

***THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE: ROLE,
STRUCTURE, DUTIES, AND STANDARDS OF
GOOD PRACTICE***

ADOPTED FALL 1996

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Curriculum Committee, 1995-96

Luz Argyriou, chair, Napa Valley College
Kathleen Baker, Fullerton College
Donna Ferracone, Crafton Hills College
S. Craig Justice, Chaffey College
Ric Matthews, Miramar College
Bill Scroggins, Chabot College
Ron Vess, Southwestern College
Nancy Glock-Grueneich, Chancellor's Office
liaison
Joyce Black, CIO liaison, Pasadena City
College

Curriculum Committee, 1996-97

Bill Scroggins, chair, Chabot College
Luz Argyriou, Napa Valley College
Donna Ferracone, Crafton Hills College
Jannett Jackson, Fresno City College
Linda Lee, San Diego Miramar College
Jean Smith, San Diego Continuing Education
Bob Stafford, San Bernardino Valley College
Ron Vess, Southwestern College
Nancy Glock-Grueneich, Chancellor's Office
liaison
Joyce Black, CIO liaison, Pasadena City
College

Table of Contents

<u>Abstract</u> , Acknowledgment, Special Thanks		iii
I. <u>Introduction</u>		1
II. <u>The Role of the Curriculum Committee</u>		2
III. <u>Structure and Membership of the Curriculum Committee</u>		6
<u>Relationship Between the Academic Senate & the Curriculum Committee</u>		6
<u>Membership</u>		6
<u>The Curriculum Committee Chair</u>		7
<u>Support for Committee Activities</u>		8
<u>Governance Issues</u>		8
IV. <u>Duties and Responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee</u>		9
<u>Approval of New and Revised Courses</u>		9
<u>Approval of Credit Hours: The Carnegie Unit</u>		11
<u>Approval of Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Advisories on Recommended Preparation</u> ..		12
<u>Approval of Distance Education Courses and Sections</u>		12
<u>Approval of Associate Degree Requirements</u>		12
<u>Course Repetition</u>		14
<u>Approval of CSU-GE and IGETC Courses</u>		15
<u>Approval of New Degree and Certificate Programs</u>		15
<u>Discontinuation of Existing Programs</u>		16
V. <u>Other Duties Typically Assigned to Curriculum Committees</u>		16
<u>Catalog and Schedule of Classes</u>		16
<u>Program Review</u>		17
<u>Record Keeping and Dissemination</u>		18
<u>Prerequisite Review</u>		18
<u>Articulation</u>		18
<u>Placing Courses in Disciplines</u>		20
VI. <u>Curriculum Approval Good Practices</u>		21
<u>Origination of Proposals</u>		21
Preliminaries:		
<u>Review by Other Disciplines and District Colleges</u>		22
<u>Library Sign-Off</u>		22
<u>Technical Review</u>		23
<u>The Review Cycle: Reading, Discussion, Approval</u>		23
<u>Final Sign-Off by Faculty Chair/Co-Chair</u>		24
VII. <u>Subcommittee Structure and Good Practice</u>		24
VIII. <u>Maintaining Delegated Approval Authority: Good Practices</u>		25
<u>Approval Authority</u>		25
<u>The Knowledge Standard</u>		29
<u>The Procedure Standard</u>		31
<u>The Approvable Curricula Standard</u>		32
<u>Documentation</u>		32
IX. <u>Summary</u>		33

The Curriculum Committee: Role, Structure, Duties, and Standards of Good Practices The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Abstract

The curriculum committee plays a central role in the California Community Colleges. This role has expanded tremendously with the expanding role of faculty in community college governance and with the expanding demand for a curriculum which is flexible and responsive to the needs of our increasingly diverse student body. These demands have necessitated, now more than ever, that faculty understand the role of the curriculum committee, remain committed to high curriculum standards, and implement the college curriculum in an organized, efficient manner. To that end, this document reflects the collective wisdom of the faculty of the California Community Colleges and is recommended as a compilation of requirements and good practices to our colleagues charged with that task closest to our professional calling--the development, review, renewal, and approval of sound curricula.

Acknowledgment

The inspiration for this paper originated under the leadership of Jean Rincon-Germond who was the founding chair of the Academic Senate's Curriculum Committee and served with distinction as the Vice President of the Academic Senate, 1994-95. Her enthusiasm and creativity is gratefully acknowledged.

Special Thanks

The Curriculum Committee wishes to extend a special thanks to Craig Justice for hosting its meetings for three years at Chaffey College and for his service as a primary author of this paper. The goals of the state Academic Senate could not even be approached if not for the selfless service of individuals such as Craig.

The Curriculum Committee: Role, Structure, Duties, and Standards of Good Practices

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

I. Introduction

Given the diversity of disciplines and faculty and the varying degrees of shared governance currently operating in the system, practices utilized by curriculum committees throughout California's community college system vary widely. Nevertheless, a clear consensus about the main function of the curriculum committee has emerged. *The main function of the curriculum committee is that of primary responsibility for the development, review, renewal, and recommendation of curriculum to be approved by the Board of Trustees.*

Curriculum renewal and development necessarily reflect the collegial decision to meet student needs for course work that is encompassed within basic skills, general education, transfer, and major programs of study, which include a wide array of occupational and liberal arts disciplines and areas. *Effective* curriculum renewal and development require that the curriculum committee of each college utilize standards of practice that ensure the highest possible quality for the curriculum offerings that can be made available within allocated resources.

There is no single or monolithic list of "good practices" in the process of curriculum renewal and development. Instead, many effective practices exist that are appropriate within unique settings of shared governance of each local college. On the other hand, discussion about comparative practices often yields a consensus of what is likely to lead to effective, quality curriculum and therefore be considered a "good practice," and what practices that are likely to be problematic and thus should generally be avoided.

Attaining effective standards of good practice requires that a number of factors come together at the right time and place to arrive at a curriculum consistent with the mission of the community college. Effective leadership must be forthcoming from faculty, and administration must provide adequate resources and support so that effective, quality curriculum can be attained in a cost-effective manner. Regulations that have been promulgated must be understood widely, and clear models of good practice must be identified and disseminated. From all of these cooperative efforts should emerge a dynamic curriculum development and renewal process that produces the desired quality, effective curriculum. In addition, the process should be highly adaptive to needed changes and, at the same time, insulates quality, effective curriculum already in place from transitory, faddish, or disruptive pressures.

As faculty, we have dedicated our professional lives to ensuring that students are able to fulfill their educational potential. *The provision of instruction, with all the support services necessary to make that instruction possible, is the faculty's responsibility. The design of the curricula needed to carry out that instruction is a primary role of faculty and the major area of our professional expertise.* While each of us in our own disciplines provides the specific expertise to develop courses and programs in the areas of our training and preparation, the oversight of that process is our collective responsibility as members of the college faculty. That collective oversight is accomplished at the local level both by the academic senate, in its role of recommending policies

and procedures in the area of curriculum, and by the curriculum committee, as the vehicle by which the academic senate assures that those policies and procedures are implemented and that quality, effective courses and programs are recommended for approval.

This paper outlines the statutory and regulatory roles of the curriculum committee. Moreover, this paper describes the policies and procedures faculty have found to be most effective in putting those statutes and regulations into practice. Readers of this document should pay particular attention to the differentiation between curriculum committee functions which are “required” and those which are “good practice.”

The experiences of college curriculum committees throughout the system in developing curriculum are continually being discussed in a variety of forums, including semi-annual meetings of the Academic Senate, meetings of chief instructional officers, and in regional colloquia. The need for this paper was formally recognized at the Spring 1994 Plenary Session in passing Resolution 8.1 (Rincon-Germond):

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to prepare guidelines for local senates regarding model practices for curriculum committees which include, but are not limited to: standards for committee composition, role of department/division chairs, role of administrators, role of librarians, involvement in program review, and resource allocation, and to present such guidelines at a future session.

This paper will become the centerpiece of volume II of *The Curriculum Standards Handbook for the California Community Colleges: Good Practices* which will be prepared jointly by the Academic Senate and the Chief Instructional Officers. This volume will list and summarize the variety of good practices that are currently being employed as well as provide model documents, flow charts, and other materials that reflect the steps taken by colleges successful in their efforts to renew and develop their curriculum. Readers should refer to volume I, *The Curriculum Standards Handbook for the California Community Colleges: Legal and Procedural Requirements*, for required practices.

II. The Role of the Curriculum Committee

For decades the curriculum committee has been the major mechanism by which the primacy of faculty has been exercised in their central domain of expertise: developing and renewing the college curriculum and assessing its quality and effectiveness to the highest of professional standards. The primacy of faculty in the area of curriculum has been repeatedly confirmed by the Legislature in the form of statutes and by the Board of Governors in the promulgation of regulations to implement those statutes.

In AB 1725, the Legislature specifically required the Board of Governors to establish regulations ensuring the effective participation of local academic senates in governance, especially in the area of curriculum and academic standards (**bold and italics are added for emphasis**):

Ed. Code, §70901. (a) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall provide leadership and direction in the continuing development of the California Community Colleges as an integral and effective element in the structure of public higher education in the state. The work of the Board of Governors shall at all times be directed to maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local authority and control in the administration of the California Community Colleges.

(b) Subject to, and in furtherance of subdivision (a), and in consultation with community college districts and other interested parties as specified in subdivision (e), the Board of Governors shall provide general supervision over community college districts and shall, in furtherance thereof, perform the following functions:

(1) Establish minimum standards as required by law, including, but not limited to, the following:

(E) Minimum standards governing procedures established by governing boards of community college districts to ensure faculty, staff, and students the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and ***the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.***

While authority for final approval of educational programs remains with the Board of Governors, approval of the courses which constitute those programs lies with the local governing board. Furthermore, the Legislature differentiated between the role of the local governing board in *approving* courses and programs from that of the academic senate in having primary responsibility for *recommending* that curriculum.

Ed. Code, §70902. (a) ...The governing board of each community college district shall establish rules and regulations not inconsistent with the regulations of the Board of Governors and the laws of this state for the government and operation of one or more community colleges in the district.

