

Columbia College Curriculum Review Process for Lower Division Courses: Stages, Roles, and Responsibilities

The Columbia College Curriculum Committee, in accordance with YCCD Policy 4020, California Education Code, and title 5, adheres to the curriculum review process outlined below. Additionally, the College submits the Annual Curriculum Approval Certification form to the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) certifying that it meets all CCCCCO curriculum and curriculum training requirements.

Annual Curriculum Review and Approval Timeline

January – October

All curriculum is subject to a five-year review timeline. Faculty may submit new and modified curriculum to become effective in the following fall semester at any point January through October (the fall curriculum submission deadline is annually determined in spring by the Curriculum Committee). The goal is to have all curriculum for the following year approved by the Curriculum Committee in early November and by the Board of Trustees (BOT) no later than the December BOT meeting. This timeline allows sufficient time for the Articulation Officer and Curriculum Specialist to submit newly approved curriculum to appropriate bodies for approval and articulation in order to meet catalog and scheduling deadlines. Exceptions to the timeline may only be made by approval of the Curriculum Committee.

Curriculum Review and Approval Process (Courses, Certificates and Degrees)

All curriculum (courses and awards) goes through a thorough review process as approved by the Curriculum Committee. Although there are minor variations in steps and roles depending on the type of curriculum (course/award) and the type of workflow (course deactivation vs. award proposal), the process, roles, and responsibilities are generally as follows:

1. Planning Stage

Prior to submitting curriculum, discipline faculty work with their Division Dean and VPI to discuss topics including:

- proposal goals and objectives
- proposal alignment with college EMP, college mission, and higher education in California
- placement in college curriculum and regional need
- proposal ability to meet student and industry needs
- consideration for resources (physical, human, technology, finance) and outcomes
- local advisory committee involvement
- review of labor market information

2. Curriculum Submission Stage

Discipline faculty, as Discipline Originators, work with the Curriculum Chair and Specialist to submit curriculum proposals into the College's curriculum management system, eLumen, within the timeline outlined above.

Notes: If submitting a CTE award, Discipline Faculty will need to provide Local Advisory Committee meeting minutes showing committee endorsement of proposed curriculum. If submitting a new course, the Discipline Originator will need to initiate the YFA Class Capacity process outside of the eLumen workflow (see YFA contract for details).

3. Technical Review Stage

In the Technical Review stage, the following roles participate:

- Articulation Officer (AO) – reviews entire workflow and focuses on the development of Associate Degrees for Transfer as authorized by Senate Bill 1440 in relation to Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC templates), Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID descriptors), Articulation Agreement by Major (AAM), CSU Baccalaureate Level Course List by Department (BCT), and CSU GE Certification Course List by Area articulation (GECC). The AO reviews appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor of all courses and awards. In course workflows, the AO reviews course descriptions, pre-requisite(s), sequencing, numbering, objectives, learning outcomes, units, course outlines, textbook(s), and assignments. The AO also reviews articulation requests in terms of course applicability and requirements for C-ID descriptors, CSU Transferability, California State University General Education Breadth Requirements (CSU GE), Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), Columbia College GE Requirements (CC GE), and University of California Transferable Course Agreements (UC TCA), and CC-MJC Intradistrict Comparability.
- Curriculum Chair – reviews entire workflow for compliance with the CCCC's Course and Approval Handbook (PCAH), title 5, and college curriculum guidelines. The Chair generally reviews descriptions, course information (MOI, MOE, assignments, texts, objectives, CSLOs/PSLOs), DEA, synthesis of learning, award builds including reviewing appropriate length, breadth, depth, and rigor, appropriateness of curriculum to college mission and curriculum inventory
- Curriculum Specialist – reviews entire workflow for technical correctness focusing on integrity of MIS coding, compliance with the CCCC's Course and Approval Handbook (PCAH), title 5, college curriculum guidelines, class capacity
- Division Dean – reviews entire workflow, focusing on alignment with college goals, two-year planning needs, resource needs including materials/fees, class capacity, place in college curriculum
- Distance Education Coordinator – reviews entire workflow focusing on matters relating to distance education and to correspondence education. Primarily reviews DE and CE Addendum Step in addition to MOI/MOE, assignments, and other fields on Specifications Step

