

Introductory Criteria			
Introductory non-core electives	Introductory non-core electives tend to	Introductory non-core electives have readings at the 'textbook' level that tend to	Introductory non-core electives tend to have evaluations consisting of (<i>but not limited to</i>)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the basic foundation for a given discipline, introduce an overview of the discipline, or explore a subject area at an introductory level. Introductory courses will require students to begin to engage with the theoretical and methodological concerns of the given discipline. These courses will focus on introducing students to the current research in a field of study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore/explain a discipline or subject area via a guided tour/survey of the basic contours of a genre, field, or large conceptual category. • Inform students of key terms and general patterns of current research, but do not necessarily require direct, sustained engagement with the body of writing in a particular field. • Introduce students to basic research procedures/skills, including scholarly literature searches, basic citation strategies, assessing source validity. • May expose students, at an introductory level, to some instances of the interfaces between complementary fields (e.g. literature and philosophy/theory) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define and describe the field of study (and its sub-fields) for audiences who are generally unfamiliar with it. Examples may include textbook chapters that define the basic nature of a field and list general subfields. • Define/discuss basic terms, principles, concepts, and methods associated with the field. • May describe the basic nature of research in a particular field but do not generally address detailed topics/controversies /methods in research. Students may be introduced to seminal debates within the discipline. • For courses based on primary readings, (e.g. literature), engage with selections at an introductory level. Selections will tend to be shorter and more accessible than in Upper Level courses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midterm and final exams: essay, multiple choice, short-answer questions. • Shorter papers on topics of a basic, exploratory nature. • Research papers of limited scope/originality on topics of a basic, exploratory nature. • Presentations on topics of an exploratory nature.

Upper Criteria			
Upper non-core electives tend to	Upper non-core electives tend to	Upper non-core electives have readings at the 'textbook' level that tend to	Upper non-core electives tend to have evaluations consisting of (but not limited to)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on the application of conceptual analysis and advanced critical theory to a topic in a given discipline • These courses build on prior disciplinary learning and require greater depth of critical analysis, and advanced theory and research. In these courses, students access previous knowledge and apply it in new and relevant ways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on in-depth application of theory and research to a topic in a given discipline • Topics may be defined conceptually, theoretically, methodologically, or on the basis of interdisciplinary dialogue • Require discussion and application of advanced research skills • Engage with the interfaces of complementary fields (e.g. literature and philosophy/theory) in a mature and methodologically-aware fashion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent the research communities in the fields/sub-fields of the course, including refereed journal articles and substantial monographs, with particular attention to the critical debates within these fields/sub-fields • For courses incorporating significant primary readings (e.g. literature), analyze selections in the context of current theoretical discourse around those selections and/or their genres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midterm and final exams should generally be less emphasized here • A substantial research paper/project appropriate to the field(s) • Papers, projects, and/or presentations should be longer and more detailed than at the intermediate level, and should demonstrate evidence of substantial engagement with scholarly literature and critical debates within a field/sub-field • Presentations should be more seminar-style at this level • Scholarly literature reviews, either as separate assignments or within research papers, are desirable at this level

Scenario A – Mythology Non-Core Elective

A professor in the School of Language and Liberal Studies has proposed a course entitled “Greek Mythology” as a non-core elective. She has based this course on a popular diploma-level General Education elective course that examines mythology, folktales, and fairy tales.

The course is designed to have a mid-term exam and a final exam. It also asks students to produce a relatively short (1,500 words) research essay from a selection of topics provided by the instructor. There are other, periodic reflection pieces for students to demonstrate their learning throughout the course. Class participation does not receive a formal grade, but students are expected to use the class participation to form the basis of these reflection pieces.

The textbook for the course is Barry B. Powell’s *Classical Myth* (8th edition). Readings from the textbook are laid out for each week in the professor’s syllabus.

Questions

1. Using the rubric provided, categorize the level of this non-core course. What features of the scenario above help us to properly categorize this proposed course?
2. What advice would you give to the professor to ensure that the course is sufficiently different from the one offered as a General Education elective to diploma-level students?
3. What guidance would you provide to this professor about the learning outcomes for the course? How would those learning outcomes help to solidify the level at which this course is being offered?

Scenario A – Psychology Non-Core Elective

A professor in the School of Language and Liberal Studies has proposed a course entitled “Exploring the Brain” as a non-core elective. She has based this course on her research, but students will not have been required to take psychology in order to enroll in it. She has asked if she should include a note in the course description that suggests that prior study in psychology, anatomy, or a related field is an asset.