(b) In furtherance of the provisions of subdivision (a), the governing board of each community college district shall do all of the following:

(2) ***Establish policies for and approve courses of instruction and educational programs.*** The educational programs shall be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval. Courses of instruction that are not offered in approved educational programs shall be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval. *[Note: Authority to approve courses not part of programs has been conditionally delegated to the local board. See the section of this paper on Maintaining Delegated Curriculum Approval.]* ***The governing board shall establish policies for, and approve, individual courses that are offered in approved educational programs without referral to the Board of Governors.***

(7) Establish procedures not inconsistent with minimum standards established by the Board of Governors to ensure faculty, staff, and students the right to participate effectively in district and college governance and ***the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.***

The Board of Governors is specifically called upon to establish policies to ensure the primary role of the academic senate in determining curriculum:

AB 1725. Section 61. The Board of Governors of the California Community colleges shall, by January 1, 1990, do all of the following:

(a) Develop policies and guidelines for strengthening the role of the academic senate with regard to the determination and administration of academic and professional standards, ***course approval and curricula***, and other academic matters.

The Board enacted regulations in this area as Title 5 Sections 53200-206.

Title 5, §53203. Powers.

(a) The governing board of a community college district shall adopt policies for the appropriate delegation of authority and responsibility to its college and/or district academic senate. Among other matters, said policies, at a minimum, shall provide that the governing board or its designees will consult collegially with the academic senate when adopting policies and procedures on academic and professional matters. This requirement to consult collegially shall not limit other rights and

responsibilities of the academic senate which are specifically provided in statute or other regulations contained in this part.

§53200. Definitions

(c) "Academic and professional matters" means the following policy development and implementation matters:

(1) Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines

(2) Degree and certificate requirements

(3) Grading policies

(4) Educational program development

(5) Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success

(6) District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles

(7) Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self study and annual reports

(8) Policies for faculty professional development activities

(9) Processes for program review

(10) Processes for institutional planning and budget development, and

(11) Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

(d) "Consult collegially" means that the district governing board shall develop policies on academic and professional matters through either or both of the following methods, according to its own discretion:

(1) Relying primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate; or

(2) That the district governing board, or such representatives as it may designate, and the representatives of the academic senate shall have the obligation to reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the governing board effectuating such recommendations.

As a consequence, each local governing board may adopt policies and procedures related to curriculum only if recommendations on those curriculum policies and procedures are made through collegial consultation with the local academic senate.

The curriculum committee is the vehicle upon which the local academic senate relies in carrying out its responsibility to develop curriculum recommendations for presentation to the local governing board. As stated in the Title 5 sections below, courses and programs must be recommended by the curriculum committee and approved by the governing board of a college district. The curriculum committee may either be a committee of the senate or a college committee whose composition is mutually agreed upon by the senate and the administration.

Title 5, §55002. Standards and Criteria for Courses and Classes

(a) Associate Degree Credit Course. An associate degree credit course is a course which has been designated as appropriate to the associate degree in accordance with the requirements of Section 55805.5, and which has been **recommended by the college and/or district curriculum committee** and approved by the district governing board as a collegiate course meeting the needs of the students eligible for admission.

(1) Curriculum Committee. The college and/or district curriculum committee recommending the course shall be established by the mutual agreement of the college and/or district administration and the academic senate. The committee shall be either a committee of the academic senate or a committee that includes faculty and is otherwise comprised in a way that is mutually agreeable to the college and/or district administration and the academic senate.

(2) Standards for Approval. **The college and/or district curriculum committee shall recommend approval of the course for associate degree credit** if it meets the following standards.... [Similar language appears in paragraph (b) for nondegree credit courses and in paragraph (c) for noncredit courses.]

Summary

The Education Code and Title 5 specify the following:

1. The academic senate has primary responsibility for making recommendations in the area of curriculum and academic standards [Ed. Code §70902(b)(7)]. This right is protected as a minimum standard set by the Board of Governors [Ed. Code §70901(b)(1)(E)].
2. The local governing board has the responsibility to establish policies for and approve courses of instruction and educational programs [Ed. Code §70902(b)(2)].
3. The Board of Governors has the responsibility to develop policies and guidelines for strengthening the role of the academic senate with regard to determination and administration of course approval and curricula [AB 1725 Section 61] and has done so in Title 5 §53203 and §55002.
4. The academic senate has the authority and responsibility delegated to it by the local board to develop recommendations on policies and procedures in academic and professional matters, which include curriculum [Title 5 §53203]. The board must consult collegially either by primarily relying on or reaching mutual agreement with the senate.
5. The curriculum committee has the responsibility to recommend to the local board those courses and programs which meet stated standards. It may be a committee of the senate or a college committee, but in either case its composition must be mutually agreed upon by the administration and the senate [Title 5 §55002].
6. The role of the administration is defined in the local shared governance policies and procedures of the district in the areas of curriculum development and renewal.

The curriculum committee reviews and recommends courses and programs functioning under policies and procedures set by the academic senate (either through primary advice to or mutual agreement with the board). The composition of the curriculum committee is agreed upon mutually even if for other curriculum policies and procedures the board relies primarily upon the senate. The board approves courses and programs recommended directly by the curriculum committee and with the assurance of the academic senate that established policies and procedures have been reviewed and followed. The Board of Governors has final approval for educational programs passed by the local board and assures that local governance procedures affirm the primary responsibility of the academic senate in academic and curricular matters.

The role of the curriculum committee is specified in Title 5 in the area of recommending courses and programs in the curriculum. However, other duties may be assigned to the committee as part of the shared governance structure of the college. This paper will cover standards of good practice for such additional areas as development of the catalog and the schedule of classes, program review, articulation, and placing courses in disciplines.

III. Structure and Membership of the Curriculum Committee

The curriculum committee plays a central role in the shared governance structure of the college and district. In designing the curriculum committee structure, the administration and academic senate are required to work together. Whether the curriculum committee is a committee of the senate or a college committee depends largely on the tradition and governance climate on the campus. Whatever the decision, the policies and procedures by which the committee will operate are determined by the academic senate, either solely or in partnership with the board. ***Because of this required senate oversight, there must be a direct link between the curriculum committee and the senate.***

Relationship Between the Academic Senate and the Curriculum Committee

The link between the academic senate and the curriculum committee can be accomplished in several ways. A common practice is to specify that the chair be a member of the senate. Often this is done by assigning the chairship to the past president or vice president of the senate. Alternately, the chair may be selected by the curriculum committee and then become an ex officio senate member. In any case, reports by the curriculum committee should be a regular senate agenda item.

The nature of the senate report requires comment. Typically, the committee reports both on the courses and programs to be recommended to the Board for approval (usually just a list) and on the procedures used (usually as committee minutes). Because Title 5 specifies that curriculum is recommended to the Board by the curriculum committee [Title 5 §55002(a)], it is not the role of the senate to change the recommendations. However, it is appropriate for the senate to review the policies and procedures used [Title 5 §53203(a)] and call attention to any irregularities which might require a recommendation to be returned to the committee for reconsideration.

Membership

Title 5 §55002(a)(1) requires that the curriculum committee contain faculty. Good practice dictates that the faculty be representative of the departments or divisions of the college. Several good models are in use. Division faculty may nominate curriculum committee members to be appointed by the senate. The senate may delegate its appointing authority [Title 5 §53203(f)] to a divisional election process. Some colleges have divisional curriculum committees which review its proposals for transmission to the college curriculum committee. Whatever the mechanism, terms of office should be of sufficient length (two or three years) and should be staggered to develop and retain experienced curriculum committee members.

Communication between discipline faculty and the curriculum committee is essential for smooth operation. Department and division meetings should have a regular spot on the agenda for a report from the representative to the curriculum committee. Discipline and divisional faculty should thoroughly review and approve new and revised curricula before forwarding them to the curriculum committee. Division deans and department chairs should facilitate the process but do not have approval or sign-off authority. Counseling and library faculty should be part of this representative model and each should select representatives to the curriculum committee.

Because curriculum is the primary responsibility of the faculty, the voting membership of the

committee should be predominantly faculty. Students must be provided an opportunity to participate in formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures on curriculum (Title 5 §51023.7); their right to vote on the committee is determined locally by mutual agreement between the academic senate and the board of trustees. The exclusive bargaining agent for the faculty also has the right to negotiate representation on the committee (Title 5 §53204). Key administrative functions which can assist the committee in its work include an instructional administrator, typically the chief instructional officer (CIO), and a student services administrator, typically the dean of counseling, as well as those responsible for articulation and matriculation--be they faculty or administrators. The voting status of administrators who may serve on the curriculum committee is a matter for local decision as the academic senate and the Board of Trustees work cooperatively to establish the shared governance structure of the college. Classified participation is not specified as an area of significant effect on classified staff as detailed in Title 5 §51023.5 and so classified staff do not generally participate as members of the curriculum committee. Good practice has shown the value in clearly defining term lengths for each committee member, with members being able to succeed themselves if so selected by their constituency. Term limits have not shown themselves to be good practice since valuable expertise tends to be lost.

The Curriculum Committee Chair

A key role on the committee is that played by the chair. Most colleges recognize the primacy of faculty in the area of curriculum by stipulating that the chair be a faculty member. Less commonly, a faculty member and the chief instructional officer co-chair the committee.

The role of the faculty chair varies significantly from college to college, particularly with the size of the institution. The following are typical duties. (See the appendix for some typical job descriptions.)

- prepare agendas
- conduct the committee meetings
- edit minutes (typically taken by a committee member or a classified person from the CIO's office)
- set the calendar of committee meetings
- keep informed of curriculum standards including Title 5, the Curriculum Standards Handbook, intersegmental, and accreditation
- supervise the orientation of new members and on-going training of continuing members
- assist discipline faculty in the curriculum development process (usually with faculty curriculum committee member from that division)
- assure that committee functions take place smoothly: technical review, prerequisite review, distance education review, general education review, library sign-off, articulation, and program review reports to the committee (see the appropriate sections of this paper)
- report regularly to the academic senate
- sign off on final version of curriculum recommendations to the Board
- sign off on IGETC and CSU-GE Breadth submittal forms
- review catalog drafts for concurrence with approved changes

The faculty chair or co-chair typically receives significant reassigned time for the year. A survey conducted by the Academic Senate in 1992 showed a median of 25% reassigned time for the

chair. Reassigned time is appropriate in principle, is cost-effective (especially when replacement is at hourly adjunct rates of pay), and is good practice. In addition, more reassigned time is appropriate when the curriculum committee has an expanded and active role in program review, policy and budget development, and in college governance. Also, when considering curriculum workload, the local college should consider reassigned time for those other than the chair who are doing work such as technical review and program review.

