

MJC Curriculum Committee

Unit Value Review Process to Respond to Concerns about Unit Values for New or Active Courses

The following Curriculum Committee Unit Review Process has been developed in response to the **MJC Academic Senate Resolution F18-E**. This process can be initiated in several ways.

NOTE: At any point during curriculum review cycle, a faculty author or authorized curriculum representative who anticipates concern about unit value may include *Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal Form* in attached files for Curriculum Committee Members to review. This does not automatically initiate the Unit Review Process unless explicitly requested by author of course.

Author/Department-Initiated Unit Review Process

The following process ensues when a course proposal is pulled for first reading discussion at a curriculum committee meeting due to various concerns, including unit value:

1. **First Reading:** Course is pulled for discussion due to concerns:
 - a. **Discussion** ensues about the course unit values, which may include but not be limited to PCAH Criteria, Student need and success, Law/Regulation
 - b. **Vote outcomes**
 - i. **Approved** for a first read, and scheduled for second read.
 1. **If the author has included the *The Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal Form* with their original submission** of the course and wishes to start the Unit Review Process, then curriculum co-chairs convene a Standard Unit Review Sub-committee (SUR) to validate evidence before the second reading. Once co-chairs submit the determination in Technical Review stream, the course will be placed for a second reading on the next curriculum committee agenda.
 2. **If the author did not include the *The Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal Form* with their original submission.** At this point, the faculty author may initiate the Unit Review Process by completing *The Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal Form*. Once this is complete and placed in attached documents, the curriculum co-chairs will then convene a Standard Unit Review sub-committee, and once co-chairs submit the SUR committee's determination in Technical Review stream, the course will be placed for a second reading on the next curriculum committee agenda.
 - ii. **Withdrawn** by the department for revisions or to revert values in response to feedback
 1. Curriculum co-chairs unlock the course for editing if necessary
 - iv. **Tabled definitely or indefinitely**
2. **Second Reading:**
 - a. **Evidence Form Not Submitted or Not Validated:** Course is approved or not approved with the author's proposed unit value with a MAJORITY vote;
 - b. **Evidence Form Included and Validated:** If "Evidence" form was inserted as an attached document with the course and the sub-committee has validated the evidence, then a TWO-THIRDS vote by the curriculum committee is required to overturn (not approve) the author's proposed course otherwise the course is considered approved.

Standard Unit Review Sub-committee

The below steps are followed to allow for the creation of the **Standard Unit Review (SUR) Sub-Committee**.

- i. **Curriculum co-chairs appoint or accept volunteers** for an ad hoc sub-committee to function as the **Standard Unit Review Sub-Committee**
 1. **Membership** consists of three voting curriculum committee members outside of the division in which the course proposal is submitted, one of which will act as chair
 2. **Charge of the Sub-committee** will be to validate the accuracy and currency of evidence provided on the *Evidence to Support Unit Value* form
3. **SUR Committee Review Process Begins:**
 - a. **Author(s) prepare and attach Evidence:** Author(s) complete the *Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal* per Academic Senate Resolution F-18-E, attach it to the course proposal in the curriculum management system, and notify the Co-Chairs this step has been completed.
 - b. **SUR Committee is Notified:** A Curriculum Committee co-chair immediately notifies the SUR chair that the form is complete and to commence their work
 - c. **SUR Committee meets promptly** in order to submit a final committee vote/decision within 14-28 days of notification to the curriculum co-chairs or within two curriculum committee meetings.
 - d. **SUR Committee validates evidence accuracy, currency, and completeness** to ensure it conforms to criteria set forth in **Senate Resolution F-18E**.
 - i. **SUR Committee verifies** evidence and SUR chair works to ensure swift and diligent review of evidence.
 - ii. **Evidence Form is formally validated, not validated, or sent back** for further review by the SUR chair.
 1. Should issues arise during evaluation, the chair must promptly communicate the issues to the author / curriculum representative and is at liberty to ask for clarification or additional information. The author is given an opportunity to respond to concerns.
 - iii. **SUR Committee members independently** decide on the evidence submitted and provide Curriculum Co-chairs with written rationale for their individual determination as to whether evidence is valid, current, and supports median unit values across California Community Colleges that offer course. SUR committee may work as a group to verify the evidence, but the decisions remain individual.
 - e. **SUR Committee Decision is finalized** from tally of individual votes. Majority vote stands.
 - f. **SUR Decision is recorded:** Curriculum co-chairs record the SUR decision by commenting in the Technical Review stream for the course. Comments should clearly indicate whether the tally of votes by **SUR Committee** results in evidence being **validated or not validated**.
4. **Course is placed on agenda:** Curriculum Committee co-chairs promptly place the course on the next agenda following Brown Act timelines
5. **Curriculum Committee votes** on proposal informed by the outcomes of SUR Committee decision
 - a. **SUR Committee Findings and Voting Process**
 - i. **Validated Evidence form** will require a TWO-THIRDS majority vote against the proposal, unless:
 1. in event that course units proposed would not comply with law, statute, or regulation

- ii. **Not validated Evidence form:** author of course has not shown course units match median unit values for California Community Colleges who offer the course. This will trigger a normal vote on proposal (with no protection by TWO THIRDS majority)

6. **Curriculum Committee Process following Vote**

a. **Proposal APPROVED:**

- i. **Active Course or New Course:** course is implemented following normal curriculum process and implementation timelines, taking under consideration operational timelines

b. **Proposal FAILS:**

- i. **Existing Course:** active version of the course stays in effect assuming it is compliant with periodic review.
 - 1. In the event the course is not compliant, existing law and procedures apply.
- ii. **New Course:** the course proposal may be brought back to the committee in the future with revisions addressing the concerns of the committee.

*If substantial changes to the Senate Resolution F-18E occur, this process is to be revisited.