

## **Course Outline Routine Review Process and Procedures**

### **Background**

In 1985, Long Beach City College began a program to routinely review one-fifth of the curriculum documents each year. The program was created at the urging of the accreditation visiting team with the following purposes:

1. Assess the relevance of our curriculum to our college mission and educational program goals/objectives.
2. Provide a reasonably up-to-date outline of course content, which can be given to faculty newly assigned to teach the course, used for articulation, or given to outside requesters.
3. Promote accuracy in the data we maintain about our curriculum, and subsequently report to the state on an annual basis.
4. Meet accreditation standards.

In October, 2001, the Curriculum Committee passed a resolution requiring that all existing courses be translated onto the updated and integrated Course Outline Document and that this process would follow the locally established Routine Review cycle. This process will continue until the college's entire curriculum is presented on the integrated Course Outline Document format. This Course Outline Document can be found at the Course Outline Web Site at <http://www.lbcc.edu/curriculum>.

The Course Outline Document is a legal document, which establishes liability for the college. Each summer, the Academic Services Office publishes a list of courses to be reviewed during the upcoming school year and distributes that list to Curriculum Committee Representatives, Department Heads, and School Deans. In turn, Department Heads involve faculty in the review process and provide leadership in this effort.

### **What to Look For**

The materials in the balance of this chapter will assist you as you participate in this review process. Additional material is found in the *Faculty Curriculum Reference Book* (<http://iras.lbcc.edu/currefbook.htm>) and handout materials from Academic Services. The following suggestions are made for the benefit of those doing a Routine Review of Course Outlines for credit curriculum; however, the general principles are the same for noncredit courses.

1. Has the course been offered within the last four semesters? If not, should the course be deleted or inactivated?
2. Is the course consistent with the college mission and is the current course number appropriate for the college numbering system? Courses in the 100 and 300 band need special attention. Ask Academic Services for additional guidance.

3. With which program is the course associated? Is it a required or recommended course for the certificate or degree?
4. Does the Course Title accurately reflect the course description or content?
5. Is the current Catalog Description accurate and reflective of course content and theory? Is it written using complete sentences?
6. In the case of multi-semester courses (CHEM 1A-B), does the Catalog Description and Course Outline reflect the scope and distinction of each term's instruction?
7. Do the listed prerequisites accurately describe those courses a student must have taken in order to successfully complete the course requirements? Has a Content Review been completed within the past six years? (The Requisite Scrutiny Form can be viewed on the Course Outline Web Site. Search for the identified course and click on the Requisite button.)
8. Do the listed corequisites accurately describe the course in which a student must be concurrently enrolled in order to successfully complete the course requirements? Has a Content Review been completed within the last six years? (The Requisite Scrutiny Form can be viewed on the Course Outline Web Site. Search for the identified course and click on the Requisite button.)
9. If a recommended preparation statement is associated with the course, has a Content Review been completed within the last six years? (The Requisite Scrutiny Form can be viewed on the Course Outline Web Site. Search for the identified course and click on the Requisite button.)
10. Is there a minimum of six (6) learning outcomes described? Are at least three (3) of these learning outcomes reflective of college-level critical thinking for all credit courses that apply to the Associate Degree (courses numbered 1-599)? Are learning outcomes expressed in observable and/or measurable terms?
11. Is the course content, as described in the official Course Outline, an accurate reflection of current classroom instruction? Are the topics/concepts presented in a heading/subheading format? Does each major topic indicate the approximate amount of time devoted to it?
12. Is the course content taught in accordance with a core of student learning outcomes that are common to all sections of the course and listed in the outline?
13. Is the scope of appropriate instructional presentation methods identified and described? Do the instructional methodologies reflect the possible use of distance technology within the class structure (i.e. hybrid courses)? Are descriptions expressed in complete sentences?
14. Are there at least three (3) course-specific assignments described so as to reflect the opportunity for students to achieve the course's learning outcomes? Are explanations written in complete sentences?

15. Does the course treat the subject matter with intensity (outside of class preparation and pace of instruction) at a level that stimulates intellectual growth? Do assignments require two hours of out-of-class preparation for each hour of lecture time in class?
16. All courses with lecture contact hours demand assignments of written work. Courses that teach problem solving, such as mathematics, should provide modified written work, rather than expository writing. Skill building courses (laboratory contact hours only), such as music or physical education, need not require written assignments; all other courses must.
17. Are evaluation methodologies described as they align with the course's assignments, content, and learning outcomes? Do these descriptions provide standards and criteria (general expectations)? Are descriptions expressed in complete sentences?
18. If texts are appropriate, are two (2) representative, college-level textbooks listed? Is complete information included (author, title, publisher, year)?
19. If technical manuals, periodicals, and/or web sites are used as supplements, are appropriate references provided on the textbook page under the "Recommended" prompt?

### **Process**

Academic Services distributes the annual Routine Review list of courses via the Curriculum Committee Representatives, Department Heads, and School Deans. A Faculty Author initiates the Routine Review Process by creating a draft version of the identified Course Outline on the web site (<http://www.lbcc.edu/curriculum>). The Faculty Author reviews and updates the Course Outline. (Please reference "Web Standards of Good Practice".) The Faculty Author informs the Department Head and School Dean that the draft version is ready for their review and signatures (signature lines are located on the face page of the Course Outline Document).