Several models of reassigned time allocation are in use. Some districts specify the curriculum chair time in the bargaining agreement. Some colleges give a block of reassigned time to the senate for its various duties, including curriculum committee chair. Other colleges give the time to the chair directly. Whatever the mechanism, adequate reassigned time for the chair is essential.

Support for Committee Activities

Adequate resources for curriculum committee operations is essential. Reassigned time for the chair has already been mentioned. Classified staff to maintain the systematic records needed for accurate curriculum is an imperative. The position is usually recognized for its unique skills with a title such as curriculum technician. Training of curriculum committee members and discipline faculty who develop curriculum must have specific funds set aside for that purpose. Travel and conference funds are needed for curriculum committee faculty to attend state academic senate plenary sessions, which regularly focus on curriculum issues, and other professional curriculum conferences. Involvement of the college in regional curriculum colloquia require a periodic commitment of resources. It is good practice for the academic senate to be involved in the determination of adequate resources devoted to curriculum and to have the appropriate line items within the academic senate budget. ***The implication for good standards that result from an expanded role for the faculty in curriculum development and renewal is clear: the curriculum committee and its chair require adequate reassigned time, secretarial support, and budget for supplies and equipment.***

Governance Issues

Accountability for quality, effective curricula which meet applicable standards is a shared responsibility. A rigorous curriculum review process is demanding and adherence to time lines is crucial to assure that deadlines are met for catalog publication, CSU General Education Breadth (CSU-GE) and Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) submissions, etc. Moreover, the strictures of Title 5 regulations, accreditation standards, CSU Executive Orders, Chancellor's Office standards and so on are detailed and voluminous. This is clearly an area in which faculty and administrative cooperation will greatly facilitate the decision making process. Administrators can aid the process by providing training opportunities, facilitating communication with and within the committee, assuring adequate clerical support, keeping an accurate historical file of committee actions and approved curricula, and supporting sufficient reassigned time to the faculty chair or co-chair. Following the principle of shared governance, all members of the committee share the responsibility of assuring courses and programs meet the highest academic standards and that the review and approval process runs smoothly so that deadlines can be met. Faculty take the responsibility for their primacy on curriculum matters seriously. It is they who would have to live with the results of poor quality programs and missed deadlines. It is they who have developed the curricula upon which has been built the outstanding national and international

reputation for excellence of the California Community Colleges.

IV. Duties and Responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee

Approval of New and Revised Courses

Curriculum committees review and approve degree-applicable credit courses, non-degree credit courses, and noncredit courses. No such review requirement exists for community service classes, Title 5 §55002(d) and §55160, or for contract classes for which the district claims no apportionment, §55170. Note that stand-alone courses which are not part of an approved program require Chancellor's Office approval as well unless the college has been delegated curriculum approval authority (see Title 5 §55100 and the section of this paper on "Maintaining Delegated Approval Authority"). The standards for degree-applicable credit courses appear in Title 5 §55002(a)(2).

Title 5, §55002(a) ***Associate Degree Credit Courses***

(2) ***Standards for Approval***

The college and/or district curriculum committee shall recommend approval of the course for associate degree credit if it meets the following standards:

- (A) ***Grading Policy.*** The course provides for measurement of student performance in terms of the stated course objectives and culminates in a formal, permanently recorded grade based upon uniform standards in accordance with Section 55758 of this Division. The grade is based on demonstrated proficiency in the subject matter and the ability to demonstrate that proficiency, at least in part, by means of essays, or, in courses where the curriculum committee deems them to be appropriate, by problem solving exercises or skills demonstrations by students.
- (B) ***Units.*** The course grants units of credit based upon a relationship specified by the governing board, between the number of units assigned to the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours of performance criteria specified in the course outline. The course also requires a minimum of three hours of work per week, including class time, for each unit of credit, prorated for short term, laboratory and activity courses.
- (C) ***Intensity.*** The course treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that requires students to study independently outside of class time.
- (D) ***Prerequisites and Corequisites.*** When the college and/or district curriculum committee determines, based on a review of the course outline of record, that a student would be highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade unless the student has knowledge or skills not taught in the course, then the course shall require prerequisites or corequisites that are established, reviewed, and applied in accordance with the requirements of Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 55200) of this Subchapter.
- (E) ***Basic Skills Requirements.*** If success in the course is dependent upon communication or computation skills, then the course may require, consistent with the provisions of Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 55200) of this Subchapter, as prerequisites or corequisites eligibility for enrollment in associate degree credit courses in English and/or mathematics, respectively.
- (F) ***Difficulty.*** The course work calls for critical thinking and the understanding of concepts determined by the curriculum committee to be at college level.
- (G) ***Level.*** The course requires learning skills and a vocabulary that the curriculum committee deems appropriate for a college course.

Non-degree credit courses are precollegiate basic skills courses, as described in Title 5 §55002(d), and courses designed to enable students to succeed in college-level work such as college orientation, guidance, and preparatory courses in individual disciplines that integrate basic

skills instruction with discipline specific material. Non-degree credit courses also include foundation and core courses in occupational programs which do not require the rigor of the standards for degree-applicable courses. In non-degree credit courses the grade is based, at least partially, on mastery of basic skills. The standards for non-degree credit courses appear in Title 5 §55002(b)(2).

Title 5, §55002(b) *Non-Degree Credit Courses*

(2) **Standards for Approval.** The college and/or district curriculum committee shall recommend approval of the course on the basis of the standards which follow. In order to be eligible for state apportionment, such courses must be approved (as courses not part of programs) by the Chancellor's Office as provided in section 55100 of this Division.

(A) **Grading Policy.** The course provides for measurement of student performance in terms of the stated course objectives and culminates in a formal, permanently recorded grade based upon uniform standards in accordance with section 55758 of this Division. The grade is based on demonstrated proficiency in the subject matter and the ability to demonstrate that proficiency, at least in part, by means of written expression that may include essays, or, in courses where the curriculum committee deems them to be appropriate, by problem solving exercises or skills demonstrated by students.

(B) **Units.** The course grants units of credit based upon a relationship specified by the governing board between the number of units assigned to the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours or performance criteria specified in the course outline. The course requires a minimum of three hours of student work per week, per unit, including class time and/or demonstrated competency, for each unit of credit, prorated for short-term laboratory, and activity courses.

(C) **Intensity.** The course provides instruction in critical thinking and generally treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that prepare students to study independently outside of class time and includes reading and writing assignments and homework. In particular, the assignments will be sufficiently rigorous that students completing each such course successfully will have acquired the skills necessary to successfully complete college-level work upon completion of the required sequence of such courses.

(D) **Prerequisites and corequisites.** When the college and/or district curriculum committee deems appropriate, the course may require prerequisites or corequisites for the course that are established, reviewed, and applied in accordance with Article 2.5 (commencing with section 55200) of this Subchapter.

Noncredit courses are also the responsibility of the curriculum committee. Standards appear in Title 5 §55002(c).

Title 5, §55002(c) *Noncredit Courses*

A noncredit course is a course which, at a minimum, is recommended by the college and/or district curriculum committee (the committee described and established under subdivision (a)(1) of this section) and approved by the district governing board as a course meeting the needs of enrolled students.

Standards for Approval. The college and/or district curriculum committee shall recommend approval of the course if the course treats subject matter and uses resource materials, teaching methods, and standards of attendance and achievement that the committee deems appropriate for the enrolled students. In order to be eligible for state apportionment, such courses are limited to the categories of instruction listed in Education Code section 84711, and must be approved by the Chancellor's Office as noted in Title V, section 55150.

In addition, *The Curriculum Standards Handbook, Volume I*, sets forth the following criteria for course approval:

3.1 Appropriateness to Mission

The stated goals and objectives of the proposed program, or the objectives defined in the course Outline of Record, are consistent with the mission of the community colleges as formulated in Title 5 §55130(b)(5), and 55180 and with the mission and comprehensive or master plan of the college. Curricula fall within the mission when designed to be taught to lower division students for credit towards the degree, and/or for purposes of transfer, occupational preparation, or career supplementation or upgrade, rather than for a vocational use. Courses that develop the ability of students to succeed in college level courses and adult noncredit instruction also fall within the mission.

For courses to be mission appropriate, they must also *not* be designed primarily to provide group activities or services, (e.g. physical activity, counseling, or assessment) but rather to provide systematic instruction in a body of content or skills whose mastery forms the basis of the student grade. A vocational, community service, and contract courses do not qualify for state funding, but do fall within the mission if they are self-supporting.

3.2 Need

There is a demonstrable need for a course or program that meets the stated goals and objectives, at this time, and in the region the college proposes to serve with the program.

3.3 Quality

Courses and programs are integrated, with courses designed to effectively meet their objectives and the goals and objectives of the programs for which they are required. Outlines of Record for each course meet the standards outlined in Section 4.

3.4 Feasibility

The college has the resources to maintain the course or program in which the course is required at the level of quality described in course Outlines of Record and the new program application. Local approval procedures for new curriculum incorporate a detailing of costs sufficient to determine that this criterion can be fulfilled by the college.

In the case of programs, the college's affirmation of its ability to offer the program is based at least partly upon an analysis of cost estimates and includes a commitment to offer the required courses at least once every two years, unless the goals and rationale for the particular program justify a longer time frame as being in the best interests of students.

3.5 Compliance

The course or program complies with all other laws applicable to it, including federal regulations, licensing requirements, and the particular legal requirements for courses explained in 4.8 of this Handbook.

Approval of Credit Hours: The Carnegie Unit

In reviewing and approving courses, curriculum committees must assure that the units offered are commensurate with the hours necessary for the course, both in and out of the classroom (Title 5 §55002 cited above). This is known as the Carnegie unit relationship, the essence of which requires a normative commitment of the student's time of 3 hours per week per unit of credit. Clearly some students will put in more or less time, depending on their ability and level of personal commitment; however, the structure of the course in terms of semester or quarter units presumes this normative standard and is the basis of scheduling within the academic calendar. The course outline of record will state student units and the number of in-class contact hours, which are 50-minutes in length.

The basis for the Carnegie unit, in addition to the above citation, is referenced in Title 5 §55002.5 for situations in which course duration is other than the standard 16 weeks.

Title 5, 55002.5. ***Credit Hour; Allowance for Shorter Term.***

One credit hour of community college work is approximately three hours of recitation, study, or

laboratory work per week throughout a term of 16 weeks. Where a term is more or less than 16 weeks, more or less than one credit hour shall be allowed in the same ratio that the length of the term is to 16 weeks.

