

Comparable Course Criteria

(Proposed)

Prepared for the MJC Curriculum Committee by the Comparable Course Workgroup for the September 12, 2017 Curriculum Committee Meeting

The following criteria have been prepared in response to the March 24, 2017 Curriculum Committee motion: [Review of Curriculum for Quality and Currency](#).

Upon approval of any forthcoming criteria, course proposals according to the type listed and falling within the number range specified would be required to supply the evidence indicated in the corresponding section.

Committee-endorsed, streamlined enhancements to facilitate this process would be forthcoming in CurricUNET. Until then, authors would be asked to provide evidence in the *Comparable Courses* and/or *Attached files* modules.

NMBR RANGE	EVIDENCE REQUIRED FOR PROPOSAL TYPE
1-99	<p>New/Substantial Change (as outlined by CCCCCO or CIAC[†])</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approval for <u>OR</u> strong alignment with finalized C-ID descriptor, <u>OR</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Provide an example of one similar course/program from another accredited college/ university, or research and/or similar evidence substantiating the new/revised model, <u>OR</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Write a departmental narrative detailing the pedagogical and/or evidenced need for new or substantially changed curriculum
100-199	<p>New/Modified/Periodic Review*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approval for OR strong alignment with finalized C-ID descriptor, <u>OR</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Two comparable lower-division courses being offered in the current academic year at a CSU and/or UC. Examples <u>must</u> be drawn from the current catalog year in ASSIST <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>to demonstrate the relevance and value of the course content and credit earned in the context of an earned baccalaureate degree</i> o <i>to guide four-year course-to-course articulation efforts upon local approval</i>
200-299	<p>New/Modified/Periodic Review*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approval for <u>OR</u> strong alignment with finalized C-ID descriptor, <u>OR</u> <input type="checkbox"/> A letter from a local focus group made up of 2 or more leaders within regional industry and an MJC instructor <u>OR</u> <input type="checkbox"/> One comparable lower-division course being offered in the current academic year at a CSU and/or UC. Examples <u>must</u> be drawn from the current catalog year in ASSIST. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>to demonstrate the relevance and value of the course content and credit earned in the context of an earned baccalaureate degree</i> o <i>to guide four-year course-to-course articulation efforts upon local approval</i>
300-399	<p>New/Modified/Periodic Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approval for <u>OR</u> strong alignment with finalized C-ID descriptor, <u>OR</u> <input type="checkbox"/> A letter demonstrating support and need from a local focus group made up of 2 leaders within the industry and a MJC instructor.
400-999	(No Comparable Course evidence required at this time.)

[†] Because articulation agreements can be adversely impacted by changes to prerequisites, CIAC (California Intersegmental Articulation Council) regards a **prerequisite/co-requisite, unit, or significant content change** as a "substantial change" will trigger re-review of agreements

* When proposing or revising families or series of "courses related in content", authors shall uniquely validate each series course to show the sequence is necessary in entirety for transfer success. Evidence may be validated through articulation agreements and/or UC/CSU program/sequence requirements. While curricular formats may vary by institution, we want to ensure that students are not obliged to complete coursework that may not be able to be articulated with the receiving institution, and/or delay transfer goals.