### **Web Standards of Good Practice Regarding Curriculum Documentation for New Courses or Routinely Reviewed Outlines**

1. Faculties who teach multiple sections of a course are expected to collaborate and reach agreement on the Course Outline contents and on the appropriateness of any requisites.
2. The principal Faculty Author leading the work on an outline of record is responsible for consulting collegially with others who teach the course and those in the collaborative circle who help review the document to achieve consensus on the following:
  - a. Course facts (Course Title, contact hours, Catalog Description, requisites)
  - b. Learning outcomes
  - c. Content topics and relative time devoted to each major area
  - d. Representative instructional methods, assignments, means of and criteria for evaluation and textbooks
  - e. Presupposed knowledge and skills where pre/corequisites or recommended preparation is involved
3. The documentation must meet the minimum standards for curriculum documentation established by the Course Evaluation Subcommittee or it will be returned to the originator.

4. Reviewers are to participate in the collaborative circle by providing a constructive critique that applies expectations inherent in CCR (Title 5) and locally developed standards of good practice and by consulting collegially with the principal author and those in the signature path.
5. All signatories are expected to contribute to the proofreading process to ensure an accurate, complete and professional product.
  - a. Where substantive changes are requested, the originator will be asked to make them, but if reluctant to do so, additional discussion is required.
  - b. Where procedural, mechanical, technical, and proofing changes are needed, the party making the corrections will inform the originator of the changes.
6. If a college Routine Review Work Group is in place, the following procedure will occur:
  - a. The department shall contact the Routine Review Work Group member assigned to that school to “submit” the draft version of the Course Outline.
  - b. The Routine Review Work Group provides a college-wide peer review of the draft version of the identified Course Outline. Any suggestions to strengthen the document will be forwarded to the Faculty Author and the Department Head and School Dean will be copied.
  - c. Communication between the department members and the Routine Review Work Group is encouraged.
  - d. When refinements and/or updates have been accomplished, the Faculty Author and/or Department Head should contact the Routine Review Work Group for the final review.
  - e. The Routine Review Work Group will inform the Curriculum Technician, curriculum-desk@lbcc.edu, when the draft version of the identified Course Outline has successfully been completed.
  - f. The Routine Review Work Group will notify the department that Academic Services has been contacted regarding completion of the Routine Review Process.
  - g. Academic Services will process the draft version of the Course Outline into its new “adopted” status.
7. If a college Routine Review Work Group is not in place, then the following procedure will occur:
  - a. The department will provide all peer review efforts and updates to the draft version of the Course Outline.
  - b. The department then contacts the Curriculum Technician in Academic Services (curriculum-desk@lbcc.edu or extension 4126) to submit the finalized draft version of the Course Outline.
  - c. Academic Services will process the draft version of the Course Outline into the new “adopted” status.

### **Addenda to the Course Outline**

Long Beach City College has addenda documents for Distance Learning and Honors versions of credit courses. (Please reference the *Faculty Curriculum Reference Book* Credit Course Outline

Section.) If a credit course is due for Routine Review and it has a Distance Learning or Honors version, they too must be reviewed. Completion of the appropriate addendum form is all that is necessary to fulfill this requirement. A department does not need to create a separate Course Outline for the Distance Learning or Honors version. Presently, the Distance Learning Addendum form can be downloaded from [www.iras.lbcc.edu/currforms.htm](http://www.iras.lbcc.edu/currforms.htm), while the Honors Addendum is located within the Course Outline document under the Honors button. A Distance Learning Addendum must be completed in hardcopy, signed, and submitted to the Curriculum Technician within the established deadline time frame.

### **Future Review Procedures**

Once a course is reviewed and translated onto the integrated Course Outline Document on the web, future Routine Course Reviews will consist of the department's technical and qualitative review of information for currency and relevancy. The documentation of this process will be managed by the use of the Routine Course Review Transmittal Form.

### **Completing the Transmittal Form**

Attached is the Routine Review Transmittal Form to be completed and submitted to Academic Services for each course as you complete the review. This form is filed in the folder maintained in the Academic Services Office for each active course offered by the college to verify that a periodic Routine Review has been completed. The Department Head normally completes this form. The following points will help you fill out the form:

1. Place today's date on the form.
2. Add your name as Department Head on the "From" line.
3. On the next line add the Course Title and Number of the course being reviewed.
4. The next area of the form gives you a number of choices, depending on the changes you have made to the course.
  - a. Reviewed and unchanged is self-explanatory.
  - b. Minor, technical updates will need to be identified to the Curriculum Technician. Adjustments are to be made on the web Course Outline Document and noted on this document.
  - c. Significant revisions to any page of the Course Outline are to be reflected on the web Course Outline as well as communicated here and with the submission of a Course Change Form to the Curriculum Technician for placement on the Course Evaluation Subcommittee agenda. (Should the subcommittee have any questions regarding the changes you are proposing, you will be notified of the time and place for a meeting.)
  - d. If you are inactivating or deleting the course, please submit a Course Change Form along with the Transmittal Form. These changes will be added to the Course Evaluation Subcommittee agenda. (Should the subcommittee have any questions regarding the changes you are proposing, you will be notified of the time and place for a meeting.)
  - e. If the proposed change you wish to make doesn't belong under any of the above, please check "Other" and specify the change.

5. Please sign and date the bottom of the form.
6. Submit all documentation to the Curriculum Technician in Academic Services Office.