Credit for Cooperative Work Experience Education is based on a formula of 75 hours of paid work or 60 hours of non-paid work for each semester credit hour for a maximum of 16 semester credit hours (Title 5 §55253 and §55256.5).

The Carnegie unit relationship determines student units or "load;" however, faculty load is not exclusively determined by the Carnegie unit or the system's MIS classification categories, which are based on the Carnegie unit. Faculty load issues (e.g. regarding faculty unit credit for lecture, laboratory, studio, composition, *et al.*) are governed separately by agreement between the faculty's collective bargaining representative and the college district. Good practice suggests that when disputes regarding faculty load arise, the issue should be redirected to the faculty bargaining agent to be resolved apart from the curriculum committee. The curriculum committee's main role is to assign accurately and appropriately *student units*.

Approval of Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Advisories for Recommended Preparation

Curriculum committees must approve prerequisites, corequisites and advisories and must do so by separate action from that used in approving the course. Title 5 §55200-202 covers the requirements of prerequisites, the *Model District Policy*, endorsed by the Academic Senate Spring 1993 Plenary Session and adopted by the Board of Governors in September of 1993, gives state guidelines for the process, and *The Curriculum Standards Handbook* discusses prerequisites in section 4.7. In the fall of 1994 the Academic Senate issued a compilation of the prerequisite requirements and sample college implementation documents in the paper *Curriculum Orientation Package III, Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Advisories*. In addition the Academic Senate is in the process of developing a paper on good practices in the development, approval, and implementation of prerequisites, corequisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and other limitations on enrollment.

Approval of Distance Education Courses and Sections

Courses and sections delivered by distance education must be separately reviewed and approved by the curriculum committee. Title 5 regulations for distance education appear in sections 55352 to 55380. Requirements and good practices are discussed in the Academic Senate paper *Curriculum Committee Review of Distance Learning Courses and Sections* adopted by the Fall 1995 Plenary Session.

Approval of Associate Degree Requirements

Criteria established by the local board to implement Associate Degree requirements must follow the standards in Title 5 §55002(a) including recommendation by the curriculum committee. In establishing the Associate Degree requirements, districts must adopt a board policy on its philosophy on general education (§55805), include only courses of appropriate level (§55805.5), and adhere to the minimum requirements set by the Board of Governors (§55806).

Title 5, §55805. ***Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education***

(a) The governing board of a community college district shall adopt a policy which states its specific philosophy on General Education. In developing this policy governing boards shall consider the following policy of the Board of Governors:

The awarding of an Associate Degree is intended to represent more than an accumulation of units. It is to symbolize a successful attempt on the part of the college to lead students through patterns of learning experiences designed to develop certain capabilities and insights.

Among these are the ability to think and to communicate clearly and effectively both orally and in writing; to use mathematics; to understand the modes of inquiry of the major disciplines; be aware of other cultures and times; to achieve insights gained through experience in thinking about ethical problems; and to develop the capacity for self-understanding. In addition to these accomplishments, the student shall possess sufficient depth in some field of knowledge to contribute to lifetime interest. Central to an Associate Degree, General Education is designed to introduce students to the variety of means through which people comprehend the modern world. It reflects the conviction of colleges that those who receive their degrees must possess in common certain basic principles, concepts and methodologies both unique to and shared by the various disciplines. College educated persons must be able to use this knowledge when evaluating and appreciating the physical environment, the culture and the society in which they live. Most importantly, General Education should lead to better self-understanding.

In establishing or modifying a general education program, ways shall be sought to create coherence and integration among the separate requirements. It is also desirable that general education programs involve students actively in examining values inherent in proposed solutions to major social problems.

(b) The governing board of a community college district shall also establish criteria to determine which courses may be used in implementing its philosophy on the associate degree and general education.

(c) The governing board of a community college district shall, on a regular basis, review the policy and criteria established pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

Title 5, §55805.5 *Types of Courses Appropriate to the Associate Degree*

The criteria established by the governing board of a community college district to implement its philosophy on the associate degree shall permit only courses that conform to the standards specified in Section 55002 (a) and that fall into the following categories to be offered for associate degree credit:

(a) All lower division courses accepted toward the baccalaureate degree by the California State University or University of California or designed to be offered for transfer.

(b) Courses that apply to the major in non-baccalaureate occupational fields.

(c) English courses not more than one level below the first transfer level composition course, typically known as English 1A. Each student may count only one such course as credit toward the associate degree.

(d) All mathematical courses above and including Elementary Algebra.

(e) Credit courses in English and mathematics taught in or on behalf of other departments and which, as determined by the local governing board, require entrance skills at a level equivalent to those necessary for the courses specified in sections (c) and (d) above.

Title 5, §55806 *Minimum Requirements for the Associate Degree*

The governing board of a community college district shall confer the degree of Associate in Arts or Associate in Science upon a student who has demonstrated competence in reading, in written expression, and in mathematics, and who has satisfactorily completed at least 60 semester units or 90 quarter units of college work. This course work requirement must be fulfilled in a curriculum accepted toward the degree by a college within the district (as shown in its catalog.) It must include at least 18 semester or 27 quarter units in General Education and at least 18 semester or 27 quarter units in major as prescribed in this section. Of the required units, at least 12 semester or 18 quarter units must be completed in residence at the college granting the degree. Exceptions to residence requirements for the Associate Degree may be made by the governing board when it determines that an injustice or undue hardship would be placed on the student.

(a) Major Requirements. At least 18 semester or 27 quarter units of study taken in a single discipline

or related disciplines, as listed in the Community Colleges "Taxonomy of Programs" shall be required.

(b) General Education Requirements.

(1) Students receiving an Associate Degree shall complete a minimum of 18 semester or 27 quarter units of general education, including a minimum of three semester or four quarter units in each of the areas (A), (B) and (C) and the same minimum in each pair of (D). The remainder of the units requirement is also to be selected from among these four divisions or learning or as determined by local option:

(A) Natural Sciences.

Courses in the natural science are those which examine the physical universe, its life forms, and its natural phenomena. To satisfy the General Education Requirement in natural sciences, a course shall be designed to help the student develop an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method, and encourage an understanding of the relationships between science and other human activities.

This category would include introductory or integrative courses in astronomy, biology, chemistry, general physical science, geology, meteorology, oceanography, physical geography, physical anthropology, physics and other scientific disciplines.

(B) Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Courses in the social and behavioral sciences are those which focus on people as members of society.

To satisfy the general education requirement in social and behavioral sciences, a course shall be designed to develop an awareness of the methods of inquiry used by the social and behavioral sciences. It shall be designed to stimulate critical thinking about the ways people act and have acted in response to their societies and should promote appreciation of how societies and social subgroups operate. This category would include introductory or integrative survey courses in cultural anthropology, cultural geography, economics, history, political science, psychology, sociology and related disciplines.

(C) Humanities.

Courses in the humanities are those which study the cultural activities and artistic expressions of human beings. To satisfy the general education requirement in the humanities, a course shall be designed to help the student develop an awareness of the ways in which people through the ages and in different cultures have responded to themselves and the world around them in artistic and cultural creation and help the student develop aesthetic understanding and an ability to make value judgments. Such courses could include introductory or integrative courses in the arts, foreign language, literature, philosophy, and religion.

(D) Language and Rationality.

Courses in language that cover the principles and applications of language toward logical thought, clear and precise expression and critical evaluation of communication in whatever symbol system the student uses.

1. English Composition. Courses fulfilling the written composition requirement shall be designed to include both expository and argumentative writing.

2. Communication and Analytical Thinking. Courses fulfilling the communication and analytical thinking requirement include oral communication, mathematics, logic, statistics, computer languages and programming, and related disciplines.

(2) While courses might satisfy more than one general education requirement, it may not be counted more than once for these purposes. A course may be used to satisfy both a general education requirement and a major requirement. Whether it may be counted again for a different degree requirement is a matter for each college to determine. Students may use the same course to meet a general education requirement for the Associate Degree and to partially satisfy a general education requirement at the California State University, if such a course is eligible under the provisions of section 40405 of this title.

(3) Ethnic Studies will be offered in at least one of the required areas.

Course Repetition

Courses may be repeated up to three times (that is, taken up to four total times) if the course content differs each time a student repeats it. Course repetition requires that the student gains an

added educational experience in which particular skills are enhanced or for which individual study or group assignments are the primary modes of instruction each time the course is taken. The curriculum committee must assure that the course outline of record clearly states the enhanced educational experience gained with each repetition or that the method of instruction is individual study or group assignments. The catalog description of the course must include the repeatability limitation, e.g., "this course may be repeated three times," "this course may be repeated for a total of 6 units earned," or "may be taken four times." Colleges with delegation of curriculum approval authority may assign repeatability without Chancellor's Office approval (see the section of this paper on "Maintaining Delegated Approval Authority"); from Title 5:

Title 5, §58161(c) ***Course Repetition***

State apportionment for repetition of courses not expressly authorized by this section may be claimed upon approval of the Chancellor in accordance with the following procedure:

- (1) The district must identify the courses which are to be repeatable, and designate such courses in its catalog;
- (2) The district must determine and certify that each identified course is one in which the course content differs each time it is offered, and that the student who repeats it is gaining an expanded educational experience for one of the two following reasons:
 - (A) Skills or proficiencies are enhanced by supervised repetition and practice within class periods; or
 - (B) Active participatory experience in individual study or group assignments is the basic means by which learning objectives are obtained.
- (3) The district must develop and implement a mechanism for the proper monitoring of such repetition. The attendance of students repeating a course pursuant to this subsection when approved by the Chancellor, may be claimed for state apportionment for more than three semesters or five quarters.

The Curriculum Standards Handbook includes the following guidelines as well:

4.8.2 Repeatable Courses

Courses that develop similar skills but (a) at increasingly sophisticated levels of practice, and/or (b) that are applied to different content (such as a drama course in which students master increasingly demanding roles in different plays) may be offered as repeatable courses, if approved for that purpose by the Chancellor's Office, or if the college has delegated course approval authority.

Each such repetition of a course must be designed to create a discernibly higher level of achievement such that the academic progress is clearly defined and the grading standards increase substantially with each repetition.

A given student may take the repeatable course for credit, and for state apportionment, for up to the number of times the college has specified, but for no more than a total of four times altogether.

A college may indicate the sequence of repeatable courses with differing letters or numbers or course titles, such as 101A-D, or 101-4, or "Beginning", "Intermediate", and "Advanced". Or the college may simply permit a student to enroll up to three additional times after completion the course in question for the first time. But the college may *not* do both: it cannot both designate a series of courses of increasingly advanced work in the same subject area, and then permit repeated enrollment at each of those levels.