The course is designed in a seminar-style delivery model. The professor has determined a number of topics, but students will be the primary content deliverers and will hone the topics under consideration each week from Weeks 3-12 on the basis of the current critical consensus on each subject. Meanwhile, students will use the McGraw-Hill “Anatomy & Physiology” app in order to demonstrate how physical aspects of the brain relate to the cognitive topics under consideration in the seminars. The final course project will require a written report that demonstrates some dissection skill using the app in combination with the discipline-specific secondary research that students used to construct their seminars.

Each week, students will be given a series of links to articles through JSTOR and other database-accessible scholarly journals; in pairs, the students will determine which article is best to ‘assign’ their classmates to build the seminar-style discussion. Students are strongly encouraged to find at least one additional reading (not on the list) to supplement their seminar.

Questions

1. Using the rubric provided, categorize the level of this non-core course. What features of the scenario above help us to properly categorize this proposed course?
2. What advice would you give to the professor to ensure that the course is still appropriate for *non-core* learning? How would you address the professor’s concerns about a ‘soft’ prerequisite?
3. What guidance would you provide to this professor about the learning outcomes for the course? How would those learning outcomes help to solidify the level at which this course is being offered?

Scenario B – Honours Bachelor of Environmental Design & Planning

The Honours Bachelor of Environmental Design & Planning is about to undergo their consent-for-renewal application with the Ministry. As part of the process, the Program Evaluation Committee (PEC) has looked at the courses and made some suggestions. Based on PEC recommendations, the School of Art & Design would like to modify the curriculum and move the course PLAN-7003 (“Neighbourhood & Community Planning”) from Level 3 to Level 7 so that students will take it just before they start their co-op work term.

The current course description is as follows:

Neighbourhood and community denote recognized land areas; collections of sites characterized by a sense of place related to context. In conjunction with their design and GIS learning, students consider the theory and practice of community planning and design with a focus on the neighbourhood as a planning model. The natural and cultural dimensions of neighbourhood are studied in relation to planning history and design form. Suburban development is examined as an expression of planning thought and action directed at the creation of communities.

The School of Art & Design, supported by the PEC, believes that this course would be beneficial a little later in the student’s career. The current assignments are as follows:

Mid-term Examination: 30%
Sustainable Neighbourhood Plan: 40%
Neighbourhood Analysis Report: 30%

Questions

1. Using the non-core rubric, identify the attributes of this course that would need to be altered in order to change the level of this core course. What features of the non-core rubric can be maintained when developing a core rubric?
2. What advice would you give to the School to ensure that the course is appropriate to change levels? How would the assessments need to change (or be refined) in order to justify the curriculum modification?
3. What guidance would you provide to the School about the learning outcomes for this course? What considerations should be applied to the outcomes to support a move from Level 3 to Level 7? How should those considerations be reflected in a core rubric that can be globally used by any School undergoing curriculum modification requests for degree-level learning?

Scenario B – Honours Bachelor of Commerce (Digital Marketing)

The Honours Bachelor of Commerce (Digital Marketing) degree is about to undergo their consent-for-renewal application with the Ministry. As part of the process, the Program Evaluation Committee (PEC) has looked at the courses and made some suggestions. Based on PEC recommendations, the School of Business would like to modify the curriculum and move the course MKTG-7005 (“Search Engine Marketing”) from Level 6 to Level 2 so that students will be introduced to some of the key concepts of search engine ad words very early in the program.

The current course description is as follows:

This course will cover fundamental and advanced concepts in Search Engine Marketing using the Google AdWords pay per click (ppc) advertising platform. All students will participate in the Google Online Marketing Challenge in partnership with a client from industry. Each student team will be charged with creating, running and optimizing a live ppc campaign on behalf of their client. Project deliverables include AdWords account set up, geo & language targeting, keyword research, ad copywriting, goal setting, keyword bidding, campaign optimization and ROI measurement. Advanced course topics include display advertising, ad extensions, day parting, conversion tracking, remarketing, and demographic targeting. Students will be prepared to write the Google Fundamentals of Search Certification exam at the completion of the course.

The School of Business, supported by the PEC, believes that this course would be beneficial if it were turned into an introductory course early on, and then the students would be taught a more advanced Part 2 and 3 of the course in semesters 4 and 6. The current assignments are as follows:

Live-Client Google AdWord Portfolio: 100% [broken into pieces throughout the semester]

Questions

1. Using the non-core rubric, identify the attributes of this course that would need to be altered in order to change the level of this core course. What features of the non-core rubric can be maintained when developing a core rubric?
2. What advice would you give to the School to ensure that the course is appropriate to change levels? How would the assessments need to change (or be refined) in order to justify the curriculum modification?
3. What guidance would you provide to the School about the learning outcomes for this course? What considerations should be applied to the outcomes to support a move from Level 6 to Level 2? How should those considerations be reflected in a core rubric that can be globally used by any School undergoing curriculum modification requests for degree-level learning?