- Faculty – reviews entire workflow and provides discipline and/or industry-specific peer input on items including description, MOI, MOE, assignments, texts, objectives, SLOs/PSLOs, distance and/or correspondence education, synthesis of learning
- Student Learning Outcome and Program Review Coordinator (SLOPR) – reviews entire workflow focusing on course SLOs (CSLOs), award SLOs (PSLOs) and SLO mapping: CSLO to ISLO mapping (during course review) and CSLO to PSLO mapping (during award review)

4. Discipline Originator Stage

The Discipline Originator receives the workflow, responds to Technical Review comments, and makes appropriate corrections and updates.

5. Committee Review Stage

In the Committee Review stage, the following roles participate:

- Articulation Officer – ensures that articulation-related concerns raised during Technical Review have been addressed
- ASHP Representative – reviews entire workflow as a faculty representative of the Arts, Sciences, Human Performance division, focusing on items including descriptions, course information (MOI, MOE, assignments, texts, objectives, CSLOs/PSLOs), distance and/or correspondence education, synthesis of learning, award builds including reviewing appropriate length, breadth, depth, and rigor, appropriateness of curriculum to college mission and curriculum inventory
- CTE Representative – reviews entire workflow as a representative of the Career Technical Education division focusing on items including descriptions, course information (MOI, MOE, assignments, texts, objectives, CSLOs/PSLOs), distance and/or correspondence education, synthesis of learning, award builds including reviewing appropriate length, breadth, depth, and rigor, appropriateness of curriculum to college mission and curriculum inventory as well as industry needs.
- SS Representative – reviews entire workflow as a representative of the Student Services division focusing on items including descriptions, course information (MOI, MOE, assignments, texts, objectives, CSLOs/PSLOs), distance and/or correspondence education, synthesis of learning, award builds including reviewing appropriate length, breadth, depth, and rigor, appropriateness of curriculum to college mission and curriculum inventory as well as student services needs related to the proposed curriculum
- Faculty Rep-at-Large – reviews entire workflow as a representative of the Faculty at large focusing on items including description, course info (MOI, MOE, assignments, texts, objectives, CSLOs/PSLOs), distance and/or correspondence education, synthesis of learning, award builds including reviewing appropriate length, breadth, depth, and rigor, appropriateness of curriculum to college mission and curriculum inventory
- Distance Education Coordinator – ensures that all DE- and CE-related concerns raised during Technical Review have been addressed

- SLOPR Coordinator – ensures that all SLO- related concerns raised during Technical Review have been addressed

6. Discipline Originator Stage

The Discipline Originator receives the workflow, responds to Committee Review comments, and makes appropriate corrections and updates.

7. Curriculum Agenda Stage

After the Discipline Originator has addressed all comments/questions and made all corrections, the workflow moves to the Curriculum Agenda stage for a final integrity check by the Curriculum Chair and Specialist before being placed on an agenda. When a workflow is deemed ready by the Chair, it will be placed onto a Curriculum Committee agenda for a vote by the Curriculum Committee.

Notes: New courses cannot be placed on an agenda until a Class Capacity has been formally established (see YFA Contract). New/modified CTE awards must have Local Advisory Committee approval with meeting minutes that show discussion/approval of curriculum changes.

8. Curriculum Specialist / Instruction Office (Final) Stage

When curriculum is approved by the Committee at a meeting, the workflow moves into the Final Curriculum Specialist/Instruction Office Stage where it remains until it has received Board of Trustees (BOT) approval. Upon BOT approval, the Articulation Officer can move forward with submissions to various articulation bodies while the Curriculum Specialist can submit proposals to the CCC Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory (COCI) for chaptering (local curriculum) or for review, approval, and chaptering of all new CTE and new/revised AD-T programs. *Note: Some CTE awards may first require additional Regional Consortia approval.*

9. ACCJC Review – (for new awards and substantive changes)

The Curriculum Specialist, in consultation with the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), will submit new program proposals to the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) for approval as well as all necessary substantive change inquiry requests. Upon ACCJC approval, the Curriculum Specialist notifies various College offices, archives the ACCJC communication, and updates eLumen with approval dates.