Approval of CSU-GE and IGETC Courses

Approval of the curriculum committee and sign-off by the curriculum committee chair are required for the annual submission of courses for the California State University General Education-Breadth (CSU GE-Breadth) and the Intersegmental General Education Transfer

Curriculum (IGETC) requirements. In the fall of 1994 the Academic Senate issued a compilation of the CSU GE-Breadth and IGETC requirements and sample college implementation documents in the paper *Curriculum Orientation Package II, Transfer General Education*.

Approval of New Degree and Certificate Programs

An educational program is “an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education” (Title 5 §55000). Programs may thus be considered to have one of two general goals: degree, certificate and licensing programs which prepare students to directly enter an occupation and programs which prepare students for transfer. Occupational and transfer program follow different approval procedures.

All programs must be 1) published in the college catalog with a specific title, 2) result in a degree or certificate, 3) consist of a specific set of required courses, and 4) have stated goals and objectives. Courses are a required part of a program if they are 1) required for a degree or certificate in the program major, 2) part of the general education requirements for that degree, or 3) part of a set of restricted electives, that is, a set of courses of which the student must complete at least one to meet the degree or certificate requirements. (*The Curriculum Standards Handbook*, Section 5.1)

Occupational programs must be approved by the Chancellor before being offered [Title 5 §55230(a)]. No such state approval is required for “new transfer programs that are the subject of an articulation agreement that specifies that all courses required in the new community college program will be counted by a four year college towards the fulfillment of either its own general education or the major requirements in a specified discipline” (*The Curriculum Standards Handbook*, Section 5.2).

The approval process for new occupational programs is described in Title 5 §55130 and in Chapter 5 of the *The Curriculum Standards Handbook*. Submission of a New Program Application requires the signature of both the curriculum committee chair and the academic senate president. The Academic Senate is also preparing a separate paper on good practices in developing, reviewing, and approving new occupational programs and a separate paper on good practices in articulation.

Discontinuation of Existing Programs

Districts should have an agreed-upon process for discontinuing programs on the basis of criteria established in the Education Code, §78016. In addition, the Chancellor’s Office, as authorized in Title 5 §55130(d), may evaluate programs and determine that an educational program should no longer be offered. The *Curriculum Standards Handbook* does not yet address such criteria or processes, but guidelines are planned for the near future and will specify a key role for the curriculum committee.

Title 5, §55130(d)

An approval is effective until the program or implementation of the program is discontinued or modified in any substantial way. From time to time the Chancellor may evaluate an educational program, after its approval, on the basis of factors listed in this section. If on the basis of such an evaluation the Chancellor determines that an educational program should no longer be offered, the Chancellor may terminate the approval and determine the effective date of termination.

Ed. Code, §78016 Review of program; termination

(a) Every vocational or occupational training program offered by a community college district shall be reviewed every two years by the governing board of the district to assure that each program, as demonstrated by the California Occupational Labor Market Information Program established in Section 10533 of the Unemployment Insurance Code, or if this program is not available in the labor market area, other available sources of labor market information, does all of the following:

(1) Meets a documented labor market demand

(2) Does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the area.

(3) Is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students.

(b) Any program that does not meet the requirements of subdivision (a) and the standards promulgated by the governing board shall be terminated within one year.

(c) The review process required by this section shall include the review and comments by the County Private Industry Council established pursuant to Division 8 (commencing with Section 15000) of the Unemployment Insurance Code, which review and comments shall occur prior to any decision by the appropriate governing body.

(d) The provisions of this section shall apply to each program commenced subsequent to July 28, 1983.

V. Other Duties Typically Assigned to Curriculum Committees

Catalog and Schedule of Classes

Colleges are required to publish complete information about each course (Title 5 §55005):

- status as credit, noncredit, or community service
- transferability
- fulfillment of major and general education requirements
- availability of credit/non-credit option (§55752)

Colleges must also publish in the catalog the course work requirements for the Associate Degree, both in general education and in the major (§55806). The catalog description of each course must include any prerequisites, corequisites, advisories, or other limitations on enrollment. Elsewhere in the catalog must appear all other related prerequisite policies and procedures (§55202). The catalog description of a course must also include the repeatability, if any (§55161(c)(1)).

Accreditation standards also require accurate and complete curriculum information in the catalog.

As stated in the *Handbook of Accreditation And Policy Manual (1996)* produced by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges,

- 2.1 The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to its constituencies, the public, and prospective students through its catalogues, publications, and statements, including those presented in electronic formats. Precise, accurate, and current information is provided in the catalog concerning (a) educational purposes; (b) degrees, curricular offerings, educational resources, and course offerings; (c) student fees and other financial obligations, student financial aid, and fee refund policies; (d) requirements for admission and for achievement of degrees, including the academic calendar and information regarding program length; and (e) the names of administrators, faculty, and governing board.

Curriculum committee involvement in the preparation of the catalog and schedule of classes sections dealing with the curriculum is good practice. Review of the accuracy of course catalog descriptions, particularly those recently added or revised, benefits tremendously from perusal by

those who approved that material. Such benefits apply equally to the catalog listings of program major course requirements, general education requirements, transferability to UC and CSU, prerequisite policies, and CSU GE-Breadth and IGETC course listings. It is also good practice for the course description used in the schedule of classes--usually more terse than the catalog description--to be included as part of the course outline of record. This gives the curriculum committee the opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of the wording in reflecting the overall course outline.

It is also good practice for the curriculum committee to receive copies of transfer articulation agreements and "major sheets." These agreements serve as the basis for the transfer programs reviewed and approved by the curriculum committee. Additionally, another "set of eyes" reviewing campus publications on curriculum can increase communication among campus segments and provide useful feedback to those preparing the publications.

Program Review

As part of maintaining accreditation, colleges are required to regularly review their curriculum. As stated in the *Handbook of Accreditation And Policy Manual (1996)* produced by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges,

- 4D.1 The institution has clearly defined processes for establishing and evaluating all of its educational programs. These processes recognize the central role of faculty in developing, implementing, and evaluating the educational programs. Program evaluations are integrated into overall institutional evaluation and planning and are conducted on a regular basis.

The most direct implication of the accreditation standards is the need to review each course outline of record on a regular basis, at least within the six-year accreditation cycle. Good practice for occupational programs is to review the program to the standards required by Ed. Code §78016 (see above) every two years and then do a course-by-course review for curriculum standards every six years. This specific review of the course outlines is much more effective if conducted within the scope of a review of the entire program of which the course is a part. It is good practice for such program-by-program reviews to be communicated to the curriculum committee. In this way, curriculum committees become more aware of the overall development plan into which future course outline proposals will fit.

Good practices for conducting program reviews can be found in the Academic Senate's paper *Program Review: Developing a Faculty Driven Process*, adopted in spring 1996. It is good practice to incorporate curriculum review as an integral part of the program review process. For example, a self-study questionnaire could be utilized each year to estimate the curriculum committee's workload that would, at the same time, elicit consideration of alterations in the course outline of record, prerequisites, and development of new courses. (See Appendix B for an example of such a questionnaire.)

Record Keeping and Dissemination

It is good practice to establish filing systems that are discipline-based. Discipline files include Course Outlines of Record, program review documents, correspondence, advisory committee minutes (for occupational programs), copies of transfer agreements, and so on. These files should

be easily accessible in a central location such as the library or CIO's office. It is especially important that Course Outlines of Record be available to faculty, particularly part-time faculty, and to students.

Prerequisite Review

Title 5, §55201(b)(3), requires that prerequisites be reviewed on a regular six-year cycle. Although the *Model District Policy* does not specify the nature of such a review, it is good practice for this review to be part of the regular program review cycle adopted by the college and for the prerequisite review to be presented to the curriculum committee along with any changes identified by the discipline faculty for revisions or additions to existing prerequisites.

Title 5, §55201(b)(3)

...These processes [reviewing prerequisites and corequisites] shall provide that at least once each six years all prerequisites and corequisites established by the district shall be reviewed. These processes shall also provide for the periodic review of advisories on recommended preparation.

Articulation

The curriculum committee plays an important role in articulation. The nature of that role is determined at the local campus. An essential communication link is that between the committee and the articulation officer, who should be a member of the committee. A central resource for the process is the *Handbook of California Articulation Policies and Procedures (1995)*. The *Handbook* was prepared by the California Intersegmental Articulation Council in collaboration with the three public higher education systems plus the Intersegmental Coordinating Council, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, and the California Articulation Number System. The *Handbook* provides a useful definition of the process:

Course articulation . . . is the process of developing a formal, written agreement that identifies courses (or sequences of courses) on a "sending" campus that are comparable to, or acceptable in lieu of, specific course requirements at a "receiving" campus. Successful completion of an articulated course assures the student and the faculty that the student has taken the appropriate course, received the necessary instruction and preparation, and that similar outcomes can be assured, enabling progression to the next level of instruction at the receiving institution.

The *Handbook* goes on to comment on the role of faculty in articulation:

The actual process of developing and reviewing curriculum and coursework to determine course comparability between institutions rests with the faculty at the respective institutions. Faculty in each discipline are responsible for the actual review of course content, the identification of comparable courses, and the authorization of acceptance of specific courses for transferring students. Once this review, identification, and formal written acceptance process has occurred, a course (or courses) is said to have been "articulated." Implicit in the articulation process is involvement, communication, and cooperation between the respective faculties who mutually develop curriculum and establish requirements and standards for articulated courses.

It is important to note that articulated courses are not to be construed as "equivalent" but rather as comparable, or acceptable in lieu of each other. The content of the courses on the respective campuses is such that successful completion of the course on one campus assures the necessary background, instruction, and preparation to enable the student to progress to the next level of instruction at another campus.

The role of the articulation officer is to be the contact person and mediator between campuses, to be the liaison to the system level offices, to serve on the curriculum committee and other committees as appropriate, to maintain and communicate accurate articulation information, and to stay well informed and inform others on articulation issues.

In reviewing and approving courses, the curriculum committee should evaluate the appropriateness of the course to meet articulation standards. Articulation agreements fall into four distinct categories, each of which has its own standards:

- baccalaureate credit courses
- general education-breadth
- course-to-course articulation
- major preparation agreements

Baccalaureate credit courses transfer for elective credit only. For UC, the community college requests an update to the Transfer Course Agreement (TCA). The request is reviewed by UC and, if accepted, the course is added to the TCA.

