaching, scholarship, and service efforts are used to enhance student learning.

B. Program Vision Statement: This statement describes what the program would hope to be if it was achieving its mission. Describe your expectations of where the program will be in five years time.

C. Program Goals: This section aims for the program to clearly state and distinguish its goals (goals are broad statements that focus on what the program seeks to accomplish).

D. Alignment of program mission, vision, and goals with other University programs: Provide a statement describing how your program will interact with existing programs, highlighting any collaborative efforts and/or outcomes. Specify how the program differs from existing programs.

E. Relationship to University Governance: Describe how the program fits into University Governance (i.e. who will oversee the program, relationship to other governance structures within the School or College).

4. Curriculum & Scholarship of the Program. The proposal should provide detailed information on the curricula, pedagogical, and scholarly outcomes of the program for students and faculty in line with the mission and objectives of the university; that is, what are the goals and outcomes, what are the practices a program engages in to achieve these, and how are these practices aligned with specific goals and desired learning outcomes.

A. Program Curricula: Describe required curriculum for the new program. The chart below can be used as a guide for organizing the curriculum for a sample student in the program. State the lower division course requirements (specify which are required program core classes); state the upper division course requirements (specify which are required program core classes); and provide course descriptions for courses to be included in the curriculum.

	Fall	Units	Spring	Units	Total Units
Year 1	Courses		Courses		

Year 2	Courses		Courses		
Year 3	Courses		Courses		
Year 4	Courses		Courses		
Totals					

B. Statement of Student Learning Outcomes for Program: Student Learning Outcomes are specific statements that describe required learning achievement from the program. Outcomes should describe what students *should know* (the cognitive component), *should value* (the affective component, or attitudinal or values-based component), and *should be able to do* (the behavioral component, or performance or skills-based component) as a result of the program. Learning outcomes speak to the knowledge, skills, abilities, capacities, attitudes, dispositions and the like that students are expected to acquire in your program. They should be realistic, clearly stated, achievable, assessable, and stem from overarching program goals.

C. Alignment of curriculum and pedagogies with learning outcomes

CURRICULUM MAP TEMPLATE

Learning Outcomes	Required Courses, Experiences					

D. Statement of Scholarship Objectives: The scholarship objectives and research and/or creative activities of the faculty members should be integrated into the program to advance student learning and disciplinary or interdisciplinary understanding. Taken together, the objectives must show how the diversity of faculty research/creative activities contributes to the education of students in the program and promotes or advances disciplinary understanding.

5. Program Resources and Support. The proposal should provide analysis of the resources and institutional support which will be needed to implement the Program.

A. Describe the **faculty needed** to implement and sustain the program and provide complete *curriculum vitae* for each participating faculty member. Provide an explanation for any anticipated new faculty, including their roles in the new program, and the impact on existing programs in the department.

B. Describe the expected **administrative and support needs**.

C. Describe in detail **facility and equipment needs**. Provide a justification for and cost analysis of these resources, and explain how these will be financed. (These may include office space, studios, meeting rooms, laboratories, computers, other equipment, and other resources needed to run the program.)

D. Describe **library resources** which may be needed (i.e. journal subscriptions, book and/or media acquisitions) and how these will be financed. Please append the library’s cost estimate to support the new program.

E. Describe **projected enrollments** for this program and provide evidence for projections.

F. Provide a **projected summary budget** for each of the first three years as detailed above (6 a-e).

6. Program Implementation. The proposal should formulate an Implementation Plan and timeline for actions that are needed to realize the goals of the program. The plan should describe targeted goals to be achieved in each year of the 3 year budget cycle, such as: recruitment of faculty; student recruitment; timetables on how faculty and student recruitments will grow with the program until the program is fully established on campus and is self-sustaining; introduction of courses over time (once program is started).

7. Program assessment. The proposal must include a plan for on-going assessment. The assessment should focus on achievements in student learning, faculty scholarship, and contribution to the University mission. It should be clear how the proposed assessment measures the achievement of desired outcomes. Assessment plans should be consistent with APRC program review guidelines.

8. Evaluation with Comparator Schools. A minimum of three programs at different institutions should be selected, and at least one should represent a program to aspire to in the future. These programs should be justified for their relevance and significance to the proposed program. The proposal must indicate how the program will be similar to and different from other programs in comparable schools. It must

- a. Compare the requirements of the proposed program with the requirements of the comparator programs.
- b. Compare the curricular goals of the proposed program with the curricular goals of the comparator programs.
- c. Compare any other pertinent aspects of the proposed program with the comparator programs.
- d. Distinguish the proposed program from the comparator programs.

The chart below can be used as a guide to show how the proposed program compares with comparable programs at three other institutions.

College or university	Institution location and (undergraduate enrollment)	Program name	Average number of majors in the program over the last 3 years.	Number of full-time faculty in the program (Indicate the year)	Number of units required in the program*
Loyola Marymount University	Los Angeles, CA (4675)				

Comparison A: (Aspirational)					
Comparison B:					
Comparison C:					

* Indicate whether units are semester or quarter

9. Other Issues of Significance. Please provide any additional information and comments about the program that will help shed light on the feasibility and viability of the program at this institution (e.g., grants for establishing and supporting the program).

