We have developed a rubric which provides qualitative descriptions of 16 components that distinguish learning-focused syllabi and uses a weighted quantitative scoring system that places syllabi on a spectrum from content-focused to learning-focused. It is flexible enough to accommodate a diverse range of levels, disciplines, institutions, and learning environments yet nuanced enough to provide summative information to developers using the tool for assessment purposes and formative feedback to instructors interested in gauging the focus of their syllabi.

**HOW WE DEVELOPED THE RUBRIC...**

**STEP 1**
Identify and articulate criteria describing promising, learning-focused syllabi.

1. Learning Goals & Objectives: 16 components
2. Assessment Activities: 5 components
3. Schedule: 1 component
4. Classroom Environment: 4 components
5. Learning Activities: 3 components

**STEP 2**
Develop a quantitative scoring system that places syllabi on a content- to learning-focused continuum.

- 0 - 18 = content-focused
- 41-58 = learning-focused

**STEP 3**
Determine validity constructs (e.g. Fink’s Taxonomy, goals vs objectives, alignment) and reliability.

- 3 revision cycles
- < 5-pt inter-rater differences

**RESULT:**

**WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>What the component looks like</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goals &amp; Objectives</td>
<td>3 components</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Activities</td>
<td>5 components</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>1 component</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
<td>4 components</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities</td>
<td>3 components</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A BIT OF DATA...**

Overall: t(32) = 10.41, p<.001; Goals & Objectives: t(32) = 7.53, p<.001; Assessment Activities: t(32) = 8.05, p<.001; Schedule: t(32) = 2.65, p=.006; Classroom Environment: t(32) = 10.62, p<.001
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