The UC standards for TCAs are based on two principles, as stated in the *Handbook*:

1. The course should be comparable to one offered at the lower-division level on any of the UC campuses in the scope, level, and prerequisite.
2. If the course is not comparable to any offered at UC, it must be appropriate for a university degree in terms of its purpose, scope, and depth.

The review of TCA update requests is done annually and is also covered by the “Guidelines for Transfer Credit” (appendix B in the *Handbook*).

For CSU, Executive Order 167 allows a community college to place courses it deems appropriate on the “Baccalaureate List.”

It is good practice for curriculum committees to request of course originators an explanation of whether or not the course meets baccalaureate standards and to identify comparable courses at UC and CSU campuses. Evaluation of the course on these standards should be part of the deliberations of the committee. Once approved, the articulation officer can proceed to place the course on the CSU Baccalaureate List and submit the course for the next UC TCA update.

General Education-Breadth courses can be certified at the system level following the CSU-GE Breadth and IGETC process discussed in the previous section of this paper. *Individual course-to-course agreements* between specific CCC and UC or CSU campuses are the responsibility of the individual campuses, whether in general education areas or other courses.

Major Preparations Agreements specify comparable courses at the individual community college which, upon transfer, meet the lower-division major preparation requirements for a specific UC, CSU, or private four-year institution. Such courses are accepted in lieu of the specified major preparation courses at the receiving school. Those agreements are negotiated on a campus-to-campus basis through the services provided by the articulation officers at both institutions. Submission for major preparation agreements often require additional information beyond the course outline of record, such as syllabi, texts, and sample course materials. Such agreements are often of limited duration.

Lower division major preparation agreements serve as the basis for identifying the courses which are part of each “transfer program” at the college. In reviewing such courses, the curriculum committee has the responsibility to assure that the standards expected within the agreements are maintained. It is good practice for curriculum committees to maintain a file of current transfer articulation agreements or “major sheets.”

Placing Courses in Disciplines

AB 1725 replaced the credential system with minimum qualifications for each discipline. (The *Disciplines List* is updated every three years with the latest edition produced in spring 1996.) All the courses taught at a community college fall within one or more of the established disciplines. Only those faculty with minimum qualifications (or credentials, if hired prior to July 1, 1990), can teach courses within a given discipline. Essential to this process is the placing of all new and existing courses into one or more disciplines. In meeting the requirements of AB 1725, each local academic senate has established a process whereby all *existing* courses are placed in disciplines. As *new and substantially revised* courses are brought before the curriculum committee, it is good practice for the originator(s) to propose the discipline listing for the curriculum committee to review and approve.

The Academic Senate paper *Placement of Courses Within Disciplines* addresses this issue in more detail, and only a brief synopsis will be presented here. Generally, the department titles at a given campus correspond to one of the entries on the *Disciplines List*. In most cases the department names are the same as the discipline titles, but this is not always the case. For example, a certain college may offer courses within the Geology department which would correspond to the Earth Science discipline on the *Disciplines List*. A particular college may have a Criminology program which might be identified as Administration of Justice on the *Disciplines List*.

It may be that a given course is best listed in more than one discipline. This is referred to as **multiple listing**. For example, Business Management 101 might be listed in both the Business and Management disciplines. This would enable instructors with minimum qualifications in either Business or Management to teach the course. Another option is to list Business Management 101 as **interdisciplinary**. This would require the instructor to meet minimum qualifications in either Business or Management *plus* upper division or graduate work in the other. (The exact nature of the training in the other discipline would be specified locally.) The decision as to a multiple or interdisciplinary listing of the course should be made on the basis of the course content. If either discipline prepares the instructor to teach the course, multiple listing is appropriate. If the instructor needs the knowledge base of both disciplines, the curriculum committee should list the course as interdisciplinary.

A separate issue is the existence of two courses, Business 101 and Management 101, each of which is taught to an identical course outline of record. This is called **double listing** and is most often done to meet the major preparation needs of students. For example, a student majoring in business might sign up for the course as Business 101, and a management major might be in the same classroom but registered for Management 101. Double listing does not address the question of placement in a discipline. The content of the double listed Business 101/Management 101 course would still need to be examined to see if it could be taught with preparation in either discipline (multiple listing) or if it needs preparation in both (interdisciplinary).

VI. Curriculum Approval Good Practices

The processes by which curriculum committees approve courses and programs for recommendation to the board of trustees is determined locally. These processes should be

approved by the academic senate and carried out by the curriculum committee. What follows are suggested good practices for carrying out that responsibility.

Origination of Proposals

Proposals for new and revised courses and programs should come from the discipline faculty, not from the curriculum committee. It is good practice for the proposal forms to have a sign-off for the faculty originator(s) in the discipline responsible for the course or program.

In instances when a curriculum revision is underway which encompasses more than one program, it may be best for the academic senate to form a task force of faculty in affected disciplines. Examples might be the institution of an honors program, an interdisciplinary program, or the establishment of a new vocational program in which new foundation courses may be needed in related disciplines. When the task force completes its work and the plans are approved by the academic senate, a coherent, unified proposal will be the result. This process will tremendously enhance the curriculum committee's ability to review and approve the proposal.

Preliminaries: Review by Other Disciplines and District Colleges

An individual course rarely stands alone. Almost always a course will serve the needs of students majoring outside the discipline of the course. A welding class may be taken by those working on an automotive repair degree or a physics class may prepare students for a major in engineering. When courses clearly affect curricula in other disciplines, it is good practice for the faculty in those disciplines to review those courses. It is good practice for the curriculum committee to request on the course submittal form whether such a review is needed and has been performed.

On many campuses this cross-discipline review is accomplished by reviewing curriculum proposals at the division level. This division review step in the curriculum development process may be accomplished by the entire division faculty or by a specially created division curriculum committee. Use of this division approach should be structured so that the primary goal of inter-discipline coordination is accomplished without impinging on the role of the college curriculum committee to review and recommend curriculum.

In multi campus districts, articulation of courses among the colleges is essential to maintain student access to the entire district curriculum. The extent of that articulation is a local matter. Some districts require identical course outlines for all colleges within the district. Others allow variability as long as clear equivalency is maintained between courses designed to meet the same requirements at different colleges.

It is good practice for the curriculum committee to require consultation among discipline faculty at colleges within the district. Where variation is allowed, the submittal form should indicate the equivalent courses on the other campus(es).

Preliminary review by faculty in related disciplines and at other campuses goes a long way toward producing a coherent curriculum and preventing future disagreements. This should be required practice before the curriculum committee accepts proposals for further review.

A common good practice is the use of a district curriculum committee to coordinate the curriculum among the campuses. The duties of the district curriculum committee relative to those of the college curriculum committee are a local matter. However, the use of a district curriculum committee should be carefully crafted to achieve the aim of a coherent and unified curriculum without subjecting every proposal to the delays of another round of review.

Preliminaries: Library Sign-Off

One of the requirements specified in *The Curriculum Standards Handbook* is the **feasibility** of offering the course. Among other factors, the availability of reference material and other instructional resources is significant. Prior to submitting the course outline for approval, it is good practice for discipline faculty to work cooperatively with library faculty to ascertain the need for instructional materials, assess the availability of such materials, and develop a plan for acquisition of those items not currently in the collection. A suggested process for accomplishing this task is presented in the Academic Senate paper *Joint Review for Library/Learning Resources by Classroom and Library Faculty for New Courses and Programs*.

It is good practice for the curriculum committee to require that the library sign-off form be attached to the proposal for all new and substantially revised courses and programs.

Preliminaries: Technical Review

The primary task of the curriculum committee is to assure that state, college, and intersegmental standards are met. It is too often the case that committees use valuable time and resources doing “cross the t’s and dot the i’s” reviews. **A great number of colleges have found that a preliminary technical review eliminates this edit-by-committee task.** The use of a technical review subcommittee is described in the next section.

The Review Cycle: Reading, Discussion, Action

The review of curriculum proposals should be set to a definite annual time sequence (see Appendix B for examples). A good practice is to use the fall semester to receive, review, and approve new proposals. Spring meetings can be reserved for development, training, and special projects such as receiving program review reports and reviewing the results of CSU-GE and IGETC submissions. This may mean weekly or semiweekly meetings in the fall and a more relaxed monthly meeting schedule in the spring.

Care should be taken to observe deadlines. CSU-GE and IGETC submissions are due each December 15th. Catalog publication deadlines are often as early as February 1st.

It is essential that adequate time be provided for a full, open review of all proposals. A good strategy is to provide sufficient time to have all proposals subjected to three phases of analysis: initial reading by committee members, full discussion of the proposal with the originator(s), and action by the committee for approval, disapproval, or referral for further modifications.

The *initial reading* puts the proposal in the hands of the full committee for their perusal. Usually, the proposal is accompanied by a written rationale which addresses the course approval standards

(appropriateness to mission, need, quality, feasibility, and compliance--see above).

Following a thorough reading, the proposals are ready for in-depth *discussion*. The originator(s) should be present to address any issues raised by the committee. It should become apparent from the discussion whether the course will stand on its merits or if changes are needed. During the meeting, the nature of those changes should be communicated orally to the originator(s) as clearly as possible. It may even be possible to resolve issues immediately at the meeting--or soon thereafter--before a vote on approval is taken.

Finally, *action* is taken by voting on each proposal separately. In the case of an unfavorable outcome, a written rationale should be included in the minutes and communicated to the originator(s).

Many patterns of meeting schedules can be formulated to implement this three-step cycle. A three meeting schedule would have the three steps occur at sequential meetings, perhaps with divisional proposals staggered throughout the fall term. Another alternative would be to distribute the proposals to the committee members in advance and then use two subsequent meetings to discuss and act upon them. It may even be possible to discuss and take action in a single meeting if no uncertainties exist.

Whatever the plan, an adopted review schedule should not be so rigid that it cannot accommodate the needs of faculty to have sufficient time and opportunity to bring their proposals forward.

Final Sign-Off by Faculty Chair/Co-Chair

It is often the case that alterations to course outlines are made during committee discussions with the originator(s). These modifications should be noted on a master copy of the outline for incorporation at a later date. It is good practice for the faculty chair or the faculty and administrative co-chairs to sign-off on the final revised copy of the course outline. The date of final approval should appear on the outline. This signed version can then be distributed to the originator(s) and committee members. This final approved version would be the official copy kept by the college, usually under the supervision of the CIO or in the curriculum office if provided with sufficient space and support. It would be this copy that is entered into the database for inclusion in the college catalog.

