Primary Charge:

1. **Summary of the original problem:**

   The visiting team was concerned that there continued to be no formal system, policy, or practice to ensure consistency of course content, objectives, and standards from the time curriculum is approved until the present. Their recommendations: 1) Periodic review of established core outlines should be formalized and institutionalized to assure the currency and continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies. 2) Division chairs should ensure that all syllabi are regularly compared to the core outlines to provide assurance that objectives and competencies for all sections of a given course, wherever and by whoever offered, are consistent with the outline of record for that course.

2. **Committee Activities:**

   The committee maintained its proposed schedule of activities for 2002-03:
   - During the fall semester, the committee met on Sept. 10, Oct. 1, Oct. 15, and Nov. 19, and in the spring semester on Feb 28.
   - A campus-wide open forum was held Oct. 10.
   - The revised draft was sent to all academic divisions for review and endorsement.
   - The revised draft was presented to the Faculty Senate at their Dec. 11 meeting and passed unanimously (with amendments) at their Feb 5 meeting.
   - The draft was sent to the Provost on March 12, 2003 and signed by him on March 20.

3. **Present status of the problem:**

   The college has formally approved and adopted the following policy:
LCC Policy on Curriculum Revision and Review

March 20, 2003

**Purpose:** To establish policy and procedures for institutionalizing curriculum revision and review, and for the periodic review of core outlines and course syllabi with the goal of assuring academic rigor and integrity in all courses and programs and of assuring the continued appropriateness of curriculum content, instructional methods, course activities and objectives, and student competencies.

**Implementation:**

1. The division will be responsible for determining which courses will be reviewed each year, so long as all courses are reviewed over a six-year cycle.
2. Each discipline will review its own courses, ensuring the accuracy of the core outlines, their academic rigor, integrity, and currency, and the continued articulation of the courses with system colleges, should that be the case.
3. If the courses to be reviewed need no modification, the division chair will input approval into Curriculum Central.
4. If the core outlines that are reviewed need modification, normal curriculum procedures for course modifications as determined by the Chancellor for Community Colleges Memos (CCCM) will be followed within the current semester. The discipline representative will be present at the Curriculum Committee meeting to present the rationale, etc., for the changes.
5. Curriculum Central will be modified so that the essential elements needed for course syllabi are standardized with the same initial information. This standard information will become the first page(s) of each course syllabus to ensure that course alpha and number, title, credits, prerequisites, description, goals, and learning outcomes, are presented uniformly regardless of the instructor. Also on the first page(s) will be the fields for the instructor's personalized information: name, office, office hours, phone number, email address, course section number, classroom, course meeting days and times, and requisite textbooks and supplies. Additional pages of the syllabus will reflect the individuality, style, and creativity of the instructor.
6. Each discipline will compare the core outlines of the revised courses with the individual syllabi of the faculty within the current semester.
7. If the syllabi do not reflect the required elements of the core outline, the discipline, along with the division chair, will work with the faculty to correct the discrepancies within the current semester.
The college has a written Curriculum Review process that includes a system for refining and evaluating the process. At the end of this review process, all core outlines will be complete and all individual course syllabi will have as their focus measurable student outcomes.

4. **Review by the campus community:**

An open forum was held on Oct. 10, 2002 for campus-wide critique. Based on the input that was received, the committee amended the draft. Then in November, each division was presented with the draft and asked for feedback. The committee again met to determine what they felt should be changed as a result of division input. Finally, the draft was presented to the Faculty Senate on Dec. 11 where it was debated and alterations were suggested. On Feb 5, they unanimously voted to recommend the policy with their amendments. The committee met a final time on Feb 28 and voted to include the changes made by the Senate. The final draft was sent to the Provost for his review, endorsement, and approval on March 12, 2003.

5. **Shift from plan to implementation:**

Throughout the spring semester, meetings were held by discipline to instruct the faculty in the assessment plans of the college, with the first step being the implementation of the policy on curriculum revision and review. As stated in the policy, discipline coordinators were charged with setting up a schedule for reviewing their curricula, and for correcting errors in core outlines in Curriculum Central. The use of the course syllabi template was explained.

Coordinators are to have their courses corrected in Curriculum Central by the end of spring 03 semester or submit a schedule showing when the work will be completed.

Curriculum Central will be made available to coordinators to make the necessary changes expeditiously.

Course syllabi templates will be provided to the faculty in time for them to prepare for the fall 03 semester opening.

Follow-up meetings will be held with coordinators. Each discipline/division will develop its timeline for reviewing curriculum according to the policy.
Secondary Charges:

The committee also addressed 6 action plans put forth by the college in its last self-study that are relevant to curriculum revision and review.

1. Gather random samples of course outlines and syllabi for specific courses taught at the College and at other institutions in the system, compare them, and determine if they show the same rigor.

Committee response: There is a university Fast Track committee that is addressing this at the system level, so there is no need for LCC to act on this right now.

2. Give instructors the final grades of all sections of the courses they teach so that they can compare the grades they give with the aggregate grades of all the other sections of the same course.

Committee response: No action. It was determined that the amount of work required to accomplish this was not commensurate with the amount of benefit it might produce for the few faculty who desire the information.

3. Determine how the F and N grades should be used across all courses and clearly communicate their meaning to the faculty and students.

Committee response: The committee voted unanimously to give this to the Faculty Senate at their April meeting with a request that they survey the campus and “test the waters” on this historically volatile issue at LCC.

4. Identify the minimum passing grade for each prerequisite and state it in the description of the affected courses in the Catalogue.

Committee response: Divisions will be instructed to make corrections in time for the next Catalogue.

5. Evaluate the long-term need for alternative delivery systems, e.g., distance education, learning communities, and cooperative education, and provide funding for those deemed important to the College’s mission.

Committee response: No action. The College has a committee reviewing the mission statement during the spring semester. Any action now would be premature.

6. Resolve the credit/non-credit differences and integrate various evaluation components and processes into its overall institutional evaluation and planning.

Committee response: No action. This is on Banner’s agenda in the near future.