MJC Curriculum Committee
Process to Respond to Concerns about
Unit Values for New or Active Courses

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

- **Author/Department-Initiated**
- **Curriculum committee-initiated**

**Author/Department-Initiated Process**
At any point during curriculum review cycles, a faculty author or authorized curriculum representative who anticipates concern about unit value may preemptively initiate the process by preparing and attaching an *Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal Form* to a course proposal. Upon dean’s submission of the proposal to the review stream, those individuals should email the Co-Chairs and request that they appoint or convene a *Standard Unit Review (SUR)* Committee (Process Step #2) to validate an *Evidence to Support Unit Value* form prior to the course being initially placed on an agenda, at which point, the process below would begin at Process Step # 3. Triggering preemptive review does not require action by committee.

**Curriculum Committee-Initiated Process**
The following process ensues when a course proposal is pulled for first reading discussion at a curriculum committee meeting due to concerns surrounding unit value:

1. **First Reading:** Course is pulled for discussion due to a concern about unit value:
   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 at the next meeting
      ii. **Withdrawn** by the department for revisions or to revert values in response to feedback
         1. Chair unlocks the course for editing if necessary
      iii. **Tabled definitely or indefinitely**
2. **Second Reading:**
   a. **Approved** with the proposed unit value. The *Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal Form* is not required.
   b. **Not Approved:** The course is not approved with the proposed unit value. The *Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal or “Evidence” form* must be completed.
      i. **Edits** at this point, the Curriculum Co-Chair unlocks the course proposal for editing purposes.
      ii. **A committee co-chair appoints or accepts volunteers** for an ad-hoc (?) sub-committee to function as the *Standard Unit Review (SUR) Committee*
         1. **Membership** consists of three voting curriculum committee members, 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 Form
3. **SUR Committee Review Process Begins:**
   a. **Author(s) prepare and attach Evidence:** Author(s) complete the *Evidence to Support Unit Value Proposal form*, 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** [prior to the next CC meeting? Scheduling can be tricky] in order to submit a final committee vote/decision within 14-28 days of notification.

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.
   iii. **SUR Committee members independently** decide on the evidence submitted and provide written rationales for their individual determinations to the SUC Committee chair. SURC 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

f. **SUR Committee Decision is recorded**: SUR Committee chair records the SURC decision by commenting in the Technical Review stream for the course. Comments should clearly indicate whether the evidence was **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. course units proposed would not comply with law, statute, or regulation
      ii. **Unvalidated Evidence form**: 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.