VII. Subcommittee Structure and Good Practice

The major work of the curriculum committee takes place during meetings at which the proposals are discussed. However, the ground work which is laid before the proposal reaches the committee goes a long way toward ensuring speedy, affirmative approvals. The previous section mentioned some preliminary reviews which can smooth the process. This section makes a few recommendations on a subcommittee structure to do this preparatory work and more. While a formalized subcommittee structure may not be necessary for every campus, at minimum the identification of those with the knowledge in each of these specialties--and the willingness to perform the tasks--is essential.

Technical Review

It is good practice to form a subcommittee for the purpose of technical

review. Usually only two or three faculty are needed, perhaps the chair plus one or two committee members, at least one of whom is well versed in the structure and proper use of the English language. In addition to grammar and syntax, the review should assure that all required components of the proposal are present. Subcommittee members should work directly with the faculty originator(s) to iron out any problems. Revisions or additions are to be made before advancing the proposal to full committee review. This will usually necessitate a due date for the proposal at least a week prior to that set for distribution to the full committee.

Prerequisites The inclusion of prerequisites, corequisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and other limitations on enrollment requires the originator(s) to do some justification of the requirement before bringing the proposal--and appropriate documentation--to the curriculum committee to review. Where the use of prerequisites outside of the discipline is extensive, it is good practice to identify two or three people on campus, not all of whom need be on the curriculum committee, to aid those in the process of adding, revising, or justifying existing prerequisites. Those best-informed on the subject typically tend to be the faculty curriculum chair, matriculation coordinator, institutional researcher, and chief instructional officer. It is these individuals upon whom the task of constructing a college prerequisite procedure (in accord with the *Model District Policy*) most reasonably falls. A preliminary review of the prerequisite proposal and accompanying documentation by this group can assure that only courses which meet the regulations and college policy will go forward to the full committee. This core group is also of great use in doing "house calls" to those discipline faculty in the process of prerequisite preparation to assist them in the process.

Distance Education Courses and sections taught in distance education mode must be separately reviewed and approved by the curriculum committee. The preparation of curricula in distance education mode is a sufficiently specialized field that a subcommittee will be quite useful. Membership would reasonably consist of those faculty with experience preparing courses in this format. The Academic Senate paper *Curriculum Committee Review of Distance Learning Courses and Sections* contains a suggested process and check off sheet which can be attached to the proposed course outline.

VIII. Maintaining Delegated Approval Authority: Good Practices

The Education Code places several curriculum review responsibilities in the hands of the Board of Governors. Some of these curriculum approval authorities have been delegated directly to the colleges--conditional upon college commitment to strict standards of excellence.

Approval Authority

The approval authorities conditionally delegated to local colleges, as specified in *The Curriculum Standards Handbook*, Section 2.2, are the ability of the local college to:

- Approve new *credit* courses not part of approved programs....
- Determine that a given course meets the conditions of repeatability in accordance with provisions of Title 5 §58161(c).
- Enter into conjoint programs between specified colleges within a district that allow one college in the district to offer introductory and intermediate courses to be counted toward a degree or certificate approved by the Chancellor's Office for a different college.

To maintain these approval authorities the college must commit to the following standards, as specified in *The Curriculum Standards Handbook*, Section 2.4:

2.4.1 Knowledge

The first standard is that faculty and staff charged with curriculum review will know state standards and requirements for curriculum review and approval, including in particular the information in this *Handbook* and addenda, as well as general standards of good practice in curriculum and instructional design.

2.4.2 Procedures

The second standard is that the procedures employed both by the curriculum committee and in other phases of the local curriculum development and approval process assure that standards can be responsibly applied. Relevant indicators that this standard is met include:

- a) Reviewers follow a process that is systematic and well-publicized and that includes both those with disciplinary expertise in the subject matter at issue and those outside the discipline who are affected by the course.
- b) Handbooks, checklists, and model outlines, or other aids, used in the review process, correctly address this *Handbook's* standards.
- c) Faculty are accorded the scope of responsibilities mandated in law.
- d) Reviewers are provided information on the particular courses or programs that is substantive, complete, specific and timely enough to enable them to apply these standards independently and appropriately.

2.4.3 Curriculum

The third standard is that continuing delegation requires that colleges be able to assure that they produce approvable Course Outlines of Record that are in compliance with the standards specified in Sections 3 and 5 of Volume I of this *Handbook*; and would typically be acceptable as meeting the requirements of transfer receiving institutions.

There are two conditions which colleges must meet to maintain delegated curriculum approval authority. First, the local college must submit to the Chancellor's Office, as evidence of the commitment to the above three standards, the Delegation Checklist, Appendix D in *The Curriculum Standards Handbook* (and appearing on the next two pages) along with appropriate documentation as specified in the checklist. To offer technical assistance in achieving the three standards, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Chancellor's Office Advisory Committee on Curriculum and Instructional Resources offer a series of day-long Regional Colloquia. A second condition of continued delegation is that colleges participate in the Regional Colloquia once each three years or make other arrangements for technical assistance from the Chancellor's Office at local expense. The Regional Colloquia are described in the *Handbook*:

2.6 Regional Colloquia

To assist colleges in maintaining delegation of approval authority, Regional colloquia will be convened on a three year cycle, beginning with the first 1995-96 term. At that time, colleges will have the opportunity to share their supporting documentation, including such items as local Handbooks and training materials and sample course Outlines of Record, where appropriate. As currently envisioned, a college will have opportunity to participate in a colloquia for one day's duration once in every three years.

Each year the colloquia will be planned in consultation with the approximately thirty colleges that will be participating in that year, to cover:

- Updates on changes to law and state procedures
- Sharing of procedures and conceptions of good practice

- Sharing and discussion of Outlines of Record that are exemplary, typical, or problematic
- Issues of regional or systemwide concern
- Suggestions for improving systemwide procedures, revisions to the Handbook, etc.

Primary leadership for the colloquium process will be provided by the Academic Senate, coordinated by a standing Advisory Committee to the Chancellor's Office on Curriculum and Instruction, working with the colleges that will be participating in the colloquia in that year. Colloquia participants may suggest other assistance that can be provided to help colleges maintain intersegmental acceptance of their courses, fulfill the three standards of delegation, and otherwise meet the curriculum standards in this Handbook.

DELEGATION CHECKLIST

This Form should be completed by college personnel and submitted to the Chancellor's Office annually according to a schedule to be published during 1995.

College:		Date:	
Chief Instructional Officer	Faculty Curriculum Chair	Academic Senate President	
<i>Signature</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Signature</i>	

<i>First Standard</i>	<p>KNOWLEDGE on the part of all faculty and staff charged with curriculum review, of state standards and requirements for curriculum review and approval, and of the information in this Handbook, addenda, and related materials on curriculum design and instructional methods.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Availability of Materials</i> This Handbook and/or locally developed handbooks or other materials are readily available to all those responsible for reviewing and recommending or approving curriculum. Local materials incorporate complete and correct explanations of the state standards as covered in the current version of the Curriculum Standards Handbook and addenda.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Reviewer Training</i> As indicated in records maintained by the college, the training afforded the reviewers at a minimum includes current state standards, intersegmental expectations, and standards of good practice covered in the current version of the <i>Curriculum Standards Handbook</i> and addenda.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Updates & New Reviewer Orientation</i> Maintained records also indicate that reviewers are regularly updated and new reviewers are provided with appropriate materials and training.</p>
<i>Second Standard</i>	<p>PROCEDURES employed by the curriculum committee and in other phases of the local curriculum development and approval process assure that standards will be applied with consistency and rigor to different cases, based upon input from all appropriate parties.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Identification of Reviewer Roles</i> The roles and functions of all who review and recommend curriculum, including both curriculum committee members and those who are part of the process, even when not on the curriculum committee, are identified in the college handbook and are trained on this material wherever it falls within their responsibilities.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Course Review Materials</i> Handbooks, checklists, sample outlines, and other aids used in the approval of courses correctly embody the five criteria for Chancellor's Office approval defined in Volume I and in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> CCR §51022 Instructional Programs <input type="checkbox"/> CCR §55002 Standards and Criteria for Courses and Classes <input type="checkbox"/> CCR §55805.5 Types of Courses Appropriate to the Associate Degree <input type="checkbox"/> CCR §55182 On the Reinstatement of Deleted Courses
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Locally Developed Course Standards</i> The materials provide the definitions mandated in CCR §55002 to local curriculum committees. They explicitly define and/or operationalize 'critical thinking' and 'college level'. Insofar as possible, they also explain when a degree credit course is sufficiently independent of reading or calculation skills as not to be covered by the requirement for essays or basic skills prerequisites (per CCR 55002)</p>

DELEGATION CHECKLIST (Continued)

Second Standard	PROCEDURES employed both by the curriculum committee and in other phases of the local curriculum development and approval process assure that standards will be applied with consistency and rigor to different cases. (CONTINUED)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Formats and Instructions Formats used for presenting course Outlines of Record or new programs assure that all components required in law are addressed. Forms require enough detail that the adequacy of each component may be fairly assessed and instructors and students using Outlines of Record may readily understand what is expected of them. Instructions for completion of course outlines and new program applications are complete and accurate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Approval Process The local handbook or other materials clearly explain the process for new course and program approval including who is to be included, the criteria to be used, what information is to be supplied, the reasons for the required information, and the time frame.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cross Discipline Review The process provides for input from those with discipline-specific expertise, resource expertise, and those outside the discipline who are affected by the course, such as instructors in courses specified as a prerequisite to the course in question, or who teach in a degree or certificate program serviced by that course, or who are at transfer institutions.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Time Allowance The time frame is sufficient to allow those included in the process to apply the standards responsibly.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Committee Composition and Charge The curriculum committee is constituted according to CCR §55002(a)1, is charged with determining the approvability of courses and otherwise affords faculty the scope of responsibilities mandated in CCR §53200, §53203, and §55002.
Third Standard	CURRICULUM <i>Course Outlines of Record are in compliance with the criteria and standards specified in Sections 3 and 4 of the Curriculum Standards Handbook.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Availability of Outlines of Record Outlines of Record on file at the college are current, are routinely distributed to faculty assigned to teach the courses they govern, and are made available to students.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequency of Curriculum Review Outlines of Record are reviewed frequently and thoroughly enough to assure rigor, effectiveness, and currency in the curriculum and continuing conformity with the standards defined in this Handbook and its updates. Prerequisites are reviewed at least every six years.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Outlines of Record in New Program Applications Outlines of Record included in applications for the approval of new programs, when submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval, are judged to be an acceptable part of the application, relative to the general standards for courses explained in Sections 3 and 4 of this Handbook.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Intersegmental Review Results General education courses submitted for intersegmental review in connection with the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Core or Executive Order 595 of the California State University system are usually accepted.