10. Cover Page and signatures. Attach a cover page with signatures from all appropriate administrators (for example, deans, chairs, program directors, etc. as referenced in section 2) who will be impacted by and/or oversee the new program.

APPENDIX FIVE: APRC CHECKLIST NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS

APRC TIMETABLE AND KEY ELEMENTS FOR NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS

Intended start date: Fall 2016

24 months before intended start date (Fall 2014): meet with interested faculty in home department and other departments with a possible stake and engage in discussions with leadership in home college/school and other potentially involved schools and colleges; meet with chair of the APRC to discuss process for submitting proposal.

18 months before intended start date (by late Spring 2015): send draft proposal to the APRC for feedback.

12 months before intended start date (early Fall 2015): submit formal revised proposal to APRC for review and recommendation to the Provost; all such proposals must have prior approval of area dean(s) and have gone through prescribed process at

college/school level. APRC may request clarification on various points or further information. The committee will make a recommendation by mid-late Fall semester.

9-6 months before intended start date (Spring 2016): work with Registrar on advertising program and setting program up in bulletin.

All modifications are subject to formal approval by the Provost following APRC recommendation.

Proposals for new programs should include the following:

- Rationale for the program: includes the mission, vision, and goals of the program, and its contribution to academic life at LMU.
- Description of governance of the program.
- Process by which the program was developed: includes discussions with stakeholders and other involved and/or impacted units, efforts to garner buy-in from faculty and leadership.
- Detailed curriculum with student learning outcomes for the program.
- List of program faculty and their expertise and competence.
- Realistic projection of program expenses, including reliance on contingent faculty and need for new library resources.
- Realistic projection of program demand and expected enrollments.
- Plan for advertising program and recruiting students.
- Analysis of comparator/competitor schools (locally and nationally): what makes this program at LMU like others and what makes it distinctive?
- Assessment plan for the program.
- Signatures of all in leadership positions (department chairs, deans, etc.) who will oversee the program.

Please refer to the APRC New Program Proposal Form for more detailed information on the required components.

APPENDIX SIX: Process for submitting Online and Hybrid course proposals to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee:

Once a proposal has been approved by the departmental or program faculty, the department chair/program director signs off on the proposal and submits it, in electronic form, to both the Curriculum Committee and the SFTV School Council, on behalf of the departmental/program faculty.

If faculty members are interested in submitting a new online/hybrid course or new program proposal, the Curriculum and Assessment Committee guidelines for modification to existing programs (CAC 1) and new program proposals (CAC 2) apply to the proposal.

Please address in the proposal all of the criteria included as Appendix 3 in the TELIG final report (Dec 2014, pag. 22)¹.

Criteria	Description
1. COURSE ELEMENTS: Provides course information, expectations, policies, and topic outlines typically stated in syllabus.	Includes items such as and not limited to course description, instructor contact information, course learning outcomes, prerequisites, grading criteria, course outline of topics, required and/or recommended readings, assignments, and due dates (consult standard LMU syllabus checklist for guidance)
2. TECHNOLOGY: Advises students on technology requirements for course, provides guidance for use of technology, and indicates relevant support structures.	Contains instruction on minimum computer requirements (hardware and software) as well as any other technology that will be used. Links to tutorials, contact information for resources that provide details for setting up necessary systems for use of technology, and for troubleshooting technical problems.
3. COURSE PRESENTATION: Shell has logical, consistent, and transparent structure and navigation.	Course structure is systematic and consistent; layout is user friendly and straightforward; all parts of the course are appropriately identified and can be easily accessed; instructions are clear; all links are functional. In every segment, all required material is available and easily accessible.
4. STUDENT ASSESSMENT: Provides clear guidelines and procedures for student assessment and specific	Instructions and policies are provided for students to follow when taking proctored exams/quizzes, including identifying possible

¹ <http://academics.lmu.edu/media/lmuacademics/telig/documents/TELIG%20FINAL%20REPORT%2012-15-14.pdf>

instructions for assignments, exams, etc.	locations for exams, and/or use of technology.
5. PEER INTERACTION: Provides appropriate opportunities for student engagement and interaction and sets clear expectations and standards for both.	Where relevant, clear evidence of appropriate instructional technology in service of student interaction, e.g. discussions, blogs, wikis, journals, peer reviews, chats, live sessions, etc.; establishes clear “netiquette” rules and expectations.
6. INSTRUCTOR INTERACTION: Provides opportunities for student and instructor interaction.	Provides opportunities and activities for instructor and student to engage throughout the course via instructional technology (e.g. office hours, scheduled feedback, synchronous meeting, chats, etc.)
7. ACCESSIBILITY: Complies with accessibility standards or provides contingency plan to satisfy accessibility standards.	In compliance with university policies.
8. UNIVERSITY POLICIES: Complies with relevant copyright rules, academic honesty guidelines, credit hour policy, and intellectual property policy.	

Approved October 22nd, 2015