The Knowledge Standard

It is good practice for each college to develop a **Resource Manual** containing all pertinent reference materials. Each member of the curriculum committee should have a copy of this manual and additional copies should be in the library, office of instruction, counseling office, and each division office. Examples of the resource documents which are of most use are cited below.

CURRICULUM RESOURCE MATERIALS

- 1. The Curriculum Standards Handbook, Volume I, 1995.**
Ed Code, Title 5, and Chancellor's Office legal requirements in the area of curriculum. Source: Each CIO and curriculum chair has one hard copy.
- 2. The Curriculum Committee: Role, Structure, Duties, and Good Practices, 1996**
Summary of requirements and good practices for operation of the college curriculum committee. Source: The Academic Senate.
- 3. Joint Review for Library/Learning Resources by Classroom and Library Faculty for New Courses and Programs, 1995.**
Developed jointly by the Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office Curriculum Advisory Committee this summary of mutual instructor/librarian review of needed instructional materials includes suggested forms for the review of both new courses and programs and is recommended as good practice for curriculum committees. Source: The Academic Senate.
- 4. Curriculum Orientation Package I: Degree Credit Standards, 1993.**
Designed for information and training of local curriculum committees, this packet is hands-on information on the curriculum standards for degree credit courses and was prepared jointly by the Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office. Source: Curriculum Services & Instructional Resources Unit, Chancellor's Office.
- 5. Components of a Model Course Outline of Record, 1995.**
Prepared by the Academic Senate to review all requirements for course outlines for degree credit courses including a suggested format and content for the course outline to meet those standards. Source: The Academic Senate.
- 6. Handbook of California Articulation Policies and Procedures, 1995.**
This handbook, prepared by the California Intersegmental Articulation Council, contains an overview of the articulation process used by UC, CSU, and Independent Colleges and Universities and gives contact persons at each of these institutions. Source: California Intersegmental Articulation Council (Helena Bennett, CSU Sacramento).
- 7. California Articulation Number (CAN) System: Catalog (1996) and Guide (1995).**
CAN is a cross-reference course numbering system for lower division transferable major courses. It is based on course-to-course articulation between CCCs and CSU and assists students and colleges in identifying comparable (not identical) courses. Participating colleges agree to accept CAN courses in lieu of each other and use them in the same way their own CAN-qualified courses are used. Source: CAN System Office, California State University, 2763 E. Shaw, Suite 103, Fresno, CA 93710; 209/278-6880.
- 8. CSU Executive Order 595, 1993.**
General education-breadth requirements for students transferring from CCC's to CSU. Replaces EOs 338

and 342 which allowed self-certification. Source: CSU Chancellor's Office.

9. Curriculum Orientation Package II: Transfer General Education, 1994.

This package contains intersegmental expectations for credit course outlines of record; CSU Executive Order 595 on GE-Breadth and related forms; IGETC standards, notes, and other relevant documents; local college procedures to comply with CSU GE and IGETC requirements, and sample Course Outlines of Record for CSU GE areas C & E. Source: The Academic Senate.

10. Model District Policy for Prerequisites, Corequisites, Advisories, and Other Limitations on Enrollment, 1993.

This set of guidelines is recommended by the Board of Governors to implement the prerequisite regulations. The curriculum committee is intimately involved in establishing these limitations on enrollment. Source: Student Services Unit, Chancellor's Office.

11. Establishing Prerequisites, 1992.

The commentary on the Model District Policy was written by the Academic Senate representatives on the committee which wrote that document. Source: The Academic Senate.

12. Curriculum Orientation Package III: Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Advisories, 1994.

This package gives examples of local college policies and procedures to implement Title 5 and the Model District Plan. Source: The Academic Senate.

13. Title 5, Sections 55300-55380. Regulations and Guidelines on Distance Learning.

Requirements for courses and sections taught in distance learning mode are covered, including the role of the curriculum committee. Source: Curriculum Services & Instructional Resources Unit, Chancellor's Office.

14. Curriculum Committee Review of Distance Learning Courses & Sections, 1995.

A review of the 1994 changes to Title 5 and their impact on curriculum committees, including suggested good practices to implement the regulations and guidelines. Source: The Academic Senate.

15. Distance Learning in California's Community Colleges, 1993.

This paper reviews the social, fiscal, and educational issues surrounding distance learning. Source: The Academic Senate.

16. California Community Colleges Taxonomy of Programs, 1995.

TOPs codes are the numeric coding system by which districts categorize degree and certificate programs and courses for both authorization by and reporting to the Chancellor's Office. As such, curriculum committees should recognize that each course and program approved must fall into an assigned TOP code area. (The Chancellor's Office plans to soon replace the TOP code system with a discipline/subject matter based system.) Source: Chancellor's Office.

17. Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges, 1996.

As of 1990, minimum qualifications replaced credentials for the hiring of new community college faculty. This document quotes relevant Ed Code and Title 5 sections and gives the Disciplines List and accompanying minimum qualifications. Source: The Academic Senate.

18. Placement of Courses Within Disciplines, 1994.

Faculty hired to teach in a discipline, either under the credential or minimum qualifications systems, are allowed to teach any course in that discipline. As such, it becomes important for each college to assign courses to the subject matter areas identified in the Disciplines List. This document, prepared by the

Academic Senate, gives a suggested procedure for local academic senates to use in this process, including multiple listing and interdisciplinary listing. As new courses are approved by curriculum committees, recommendations to the senate for discipline assignment are needed. Source: The Academic Senate.

19. Program Review: Developing a Faculty Driven Process, 1996.

This paper discusses the salient features of an effective program review process. Source: The Academic Senate.

Reviewer training is essential to assimilate the technical information needed to make sound evaluations of curriculum proposals. It is good practice to hold an annual all-day training session for curriculum committee members, or some functional equivalent. New committee members should have a special orientation session before attending the all-day training. A good practice is to develop a **Training Booklet** designed to give an overview of the curriculum process, summaries of the standards and resource materials, sample curriculum proposal and approval forms filled out with sample information, hands-on examples of typical course outlines and how they are reviewed, and tips for new members.

During the year, a portion of each meeting should be devoted to updates on current curriculum issues. Training should go beyond that of the committee members. Regular workshops should be held for faculty and administrators on such topics as standards for course outlines, articulation processes for major preparation agreements, CSU GE-Breadth and IGETC, prerequisite procedures such as content review and research methods, and distance education guidelines and regulations.

The curriculum committee chair should document these training efforts and submit that documentation with the Delegation Checklist. Typically, this would include a list of the documents in the Resource Manual, a copy of the Training Booklet, and the dates, topics, facilitators, and attendees for training sessions and workshops.

The Procedures Standard

It is good practice for each college curriculum committee to have a **Curriculum Handbook**. Typically, this handbook would contain the following information.

- The charge to the committee, membership (names and titles, including appointing body, terms, and selection process for chair/co-chairs), operating procedures (meeting times, dates, places, minutes of past meetings, plus any by-laws), and reporting responsibilities (e.g. to academic senate).
- A flow chart of the approval process with the roles and functions of all participants identified. In particular the process should include cross discipline review and a specific time line which demonstrates adequate allowance for a full review of each proposal.
- Summaries and abstracts of review standards from Title 5, the Curriculum Standards Handbook, CSU Executive Order 595, IGETC Guidelines, Distance Education Guidelines, Prerequisite Model District Policy, and Accreditation Standards.

- Locally developed standards for critical thinking, college level courses, prerequisite content review and research validation, distance education regular contact, and any other locally developed policies such as unit guidelines on lab or studio hours, contract language on class size, etc.
- Curriculum proposal and review forms (with instructions):
 - Proposal cover sheet for a new or revised course outline of record
 - Format for new or revised course outline of record
 - Library sign-off for new course or program
 - Prerequisite/Corequisite/Advisory content review
 - Prerequisite/Corequisite standard in 3 UC/CSU catalogs
 - Prerequisite/Corequisite research validation study
 - Distance Education checklist
 - Proposal for a new program

The Approvable Curricula Standard

The course outlines of record must be reviewed on a regular basis to assure currency and rigor of the curriculum. It is good practice to do this regular review of the entire curriculum as part of the college's program review process. The curriculum committee should review this process to be sure that current curriculum standards are applied by the discipline faculty during their review. Also, it is good practice for the curriculum committee to receive these reports directly from the discipline faculty. A good way to accomplish this is to invite the faculty to a spring meeting of the committee to present their report and discuss it with the committee.

External reviews of the college curriculum are important in determining the approvability of its courses and programs. In particular, the college should have a favorable record of approvals of new program applications to the Chancellor's Office and of CSU GE-Breadth and IGETC submissions. Where problems are identified, the college should develop a strategy to address those problems and be able to demonstrate steady improvement.

Documentation

Colleges should follow the Delegation Checklist when preparing documentation in support of their commitment to the standards for maintenance of delegated curriculum approval authority. Typically, this documentation would consist of the following.

- For the *knowledge standard*, colleges should submit a list of the documents in their Resource Manual, a copy of their Training Booklet, and a list of training activities for the year (dates, topics, facilitators, and attendees).
- For the *procedures standard*, colleges should submit their Curriculum Handbook containing, at a minimum, the items listed in the above discussion.

- For the *approvable curricula standard*, colleges should submit copies of 1) college policy on maintenance and distribution of current course outlines of record, 2) the college program review procedure, 3) Chancellor's Office evaluation of new program applications, and 4) CSU and IGETC evaluation reports of general education submissions.

IX. Summary

The curriculum committee plays a central role in the California Community Colleges. This role has expanded tremendously with the expanding role of faculty in community college governance and with the expanding demand for a curriculum which is flexible and responsive to the needs of our increasingly diverse student body. These demands have necessitated, now more than ever, that faculty understand the role of the curriculum committee, remain committed to high curriculum standards, and implement the college curriculum in an organized, efficient manner. To that end, this document reflects the collective wisdom of the faculty of the California Community Colleges and is recommended as a compilation of requirements and good practices to our colleagues charged with that task closest to our professional calling--the development, review, renewal, and approval of sound curricula.